

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1980

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Baie Verte -

White Bay.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of

privilege.

Mr. Speaker, it has just been more than a month ago since I stood in this House to state clearly and unequivocally my position with regard to one of the most vital issues to face this Province in its history, the issue of Newfoundland's ownership of its offshore resources.

At that time I stated in the strongest terms my disagreement with the position of this Party as it relates to this vital matter. I stated my disagreement also with the position of the federal Liberal Party - now the government in Ottawa - whose inconsistent policy on this question has created a most difficult and needless controversy in our Province.

My position on this issue, Sir, was made quite clear. I believe that legally and morally Newfoundland and Labrador alone owns the mineral resources under its continental shelf. The inclusivity of Newfoundland's rights involves fundamental principle on which, in my view, there can be no compromise or relinquishment.

Mr. Speaker, as the representative for the district of Baie Verte - White Bay, I have a responsibility to do all in my power to work for the future well being of my constituents and to protect their interests to the fullest possible extent. Also, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House, I have the same duty to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador as a whole. Moreover, I have a responsibility to make certain that personal interests, the

MR. T. RIDEOUT: interest of my Party or any other interest for that matter, do not conflict with the fundamental obligations I have to this Province.

It is a stark reality, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland, even given the benefits of Confederation, has not been able to achieve the level of prosperity comparable with the rest of Canada. For this failure, Sir, we certainly can not blame the architect of this Province. When you consider the abundance of natural resources with which God has blessed us, when you consider our mineral, fishery, forestry and hydro resources and other resource wealth, it is no fault of nature that Newfoundland finds itself in its current economic dilemma.

The fact is, Sir, and history has unmistakably proven this to be true, political leadership in the past has dismally failed to manage Newfoundland's resource development in a competent and capable manner. Our people have suffered as a result, but, Sir, it benefits no one to dwell on the

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

mistakes of the past. If we are wise, we will not dwell upon them but learn from them. We must, therefore, take every measure necessary to ensure that in the future we will seek new and better directions.

With recent oil and gas discoveries off our shores, Mr. Speaker, we can begin now to pursue those new policies. We are eminently lucky, for seldom does such good fortune present itself more than once. We have a new major opportunity to become an economically viable member in Confederation. We have an opportunity to move forward from being economically the 'worst off of provinces in Canada to being fifth or fourth or maybe even third best.

Moreover, we might also be in a position to contribute back in a substantial way to the rest of Canada. However, Sir, what I find difficult to accept is the fact that this Province and its people are being prevented from achieving those objectives in the most calculated way imaginable by the government of this country, supported, I might add, by this party.

As everybody knows, the Federal Liberal Government has taken the position that Newfoundland and Labrador does not have ownership over its offshore resources, that we do not have the right to control and manage them. It is a position which I believe defies law, history and morality, and I was raised to believe that justice and equality rests on all three of those.

I find ludicrous the Federal Government's argument that Newfoundland's rights would require a Supreme Court decision, when, as I have already stated, that in the 1930s, the Government of Canada, in the case of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, saw fit to give each of those provinces ownership and control of their resources and provide for this grant with an appropriate constitutional amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I might add that economic arguments made by those provinces for such ownership were not altogether different than those of this province. In other cases, Sir, the Federal Government extended the boundaries of a number of provinces and thereby extended their jurisdictions. The Federal Government did this without any reference to the Supreme Court, without any great national controversy, indeed without the consent of the other provinces in Canada. Therefore, Sir, the position of the Federal Government is one which defies not only all reason but all precedent. It is a position, Sir, which I believe is reflected in a number of issues facing Canada as a whole today and is placing great strain on the unity and fabric of this country.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the precedent exists. Therefore, what is simply required is for the Federal Government in Ottawa to desist in its claim to our offshore resources. In doing so, Sir, this province can get on with the job of managing our resources in an effective, efficient and beneficial way.

Indeed, we must get on with the job of ensuring that the measures which our government has implemented to make absolutely certain that the employment and industrial opportunities which will accrue to offshore development will benefit our people, we must get on with the job without the slightest delay so that our environment, our culture and lifestyle do not suffer. If we do it right, we can avoid the negative aspects associated with offshore oil development, and,

MR. T. RIDEOUT: in so doing, enhance the quality of life we enjoy. But, Mr. Speaker, without ownership and control we will have no power to do any of those things. That is why, Sir, it makes me sad that this party supports Mr. Trudeau's position and refuses to take the only responsible course of action, which is to support the government's eminently responsible position on the offshore question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. RIDEOUT: I always believed, Mr. Speaker, that Liberals should be leaders in the fight to ensure better management of our resources. How often that members of the Liberal party echoed one after another that the Churchill Falls contract type of management policy should never be repeated. Yet today, Sir, this same party refuses to go forward and establish new directions and champion some of the soundest, most sensible resource management policies that this Province has ever seen.

Mr. Speaker, I entered politics in 1975 with the belief and conviction that I had something to contribute to the people of my district and to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. At that time I believed that the Liberal Party, which I represented, was the party which had the best policies and the kind of philosophy with which Newfoundland and Labrador would be guided into the future. The people of my district elected me then and again for a second time in 1979. They placed their confidence and trust in me and, Mr. Speaker, I have never, and I do not now, treat that confidence or that trust lightly.

Mr. Speaker, I still firmly believe that I have a contribution to make to the political life of this Province and I intend, Sir, in the best way I know how to pursue my goals and my objectives in this regard. However,

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Sir, I no longer believe that the party to which I was elected now has the policies ^{or} the kind of philosophy that Newfoundland and Labrador needs throughout the 1980's and beyond, ⁱⁿ order for Newfoundlanders to progress and attain our place in the Canadian family. I no longer believe that the Liberal Party has the desire and the commitment to place the fundamental interests of this Province above the level of partisan politics nor pursue the social, economic, and cultural objectives to which all Newfoundlanders aspire.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party's position with regard to the ownership of our offshore resources demonstrates those facts in every way. Since making my last speech in this House, I have discussed the ownership issue at length with practically everybody. I have waited for some sign that there would be a radical shift in the Liberal Party's support for the Trudeau position. I have also, Sir, discussed the issue with my colleague, Newfoundland's representative in the federal Cabinet. Indeed, I asked him if the Speech from the Throne would contain something to indicate a change in the federal position. I was told that he would do what he could but, Sir, the Speech from the Throne speaks for itself. There was no reference whatsoever to the Newfoundland case over ownership of its offshore resources.

I am very proud, Sir, and I believe the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are indeed fortunate that the Progressive Conservative Party who formed the government of this Province has a very strong commitment to resource management in this Province. Newfoundland is fortunate to have a government which is not prepared to place partisan issues above the interests of our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Indeed during this past year I watched closely our Premier both inside and outside this House. I never cease to be awed by his energy and enthusiasm. I am impressed by his courage and his vision for Newfoundland's future.

Mr. Speaker, given the policies and the vision being pursued by the gentlemen opposite in contrast to positions taken by the Liberal Opposition, mostly particularly as far as the offshore resources are concerned, it is not surprising that I would examine and reassess my position in the Liberal Party. I spent many difficult weeks considering my future in political life. The decision I have taken has not been arrived at easily; however, I have concluded, Mr. Speaker, that I can no longer support the Liberal Party of this Province.

A few days ago I discussed my future with the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the Premier, and I indicated to him my interest in joining his party and asked his consent and that of the PC Caucus. I was subsequently advised that the caucus members, without exception, endorsed my decision and have welcomed me to their party and caucus. My decision, I might add, has been conveyed to the Leader, and through the Leader to the Liberal Caucus.

There are some, Mr. Speaker, who will question my decision and my motives towards this end. Let them, Sir. Let me repeat, firstly, I believe in a party that has the courage of its convictions, that is prepared to stand on certain fundamental principles which cannot be compromised by partisan objectives. The Liberal Party stand on the ownership of our offshore resources, resources that will effect the economic and social future of Newfoundland for generations to come, is both unacceptable and to me unforgivable.

Secondly, Sir, I want to assist the Premier and the Government of this Province in whatever way I can in the pursuit of ownership and control of our offshore resources.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thirdly, I want to send a clear and unmistakable message to Ottawa that Newfoundlanders throughout our Province, regardless of political stripe, are prepared to stand together and fight for what is ours unequivocally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, on the strength of those convictions and with the firm belief that those whom I have the honour to represent will support my decision today as the only morally acceptable stand which I can take, I ask through you, Mr. Speaker, that my place be moved to the other side of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, to the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of privilege, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just a few comments, Mr. Speaker, not to strain the matter, I think this is a very momentous occasion, a very historic event in the life of this Legislature and in the life of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, in the political life and in the economic life of this Province.

The hon. the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has made a courageous, historic decision. I think it should go forward from this House today that what the hon. member has done is broken on a point of principle, a point which I personally feel very strongly about and have for as many years as I have been in public life, and many people, both on this side

PREMIER PECKFORD: and throughout this Province feel very strongly about, and that is the management of our resources and a chance to contribute in a more meaningful way to Confederation as we know it. I do not want to beg the issue, Mr. Speaker, but we, as a PC caucus, welcome, as we communicated to the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) several hours ago, welcome him to the PC caucus and to the government of this Province and assure him that we will continue to pursue those policies which have made it a difficult decision for him to make to leave one political party and to join another. It is courageous and historic and, as the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay has so aptly said, let the message go forward, Mr. Speaker, first of all that we are true, patriotic Canadians and we want to be even truer patriotic Canadians, Canadians who contribute in a more meaningful way to a vibrant Confederation from Bonavista to Vancouver Island. And I think that is what is inherent in this whole business of offshore, the manage of the resources of this great country. We welcome the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). We think it is a courageous move on his part, it is historic in the life of this legislature, and let it always be recorded that it was done on a issue of principle which embodies the future viability of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to contribute meaningfully to a great country called Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! With respect to the point of privilege, I think it is fair to say that members rise on a point of privilege basically in two ways; One is a technical, precise, a defined matter of privilege, allegation of breach of privilege; and secondly, members frequently rise on a point of privilege in order to make an explanation, a comment. In the particular matter, the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), I believe, has taken the opportunity to state his position and intentions; therefore there is no prima facie case and thus no point of privilege.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up statement to one I made in the House on March 27th concerning the efforts being made by government to stabilize lobster prices paid to fishermen this coming fishing season, and the efforts being made by the Department of Fisheries and the Fishing Industry Advisory Board to ensure a fair price for fishermen for lobsters this year, a series of meetings have been held with Fishermen's Union (N.F.F.A.W.U.) on this matter.

I now wish to inform the House that the Fishermen's Union, as a result of discussions with a number of lobster buyers, for this year, this coming season, has now notified me that they have obtained an undertaking from several prominent lobster buyers whereby these buyers this year will pay a

MR. J. MORGAN:

price of \$1.70 per pound as an opening price and the prices will not be less than \$1.70 a pound this year for lobsters. That is as a result of discussions held between a number of buyers and the union.

At this time, based on market conditions, I see no reason why this opening price should not be met by all the buyers in the Province and that prices should stabilize around this level for this lobster fishing season.

Work is presently in progress, Mr. Speaker, within the Department of Fisheries, in establishing a system or a means to evaluate prices offered to fishermen, taking into consideration, of course, the prevailing market conditions. I have now instructed the Fishing Industry Advisory Board to monitor the situation throughout the lobster fishing season and to maintain and to provide me with a record of the actual lobster prices being paid by the various buyers throughout the Province throughout the season, and also for the same board, the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, to maintain and to provide me with a record of the situation in the wholesale market area, primarily in Boston, where a majority of the lobsters bought and collected in our Province are sold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if after review of the data and information supplied to me by this monitoring system by the board convinces me that the price changes made by the buyers are not justified by the conditions of the wholesale market or that favourable market conditions are not relayed on, or passed on, by bringing benefits to the fishermen in better prices, I, as minister, have no hesitation as a minister responsible for the Fishing Industry Advisory Board to investigate, through the board, the business practices and the records of the buyers in question. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the government is determined to use the Fishing Industry Advisory Board under its mandate to carry out investigations, look at the books and the records of all the buyers who refuse to, or for any other reason, do not pay \$1.70 per pound for lobsters this year. And we have the authority to do that under the legislation of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board.

MR. J. MORGAN:

So the board will investigate the business practices and the records of any buyer in question. And also, Mr. Speaker, we will not hesitate in taking action in connection with the buyer's licence which is being issued by this government, by the Department of Fisheries - and we have control over it. And if we find a buyer who is not complying with the wishes of the fishermen through the Fishermen's Union, upon investigation by the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, we will have no hesitation in taking action in connection with the buyer's licence, which means that we will possibly place very stringent conditions to the buyer's licence. This will be done only to eliminate the abuse in regard to

MR. MORGAN: the prices being paid in the lobster fishery.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about the lobster fishery, I would also like to indicate this morning to the House that there is a major problem in the lobster industry in the Province, lobster fishing industry, not only with the price that we hope will be overcome as a result of this action taken the last two or three weeks, but also with the lobster harvesting by the fishermen, a problem with the licencing. And as a result of this morning I have been informed by Mr. LeBlanc's office that a meeting will take place now on next Thursday, on April 24th., in Ottawa, between Mr. LeBlanc and his officials and the officials of the Department of Fisheries and myself and one of the things to be discussed, of course, will be, including a number of other matters, will be the licencing of fishermen. But there are a lot of inequalities in the licencing system of lobster fishermen whereby one fisherman can have a licence to fish a maximum of 50 pots, and some other fishermen can have a licence to fish a maximum of 500 pots, or more. In some cases one boat can fish up to as many as 900 pots, one fisherman, and other bona fide fishermen can only obtain a licence to fish 50. Or in many other cases a bona fide fisherman cannot get a licence to fish the lobster species.

So that matter will be discussed with Mr. LeBlanc as it ties in to the lobster fishery. I would also like to say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that the matters brought forward by the Fishermen's Union and the fishermen, I have held meetings with different groups of fishermen over the last two or three days, two or three weeks, in fact, and the management of the hearings stocks around the Province is a major concern, the setting of quotas, the problem of the damage done to the fishermen's gear by whales last season, and the need for an emergency fund to be established as soon as possible to get the fishermen back in the boats. That is a matter for discussion with the minister at next Thursday's meeting.

MR. MORGAN: The over the side sales, which is a big problem in the Province, needs to be dealt with by the federal minister, and also the Federal Subsidy Programme. These are the topics, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate to the House for the benefit of the Opposition spokesman on the fisheries, the major topics that will be discussed with the federal minister at next Thursday's meeting and I would be only too pleased to relay to the House, after returning from that meeting, the details or outcome of the talks with the federal minister and his officials.

The opening price last year, except for the Great Northern Peninsula, was \$1.50 per pound on the Northeast Coast, but on some parts of the Great Northern Peninsula, the Port au Choix area and other areas of the Province, it was \$1.70. But it dwindled down from there, Mr. Speaker, around the, I think it was, the 10th. of May, and it stayed there throughout the season, \$1.50, despite the fact there were fluctuations in the Boston market. On the 10th. of June last year the Boston market was showing a price of over \$2.00 a pound, but still the price of lobster in our Province was \$1.50 per pound

MR. J. MORGAN: and there were no fluctuations reflecting better markets in Boston. And what I am saying here is that we hope the opening price will stabilize throughout the Province and that any buyer who is not paying at least \$1.70 per pound - and I specified in my statement -

MR. S. NEARY:

MR. J. MORGAN: I said, Mr. Speaker, no less than \$1.70 per pound and I want to make it clear that the government cannot play a role of setting lobster prices, we cannot do that, and this price is a result of negotiations with the union and at least a number of larger buyers. So what we are saying is now no less than \$1.70 per pound as the opening price and we want that price to be maintained throughout the season. If it is not maintained by the buyers we will find out why by using the Industry Advisory Board to look at the books and the records and the practices of the buyers to make sure that the price is at least \$1.70 throughout the season whereas last year the price was \$1.50 in most parts of the Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Trinity Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Really the ministerial statement, Mr. Speaker, represents a statement on behalf of the Fishermen's Union, on the one hand, and what the minister's department intends to do on the other. But, Sir, may I say in opening that really the ministerial statement, the minister's statement this morning, does not realize the expectations that were raised in his first ministerial statement relating to the setting of lobster prices. We would, of course, like to pay tribute to the Fishermen's Union for entering into discussions with the lobster buyers. But there are two problems that I find with respect to the undertaking.

MR. F. ROWE: It is stated here that the minister has been notified that they have obtained an undertaking from several prominent lobster buyers, which seems to indicate to me, Sir, that this regulation or rule or agreement does not apply to all of the lobster buyers throughout the Province, that is point number one. One of weaknesses that I can find in this particular statement is that only several prominent lobster buyers, are included in the statement and therefore one has to assume that there are a number of lobster buyers who will be excluded from this particular regulation.

MR. J. MORGAN: No, no, all buyers will have to comply.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, it is not said here. If the minister assures the House that that is so, it is well taken. The second point, Sir, is the fact that the opening price will not be less than \$1.70, which is not that different from last year. In fact, last year in some cases the opening price was \$1.80. So I am wondering why it is not -

MR. D. JAMIESON: I know I paid \$1.80 for them.

MR. F. ROWE: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, obviously, why this opening price was not substantially greater than it was, in fact, last year.

MR. F. ROWE:

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is that I was under the clear and unmistakable impression during the first Ministerial Statement a few days ago by the minister, that he would be issuing conditional licences to buy lobsters to all lobster buyers in this Province. And the indication in the most recent Ministerial Statement is that only after an investigation through the Fishing Industry Advisory Board will action be taken in that particular regard.

Now, I simply close by saying that this statement really does not realize the expectations that were raised or presented before us in the first Ministerial Statement regarding lobster licences. I would have expected this to include all lobster buyers throughout the Province. I would have expected it to be an opening price something in excess of \$1.70 which is about the average of what it was for last year. And then, of course, the minister did not carry through with his commitment to conditionally licence the lobster buyers with regard to the setting of the price.

My own feeling, Sir, is that the minister is going to find it very difficult, in a free enterprise system anyway, to control the prices of lobsters in this Province, and this is something that he should have realized when the first Ministerial Statement was made.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I will forego. I was going to ask the Premier a question. He will probably be back in again, or the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry), but I will pass, if I may, for the moment to one of my colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Health. I mentioned it to him just before the House met.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Can the minister indicate to us, please, the government's position with respect to the suggestion that a Royal Commission be set up to look into the operation, as I understand it -and I do not know if the request has been made with precision, so I can simply state my understanding- with respect to the administration of health services in Coastal Labrador and in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, which are administered now as they have been, I suppose, as long as there have been services by the International Grenfell Association? And may I add that I think we on this

MR. E. ROBERTS:

side feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is a suggestion which ought to be heeded and I would suggest that perhaps the government should consider setting up such a Royal Commission to have a look into it and if there is something wrong, if there is something not right, then let us know about it so that it can be acted upon and if things are, in fact, okay then let us see what the situation is with an impartial, neutral party.

Where does the government stand on the matter?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to fill out a review of it. The point was that a group got together after a public meeting, as a result, I guess, of a very unfortunate incident, and they were given a mandate to look at the situation; and they have done a report and I have received it. They have done a report and have received it. One of the parts of the report - and I might say the report is not all negative; it is a good report. There are some good positive parts to it and it was very thorough. I cannot say how accurate it is. They sent out something like 1,700 questionnaires and they received just over 100, I think, back, so, you know, I do not know what that sampling is like either.

But, I have not stated yet, I have not discussed it with my colleagues about any commission of inquiry. They are requesting it and I am going to meet with them as soon as I can arrange it. I am going to meet with the committee and some of my colleagues will be meeting with the committee also. And we will be discussing that, we are not ruling it out, but one of the things I want to point out that a lot of the things that they are requesting in their brief being met now, because there is a board put in place and it will be taking over, I think, fully within the next three or four months.

MR. W. HOUSE: So, all I can say is that we are considering it but we can not make a final decision on it until we meet with the committee, and I want to meet with the IGA people also.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. Member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I want to ask the minister - he said he would meet with IGA and with the committee and that is reasonable - can the minister indicate the kind of time frame because, you know, I understand that the process of government can be lengthy in its very nature, but the fact remains that this matter has, first of all, been on-going for some considerable time and the government obviously ought to have anticipated and may, -in fact, have anticipated what would come out and, secondly, health is such a matter of such intimate concern, particularly to those who are sick or who have people who are sick, and thirdly, of course, the matter is of such a great concern in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area where it has become a very important issue, obviously. So, there is a considerable urgency, I would suggest, to some resolution being taken at hand. Can the minister accordingly indicate when he anticipates the government might be in a position to take a definitive position and let us know whether this Royal Commission or some other form of enquiry can be set up or not?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

I have tentatively set up a date at the end of next week with the IGA. I have advised the Committee that I will meet with them any time, from my point of view, as minister. I will either meet with them in Labrador or here. They want to meet with a couple of other members of our Cabinet so that date is still open, but I am going to meet with the IGA next Friday.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, with the Minister of Energy Mines and Resources present, I will direct my questions to him, if I may. I was going to ask the Premier but I am sure that he can answer them equally well.

By way of preamble, a news item which I read this morning with regard to the Premier's visit to New York has an eerie ring about it in the sense that it was in 1965 that I accompanied, as a member of the media, another Premier of this Province to New York to discuss the possible sale of power in New York and the possible so-called tunnel and combination of cable across the Straits and on across Cabot Strait. In other words, the whole thing seems to be very, very similar. Does this mean, my question being this, given the reference two or three days ago with regard to the corridor concept, does this mean that this is an alternative possibility or are the two in some way linked? And why are we back where we were, as I understand it in any event, in terms of about 1965 in relation to the sale of power to the United States?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Well, on the last point first, Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way since 1965 in that there has been significant technological development with respect to underwater cables. Underwater high voltage electrical cables have now reached the stage where it warrants another look at this particular routing and a possible route for the supply of power to the Maritimes and/or the Northeast States

MR. BARRY: of the United States. But to answer the first part of the question, this is an alternate to transmitting electricity through the province of Quebec, and we are concluding our examination of all alternatives so that we know the full options that are available to the Province with respect to the sale of any energy which may be surplus to our own needs. And I stress again that this has to do with the sale of surplus energy.

MR. JAMIESON: Which leads me to my supplementary question. I am aware that there has been some change in technology and some improvement but I am reminded by my friend from the Strait of Belle (Mr. Roberts) that the outfit was, I think, Preece, Cardew and Ryder who did the original study. I recall it was many, many volumes and it showed, I think, the practicality of it even back that far. But if my memory again is correct, and on these matters I think I am correct, it also indicated that, to use the hon. minister's comment the other day about recallable power, that once a system of this kind was in place, that in a sense the supply would have to be in perpetuity. In other words, if you could not either (a) finance or, secondly, operate technically on a sort of switch back and forth loading kind of arrangement if my technical jargon is familiar to the hon. member. So what I am asking is this, if in fact the technical information available to the government, which prompts the discussions now to take place in New York does in fact indicate that there would have to be a long-term commitment for a fixed amount of power before this kind of arrangement could be put in place from a technical point of view?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if the system were put in place, a transmission line from here to the United States of America, obviously it would only be done if you could visualize the line

MR. L. BARRY: being paid for through the amount of electricity that was available for transmission. As the hon. member opposite knows, there has been considerable potential described in Labrador. There are other rivers apart from the Lower Churchill River and we have, I guess, twice as much again as we have already seen developed in the Upper Churchill project.

MR. E. ROBERTS: You mean a thousand million whatever-it-is?

MR. HODDER: You mean it will be twice as much as the Upper Churchill - 10,000 megawatts?

MR. L. BARRY: There is a tremendous amount of energy. Some of it relates to waters flowing into Quebec -

MR. E. ROBERTS: If the minister will permit, I never realized that we are talking in addition to Upper Churchill, what, another 10,000 megawatts of potential power.

MR. L. BARRY: I would have to confirm that for the hon. member. Some of the rivers are more remote in terms of the time when they are likely to be developed, but there was a study done which, to my recollection, confirmed that there was at least 5,000 megawatts -

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, that is another Upper Churchill.

MR. L. BARRY: - and there were other rivers indicated that had considerably more potential but would be further down the line in terms of development.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Could that be made public?

MR. L. BARRY: I can get that.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I would like to see that, yes.

MR. BARRY: I can get that information for the hon. member. But I think the point is that if you have these transmission lines in place, then they would have to be paid for by the transmission of electricity, but it is not our intention to have electricity exported which we can foresee being needed within this Province within the time frame that we are doing our electrical planning. So that it would not be

MR. L. BARRY: a matter of developing the Lower Churchill and having that committed to the State of New York; that would not be acceptable.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: I thank the hon. member because there is some kind of inconsistency, and I am not saying in what the hon. minister is saying. I recall interviewing the head, at that time of Con-Ed, which was, if my memory serves me right, the principal customer -

MR. L. BARRY: The biggest utility company.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - and, first of all, the amount that was required was very, very significant; if I am not mistaken, almost the total output of the Upper Churchill if not all of it, but a very large amount and uninterruptable that you have to put it into place.

Now, can the hon. the minister tell me, given what he said a moment ago that anything that is going to be exported must be surplus to Newfoundland needs - I presume Canadian needs would come second - but if that is the case, what is the minimum amount of power that would have to be carried through this, what has come to be known as the Anglo-Saxon route? There must be a technical figure that shows that so that if we know what the minimum amount is then we can get some indication of what, in a sense is left over for our own or other purposes.

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the study which is now ongoing, which is being cost shared between Newfoundland Hydro and the Power Authority of the State of New York. The purpose of that study is to identify the economics of transmittal of power to New York, how much would be required in order to make it economical and at what price. And I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to the developments in technology there has been a tremendous escalation in the price obtainable for electricity in the United States -

April 18, 1980

Tape No. 888

SD - 3

MR. JAMIESON:

I realize that.

MR. L. BARRY:

- just unbelievable in terms of 1960 -

1965, was it?

MR. JAMIESON:

Yes, 1965.

MR. L. BARRY:

Just a tremendous, astounding escalation
in price so that it warrants another look at that particular route
before we are in a position to make our decisions as to how we go.

MR. JAMIESON: But you do not know at the moment.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor), but he is not in his seat. So seldom I suppose is he asked a question that he felt that he was not going to be asked a question. So I will have to direct my question to the President of the Council, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Marshall). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the government has yet taken a decision to lift the freeze on the incorporating of communities in this Province. Hon. members will recall before the Municipal Act was passed, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) put a freeze on applications from communities to become incorporated. And one of these communities is in my district of LaPoile, Fox Roost, Margaree.

A public meeting was held at Fox Roost, Margaree a year and a half ago and the majority of the people in that community wanted a municipal body of some kind, a community council, I think, they wanted, and I was also told by the people of Bauline to ask the hon. minister the same question, has the freeze yet been lifted and what is going to be done about granting incorporations of communities where people have indicated either through a public meeting or by a petition that they wanted some form of municipal government in their communities?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The question was originally framed to me. The hon. minister is back in his seat. I just want to point to the preliminary words mentioned by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I assume was in the Common Room, talking over with my colleagues an event of great import that occurred and, you know, rejoicing in that same way as the members of

MR. MARSHALL: Opposition have been trying assiduously to carry on business and show that the momentous event that did happen in fact did not happen. This is what the hon. gentleman is trying to do. But the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) is there to answer the question.

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

MR. WINDSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank my colleague for mentioning that point. As it turns out, however, I was not in the Common Room; I was over talking to my hon. colleague from Kilbride (Mr. Aylward), I was in the Chamber in another seat talking on government business.

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to a freeze on incorporations—there is no such freeze, so I have not lifted it because there was never one imposed. As it relates to the community of Fox Roost, Margaree, we do have a request for incorporation from them. I have replied to them telling them, this was just some time ago, that the new act was coming into place. Under the new act the method of incorporation and the possibilities, the various possibilities for incorporation are far different from under the old legislation and I suggested that we wait until the new act came into force and then we can look at the possibilities for either incorporating them as a town or perhaps as a local service district under that new act which may be a far more an appropriate form of incorporation for that particular community. And I have indicated to them that once the act is in place, which it now is, and we have had these regulations and so forth put in place, that we will have further discussions with them. As it relates to the community of Bauline, we are looking at that as well and we will be having further discussions with them in the not too distant future.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if it was not a freeze I do not know what you would call it. The hon. gentleman just admitted that they put all these applications on hold until the new municipal act went through the House. A rose by any other name, it is still a freeze. And now, what happens now with the backlog of applications? For instance, in the case of Fox Roost, Margaree, will the representative of the minister's department in Western Newfoundland - I believe it is Mr. Colbourne, is it? - will he be instructed now to go down to Fox Roost, Margaree and hold a public meeting and explain to the people what form of incorporation now they should go after? I mean, what happens to all these applications? The minister said he wrote somebody in Fox Roost, Margaree and said, "Well, we cannot do anything until after the new municipal act is passed in the Legislature." But he has not done anything about it since and I presume the same thing has happened to all the other applications. So what now is the procedure? What machinery, what mechanism is set up to start the ball rolling again to inform these people now what route they should follow?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, the route that is available to these people, the route that has always been there, it is still the Department of Urban and Rural Planning. The provisions under the act are now being made known to the various municipalities, information on the act is being distributed to them, seminars are being held to inform councils and members of municipalities exactly the ramifications of the new act and the implications of it, and the way it affects various municipalities. As it relates to these unincorporated communities of course they are not taking part in these, although they are eligible to take

MR. N. WINDSOR: part in these seminars if they so desire. For somebody in the community who wanted to know more about local government, more about the new Municipalities Act, they are perfectly entitled to take advantage of these seminars being held around the Province.

As it relates to Fox Roost - Margaree, officials of the department will be meeting with them in due course. Discussions have been held, I think, with them already on certain aspects of it. Basically, however, as I indicated earlier, we did suggest to them that they wait until the new act came in place so that we could more effectively deal with it under the new legislation which is, I think, far superior to the older local government act under which these incorporations took place previously.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: It has to do again with Fox Roost - Margaree. Down in Fox Roost - Margaree, as the hon. gentleman is aware, which is an unincorporated area, as we just indicated, the people have raised more than their 75 per cent of the cost of a fire pumper, and yet the minister's department has reneged on giving Fox Roost - Margaree the same privilege of any other community in Newfoundland by paying the additional cost. They have raised whatever amount they had to raise for a fire pumper and they have it raised now for over a year, yet the minister's department has reneged and not given the government assistance under the programme that was announced in the last session of the House by the minister, in order to enable them to buy this essential fire equipment. Can the minister explain that? What is the explanation for it?

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Gladly, Mr. Speaker. As I announced last year quite proudly on behalf of this government, that programme of providing funds for fire fighting equipment was changed last year to a 75/25 programme

MR. N. WINDSOR: from the previous 50/50. We further expanded it to make it possible to provide funding to unincorporated communities through properly incorporated fire brigades.

MR. S. NEARY: Right.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The fact that Fox Roost - Margaree is not receiving any funding simply is because there is a limit of funding to that programme each year. We cannot possibly meet all the requests made to us. In fact, I think the amount of requests made to us last year was about five times the amount of funding available, so we simply had to try to choose the priorities of them and we will be doing the same thing this year again. The number of requests made to the Province far exceeds the amount of money available, but we will be certainly looking at the priorities and meeting the ones that we see as being top.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, that is shocking, you know.
That is shocking.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Education. When the hon. lady is ready, if I could ask her a question? I am sorry, it is the only chance I get, you know.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us what steps the government are prepared to take and what steps the government feel they ought to take in response to the somewhat unusual, and I suggest, somewhat confusing situation which appears to have developed between the Vinland School Board, the employer of a number of teachers, most of whom - not all of them, but most of them - are in my constituency. That is on the one hand. On the other hand, the Newfoundland Teachers Association, which is certified to represent those teachers in the collective bargaining sense. The minister, I think, is familiar with the situation. I do not need to go into that, but could she tell us what steps the government are prepared to take and whatever she may know about the situation?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it came to the attention only yesterday morning of the officials of my department that the Vinland Integrated School Board, through its superintendent, had written each of the approximately 110 teachers in its employ requesting each teacher's resignation and going on to say that each teacher should submit a new application for employment but that each person would not be assured a position. This, of course, is quite an extraordinary happening. It is largely one which is between the school board as the employer and the teachers who bear union in Newfoundland Teachers Association. It is a matter which is covered by the collective agreement and what I understand from speaking this morning with the President of the Newfoundland Teachers Association, the N.T.A. has intervened on behalf of its members. I am hopeful that a resolution will be reached between those two parties directly involved.

As for any government intervention, I think it would be premature to speculate on the possibilities that there are for intervention. Those possibilities have not been thoroughly explored and hopefully will not be necessary because the matter is primarily one to be resolved by the school board as employer and the teachers through the Newfoundland Teachers Association.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister, and I guess she has taken it as far as we can right now, but I wonder by way of a supplementary if she could tell us how many, if any, teachers the Vinland School Board will be required to dispense with?

MR. E. ROBERTS: How many posts are they losing as a result of the cutbacks? I know I do not need to tell the minister about the cutbacks, I think she is familiar with what is going on there, but could she tell us just how the axe will cut at the Vinland School Board.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I will take that as notice and supply the information on Tuesday.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) relating to the Fisheries Loan Board. Would the minister indicate - well, in view of the fact that a number of fishermen because of the delays in processing the applications for loans through the Fisheries Loan Board, in view of the delay this year, a number of fishermen have gone through the chartered banks and arranged for private loans for the purchase or building of boats and purchase of gear. Will the minister undertake to transfer these loans or roll over these loans from the chartered banks now to the Fisheries Loan Board system whereby they will be paying at a lesser interest rate - I believe the bank is somewhere up around 15, 16 or 17 per cent and the Fisheries Loan Board is 8 per cent - would the minister undertake to roll over these loans now from the chartered banks directly through the procedure within the Fisheries Loan Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that was one of the points of negotiation with the chartered banks when we were negotiating with them to take over these loans over \$50,000. It was agreed that this arrangement, a new procedure, would be in stages and first of all we would have

MR. J. MORGAN: the banks get involved in loans over more than \$50,000 which they will now in May month, and secondly, was to look at loans already made, as mentioned by the hon. gentleman, by the banks to the fishermen at the high rates is to have the banks take over these loans from these fishermen and we would subsidize the interest rate. The banks have not agreed to that right now but they have agreed to sit down and negotiate with us that point and also to look at taking more loans coming down less than \$50,000, maybe a lower ceiling to include more boats. So that point is a point well taken with the department and with government, that there is a need to look at those fishermen who have gone to the banks on their own, who have met all their qualifications, their federal subsidies and bounties, etcetera, and to have these loans eventually passed over to the banks as well under the new programme and would qualify for the subsidized interest. But that is not approved to date and we will have to negotiate with the banks after the big programme is put in place.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister mentioned that it has not been approved to date. I mean, who has to approve it, the banks or the Government of the Province, because the banks cannot lose if the government is going to subsidize the difference? The banks cannot lose so who has to actually make the approval here the banks or the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Well, we have a situation whereby in our negotiations they have agreed to a certain limit so far - the banks. - In this case they have agreed to deal with new loans starting in May as soon as the agreement is signed between the

MR. J. MORGAN: Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)
and the different chartered banks and to deal with new loans only, first. And then after that programme is in place a few weeks, after that, then we will sit down with the banks again and hopefully get them to agree to look at and review all of the existing loans made through the banks at high interest rates and having them included under the same programme, and for government to agree to subsidize the interest and to guarantee the loans. So I cannot see any problem with that, but right now the problem is the banks have not agreed to deal with any existing loans except to deal with all new loans first of all to get the programme in place.

MR. F. ROWE: But why?

MR. J. MORGAN: Well, I cannot indicate to you or to the House of Assembly why it is. It is a matter of negotiations and, as I announced in the House yesterday, the agreement to date is for the banks to start on new loans of more than \$50,000. It is a brand new programme and all of the chartered banks - they have to get their feet first - and it is very obvious it is a brand new programme and until they get the programme in place then we will look at the possibility of including and taking in the other loans. I would not guess there are too many of them because most of the fishermen would get loans from the Loan Board anyway. But there are a few fishermen of that nature and I cannot foresee a problem in having these fishermen who have these loans now with high interest included in the same programme, but it will not be in May, possibly in June or July.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not know what question to ask the minister now, I had a number of them, Mr. Speaker, I just cannot understand why we have this unnecessary delay. Just who do the banks think they are? I mean, if the government is willing to subsidize the difference in the interest rates, I cannot see why they cannot go ahead and put those loans right under the Fisheries Loan Board now without any delay, the ones that have been approved, instead of just looking at the new loans first. And the minister indicated that there are not those many loans involved anyway so I cannot see why there are -

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Oh yes! A lot of fishermen have gone ahead and arranged privately. Now, it might take some time for the fishermen to inform the Fisheries Loan Board of the fact that, you know, they have done this. That may be a problem but the banks telling the government what to do in this instance, I just cannot understand it. I would just ask the minister if he would please do something and try and persuade the banks to do something about this as quickly as possible and take the necessary government action.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) Order, please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTION FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the questions and comments, the questions primarily made by the Opposition spokesman on fisheries in connection with the Ministerial Statement today. I want to point out that -

MR. F. ROWE: Come on, now (inaudible)

MR. J. MORGAN: Questions were asked, Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please. I understand the Minister of Fisheries was responding under the routine business matter of Answers to Questions for which Notice has been given. I am not certain what the hon. Member for Trinity-Bay de Verde -

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order .I understand we are on Section E of the routine business of the House, Answers to Questions for which Notice has been given. Mr. Minister, there have been no questions asked for which notice has been given for the answers, so the minister is completely out of order in answering questions now as a result of comments that I made in reply to his Ministerial Statement.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN: I stand today and make a statement on an important matter pertaining to fisheries and fishermen's prices on lobsters, and during the debate , the so-called debate, it was almost a debate, or comment on the Ministerial Statement, there were questions posed by the hon. gentleman, the spokesman on fisheries. And I was unable to reply at that time, to answer the questions, because I could not get involved in debating Ministerial Statement. What I am merely trying to do now is to answer questions that were put forward in the comments made on the Ministerial Statement which I could not answer at that time. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. spokesman on fisheries and the hon. members in the Opposition Liberal party do not want the information on fisheries -

AN. HON. MEMBER: Sure we want the information.

MR. J. MORGAN: - if they do not want it I will sit down and gladly do so.

MR. H. YOUNG: They do not want the information on fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: On a point of order, Sir, I do not think the question is one of whether information is wanted or not wanted. I suggest to Your Honor the matter is rather one whether this is an appropriate time in the procedural sense for the Minister of Fisheries

MR. E. ROBERTS: (J.Morgan) to speak, and I think if Your Honor looked at Chapter 10 of the current edition of Beauchesne, the one we now use, it is quite obvious that notices cannot be oral and I will refer Your Honor specifically to citation 395 which is found on Page 143. The first sentence of Sub-Paragraph 1 of that citation reads, "Oral notices for future proceedings do not generally exist in the House of Commons." It goes on, as Your Honor will see, "It is useless for a member to say: "Mr, Speaker, I give notice that I will move a certain motion tomorrow." you know, in quotes. Now, all we are talking of here, this is the place in our procedure where a minister gives answers to questions for which notice has been given. There has been no notice given in response to any question which the Minister of Fisheries (J.Morgan) is trying to answer.

Now, essentially he has three ways to answer it, I would suggest. One is to make a Ministerial Statement. The second is to, which he did as my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition says the second is to make a statement outside the House. The third is, we are going to go into estimates, let him deliver himself of some thoughts there. We have no lack of interest in hearing what the minister has to say. We have a very definite feeling that he ought not to say it here because we cannot ask supplementaries, we cannot ask for normal procedure. It is simply a matter of whether notice has been given and I suggest this is not a notice in the way in which that term is used in our Standing Orders.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Because the hon. member brought up this point, Mr. Speaker, I think I should just respond to it. The section to which he refers, talks about 'Oral Notices for future proceedings

MR. MARSHALL: do not generally exist in the House of Commons. Oral notices of questions certainly do exist here in the House of Assembly. I mean, every day members are getting up and asking oral questions and the response has been like the hon. Minister of Education (Ms Verge) quite properly did during Question Period today, indicated that she did not have all of the information being sought and she would Tuesday. So she has oral notice. Now I think it would be a contempt of the House really, not a contempt, it is probably too strong a word, for the hon. Minister of Education (Ms Verge), or any other minister to say, "I am not going to answer any question unless you give it to me in writing." That really does not apply to this particular proceeding.

Now the fact of the matter is that answers to questions are given, obviously you can only give answers to questions after a question has been asked. So the question comes when is it competent for one to answer a question on this particular routine order of business, when must the question be asked? Must it only be asked, Mr. Speaker, in Question Period? Or may it be asked -

MR. NEARY: Otherwise put it on the Order Paper.

MR. MARSHALL: May it be asked in response to Ministerial Statements? Now if it cannot be asked in response to Ministerial Statements, and other times I would submit that it is probably out of order to ask questions when you are responding to Ministerial Statements, so as far as this side of the House is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we have no desire, or no intent, or no wish at any time to curtail the debate and the free flow of information. As a matter of fact, we strive and do everything we can to enhance it. And the hon. gentlemen there opposite, I know Your Honour will have to take probably notice of this point of order, but if Your Honour takes notice of it, and if Your Honour has to come in, which I would submit would not be appropriate with our customs, but if Your Honour did come in with an order that it could not be given, and if the hon. gentlemen

MR. MARSHALL: there opposite wish to rely on technical matters in order to prevent the free flow of information, well as far as we are concerned, as the hon. minister says, "If you want the answer you can have it. But if you do not want the answer we will not give it."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: May I just have a brief -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I simply want to draw your attention to a Standing Order which neither my learned friend opposite, nor I have previously drawn your attention on this matter, and my learned friend, with his normal ill grace has conceded defeat. 31 (a) I think probably would deal with it and whether Your Honour chooses to take it under advisement or not is of course up to Your Honour. But I think it makes it quite clear that the procedure which is proposed to be adopted by the gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) is not in effect proper under this and that is all we are talking about. We are delighted to have the information. He can bring it out in two seconds once we get into Committee. I understand we are going into Committee; we will be delighted to hear from him then on the question of lobster prices and let us have a go at it there, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Perhaps the hon. member -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council, one final point on this point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: I just want to say, you know, if the hon. member wants to quote 31(a), he can quote 31(a), and envoke it but I will just come back to my point; 31(a) also indicates that a question that has been asked should not be asked if it is one that should more appropriately be put on the Order Paper. And this ministry is not in the habit of insisting on technicalities like that, but if the

MR. MARSHALL: hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to insist on technicalities, and thus preclude themselves from getting answers to questions of public importance, sobeit. That is there concern.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

With respect to the point of order, I thank hon. members for the debate. I will, however, point out that generally speaking in this hon. House the section (e) referred to at the present time is generally used when members have asked a question during Question Period and the minister has decided to take notice of it and answer it under section (e), or when a question has appeared on the Order Paper.

I am not quite sure what transpired during the earlier part of the proceedings. I will have to check Hansard before I can really give a decision on this particular point of order.

The other point I should make is, as well, and there are precedent rulings for this, that under Ministerial Statements, the member responding is entitled to ask questions and obviously it means that the minister presenting the statement is also entitled to answer the questions. Maybe it might have been more appropriately done at that time. But in any event I will have to check Hansard before I can give a ruling on the point of order, unless there is leave at this present time for the minister to respond.

AN HON. MEMBER: Leave.

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

MR. NEARY: No. No. No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order is always in order.

The hon. member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the reason why I think it is a point of order is because, as you have just mentioned in your ruling, that when questions are asked by an Opposition spokesman on a matter that is referred to in a Ministerial Statement by a minister, in this case today myself, on fisheries, and then referred to and commented on and questions posed in his comments on the Ministerial Statement, that I then was going to answer the question and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) looked across the House to me and said, "No, no, wait until some other period because we

MR. MORGAN:

want to get on to Question Period¹¹ and I nodded agreed. Now the reason why I think it was important, Mr. Speaker, is because I am referring to a matter that is going to be commencing on Monday with the House of Assembly to be closed on Monday because it is a holiday. Monday is the commencement of the fishing season for lobsters in this Province. Every fishermen should know what the government is doing with regard to the lobster prices, What I was doing was attempting to answer the questions today in the House which I could not do on Monday, and now the Opposition says, "No leave!" So, Mr. Speaker, we know the attitude now of the Opposition party on fisheries, They hate fisheries!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the point of order. Order, please! That particular comment, I believe, probably could have been made in the same debate on the other point of order, it is all the same point that we are making. My understanding is that leave was granted. I heard the hon. members here - I believe you did agree to - leave was granted to allow the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS:

I do not care whether the minister gives leave or not, I will speak for this side on this matter. My understanding is that we are prepared to give leave. Well, Your Honour, has made a ruling and I do not need to say that the point of order was specious, furious, dubious and of no worth whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already ruled on that point of order. Order, please! I think we are beginning to get a little bit carried away here this morning. The hon. members to my right, I understand, have given leave to allow the minister to answer questions? Am I correct in that assumption? Is there leave?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has been granted. The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: I thank the members, Mr. Speaker, for giving me leave because I think it is an important point I want to stress in answering the question regarding lobster prices, the season opening on Monday morning in the Province. The lobster fishermen go fishing tomorrow morning for the first time this Season and the first catch is on Monday. And in my Ministerial Statement I want to point out in answering the question that we are not saying that \$1.70 a pound is all the fishermen will get; what we are saying is that we will not accept less than \$1.70 a pound. It is not the fact that we think the buyers can only afford to pay \$1.70. In answering the question, Mr. Speaker, that was posed, we are saying that we do not want less than \$1.70 per pound paid anywhere in the Province this year based on the discussions held between the union and the buyers and if anybody is paying less than \$1.70 per pound they are going to justify, to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, why they paying less than \$1.70 per pound or could very well lose their license.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further answers to questions?
Are there any petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt) I would like to inform all hon. members that the time remaining is nine hours, fifty-three minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: After the concurrence debates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, after concurrence debate. We are under Head 111, the Executive Council, Clause 302-01. Shall Clause 302-01 carry?

MR. NEARY: Not quite, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish the hon. the Premier would stay in his seat. There are a few things I want to say about the matter that arose in the House this morning and this directly involves the hon. the Premier and his wanting honesty and

MR. NEARY: integrity in politics and in government in this Province. My reaction to it, Sir, was those whom the Gods wish to destroy they first make mad. Now that is the best way to describe that situation this morning. But I am amazed, Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at the hon. Premier who talks about honesty and integrity in politics and in government in this Province, would negotiate with a member of this House who was elected as a Liberal, that he would go to his caucus, who had nothing to do with electing this particular member and say, 'Look, this gentleman wants to stab his colleagues in the back, should we take him in?' And of course you get the desk thumping and the applause and they say, 'oh, yes, take him in. Take him in for no other reason but for political expediency. Do not let hon. gentlemen kid themselves. There is no principle involved here, no principle involved. It is just a matter of political expediency and the Premier and the administration will bask in the sun for just one day

MR. S. NEARY: or one weekend, because the timing of it alone should be an indication to members that it was done to get the coverage on the weekend, that is why it was done.

But it raises a very, very interesting question, Mr. Chairman, and that is do new members of this House have the right when they are elected as Liberals or NDP or as Tory members, do they have the right then to take it upon themselves to switch parties whenever they feel like it?

AN HON. MEMBER: You did it.

MR. S. NEARY: No, I did not do it. I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, I did not do it and I am going to cite my own case as an example. I did not do it. Even though I was driven to the brink of doing it, I did not do it.

Mr. Chairman, I firmly believe that if a man has the courage of his conviction, that if he thinks he is in the right and he feels that he can no longer sit with a group of hon. decent Newfoundlanders and Canadians, if he feels that strongly in his heart, does he not have the obligation and indeed the responsibility to go back to his constituents and say, "Look, you elected me as a Liberal member of the House of Assembly, of the Legislature of this Province"-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: He was elected as a Liberal -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: - as a Liberal.

MR. L. THOMS: You tried it as an individual.

MR. S. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, let the people decide what they want the individual to do, and I am not talking about this particular individual because as far as I am concerned he has pulled a Jack Horner. You know, history will show, will indicate to members if they take any trouble to read any history at all, that only once in awhile does somebody make it to the top after they switch parties. Winston Churchill did it, but I would submit in this case we have a Jack Horner on our hands.

And I have seen a lot of members,

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, in my career in public life and as a member of this House, which is now going on eighteen years, I have seen a lot of people go back and forth across the House. There are so many people after going back and forth across the House, I am surprised there is not a groove in the floor. One time we had a member, Mr. Crosbie, who went back and forth so often that I suggested to him that he buy a pair of roller skates. I am surprised there is not a groove in the floor, Mr. Chairman. But even when members from the PC Party came into the Liberal Party, I questioned it because any man who wants to stand on a principle, any man who says, "I am standing on a principle,"- one of the greatest principles as far as I am concerned is to carry out the wishes of your constituents and not betray your constituents and not be a traitor to your constituents and not stab your constituents in the back. If the voters of Baie Verte wanted a Tory in this House they would have elected a Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. S. NEARY: They elected a Liberal, they had the opportunity less than one year ago -

MR. L. THOMS: The honourable thing to do is to resign.

MR. S. NEARY: - they had the opportunity less than a year ago.

MR. L. THOMS: It is the only honourable thing to do.

MR. S. NEARY: The only honourable and decent thing to do, Mr. Chairman, is to resign your seat if you disagree with your colleagues-and I still do not know what the disagreement is about-but if you disagree with your colleagues, resign your seat and go back to the electorate and say, "Now, look, I am standing as a Tory" -

MR. STAGG: Did you do that?

MR. S. NEARY: What I did, Mr. Chairman? I can tell the hon. gentleman what I did. Before I moved my seat as an Independent Liberal when I was elected in LaPoile, and I sat down there for over

MR. S. NEARY: two years, I sent a ballot to every household in LaPoile District and the answer came back unmistakably Mr. Chairman, to go back and sit in the Liberal caucus. I was a Liberal all along, but just moved back into the caucus, that was all I had to do, which I did. But I did not do it, I told the people of LaPoile district during the election campaign of 1975, and I had a public meeting in every community in that district, and I told the people, I said, "Before I move, if I move, back to the Liberal caucus, you will be consulted by my sending out in the mail a ballot for every household in this district." And I kept that commitment and as a result I went back and defeated the shining light of the Tory Party last June when they sent in the

MR. S. NEARY:

big guns to try to knock me off.

MR. F. STAGG:

You defeated a very good man in 1975

(inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY:

Yes, I would put Cabot Martin in the same category as Al Evans. I think they are both equal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

A good man. The hon. gentleman is right, they have the same mentality and they are equals. I agree with the hon. gentleman, they are equals.

MR. F. STAGG:

The Liberal candidate in 1975 was very good (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY:

And I would submit, Sir, that if the man that I defeated in 1975 were in this House today, I think he probably would be ashamed to see some of the things that are going on in this administration with their separatist techniques and their separatist strategy and so forth.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be sidetracked; this is a very, very important matter. There is a great principle involved here. And I would submit, Sir, that the beginning of the undoing of the Tory regime in this Province started the other day when the Premier of this Province refused to recognize a unanimous report of the Public Accounts Committee. That was his first major blunder. And at the same time, I suppose I could add in the same breath, refusing to insist that the President of the Council, the member for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall), who is in a conflict of interest situation - has refused to deal with that. And today the Premier - and not only today but apparently from what came out this morning, these negotiations started a few days ago. And I would submit, Mr. Chairman, in due course we will discover the real reason for the move. The real reason had nothing to do with offshore, no more than the man in the moon. As a matter of fact, this is not the first time that this very same member - I remember before the election in June coming into this House and expecting two of my colleagues on a Friday morning - two of my colleagues, of which that gentleman was one; I sat in my seat, the deal was made - these are political deals - the deal was made and I was expecting to see that same

MR. S. NEARY: gentleman go on that Friday across the House. As it happened, one or two of my colleagues got to him the night before and persuaded him not to do it. So we are not surprised and the people of Newfoundland are not surprised.

MR. J. CARTER: Well, what are you going on about?

MR. S. NEARY: All I am going on about is the principle that is involved here. If this particular individual claims that he is such a man of honour and decency, then I would submit the honourable thing to do - and I would say it even if somebody came across to this side of the House - the honourable and decent thing to do is to resign from the House, go back to the people and ask them to elect him as a Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And then let the chips fall where they may. I would be prepared to take that chance, to take the gamble.

AN HON. MEMBER: Exactly.

AN HON. MEMBER: The difference between us and them is that we do not want anybody over here.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I would not go as far as to say that, now.

MR. THOMS: There are a few we would not want.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the Premier in his seat to answer, to tell us now if he is still the man of honour and decency, the man who wants to bring honour and decency and integrity to politics and to the Government of this Province. He certainly did not show it this morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Butt): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I suppose perhaps we should not respond, but I just draw to the attention of the Committee that obviously now as I have noticed over the past little while, the leadership in the Opposition is becoming more and more again re-cloned to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary), and I think we have seen the culmination of this this morning, that the first official comment from the Opposition in the House today with respect to the momentous events that have occurred,

MR. W. MARSHALL: came from the lips of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary). So I presume that the hon. the member for LaPoile is now speaking for the Opposition.

Now, Mr. Chairman, normally I do not think - I say this to the hon. member. He mentioned the fact that he would make the same argument if any member from this side went over there. I will say to him right now that he will never have the chance to make that statement anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: So he is talking about a very, very hypothetical situation.

But, Mr. Speaker,

MR. W. MARSHALL:

we just cannot back and allow the official Opposition, through the lips of their de facto leader, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), to get up and make statements and attacks upon the newest colleague on this side of the House without them being answered. Even though, I would assure Your Honour and the members of the House normally the people on this side to every man and woman, every person do not pay too much credence to the hon. member. But since the hon. member is obviously speaking for the Opposition now and, as I said, the leadership of that party is now becoming more and more reconded to him perhaps a few words should be stated.

When he talks about principle, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: This morning in this House with respect to the event to which the member referred, we saw and the people of Newfoundland saw a man stand on the courage of convictions, acting on principle and taking a step which requires a consummate amount of courage. This gentleman broke with his party, and let us not get down into the business of the seedy little innuendoes from time to time that can come from certain places in this House, but let it just be clear that this hon. gentleman took his step on the basis of principle and on the basis of the courage of his convictions and in the interest of the people of Newfoundland. And in so doing has done a great service to not only this Assembly but to the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Because for this reason, Mr. Speaker, there are two main issues before the people of this Province today and they are with respect to our rights to the Northern cod fish and anyone who has seen the recent publication of Statistics Canada can see four square that that Northern cod

MR. W. MARSHALL: stock is the life and breath of the Northeast coast of this Province. Just look at the - you can see, Mr. Speaker, from the statistics of Statistics Canada how important that Northern cod stock is. That is the first issue that is before the people of this Province.

And the second, and of major importance at the present time, equal to the Northern cod stock, is our ownership of the offshore and that, Mr. Speaker, is why the hon. gentleman crossed over. And I would think that what has happened in this Province at the time - he has indicated and he has shown, I think, quite visibly to the people of this Province that the interest of the people of Newfoundland does not coincide with the Liberal Party of Newfoundland or the Liberal Party of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: And let, Mr. Speaker, that message be rung out loud and clear, because of the attempts of confusion made by the hon. gentlemen there opposite both inside this House and outside in order to save their own political situation as opposed to the preserving the rights of the people of this Province. There has been a certain element in this Province and I can only liken it to the old saying that, 'Nero fiddled while Rome burned', and there are certain elements in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who are sleeping while the rights of this Province are indeed being trampled on. And before you know it, Mr. Speaker, unless the people of this Province realize what their true place is, the place of Newfoundland and their true rights within the Canadian Confederation, that we are going to find a disaster in this Province that is even worse than the giveaway of the Upper Churchill.

DR. COLLINS: If in fact that is possible.

MR. W. MARSHALL: If, as the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) indicates, in fact that is possible. We are going to find a disaster worse than the economic condition of this Province that we now find ourselves in. We are going to find a condition worse than the abandonment of our railway, we are going to find conditions worse than the isolation of the mainland part of our Province, Labrador.

So what this hon. gentleman has done, I say, apart from the fact that he has acted on an intrinsic point of principle himself—and let that not be clouded with seedy, little innuendo, Mr. Speaker, let that be known, that it was an act of consummate courage by anybody to cross the House and to cross the House on a point of principle but the other thing that this hon. gentleman has done is

MR. MARSHALL: that this hon. gentleman has underscored and shown to the people of this Province that there is a matter of deep problem before the people of this Province. There are two really gut issues before the people of this Province and they all relate to the ownership of our resources. Now the hon. gentleman has had the courage of his convictions. I would suggest that we not allow any weasle words in the future by members there opposite with their silly innuendo of people being separatists, of people being anti-Confederates and what have you. The hon. gentleman there opposite, and his colleagues, do not understand how Newfoundlanders can only partake in Confederation by being able to have the confidence to be able to manage their own resources and act like other Canadians, and that is a good principle of a good Canadian Newfoundlander and not of a separatist.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So I say that what the hon. gentleman has done today, what the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has done today has been one of the most singular acts of consummate courage of his acting on principle. As far as this party is concerned, and this government is concerned, we are delighted to have a person like the hon. member associated with us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We welcome him with open arms and let us realize this, and I am glad the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), is here because I know this is not the hon. Leader's type of modus operandi. Maybe he did not hear the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) attempting to speak on behalf of the Opposition. But let us realize this, that any hon. member in this House can have a difference of opinion, can have a difference of opinion on deep and abiding principles, and that the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) did, and let us not, right from the outset, overlook the fact that he crossed this House on the basis of principle as he saw the interests of the people of

MR. MARSHALL: Newfoundland. And let it not be clouded with the usual type of innuendo that comes forth, that puts some seedy little motivation, or personal motivation with respect to it because it does a great disservice to the people of this House, to the people of Newfoundland and I again say to most of the people in the Opposition itself. We do not need that.

You can disagree, Mr. Chairman, with people on the basis of their interpretation of their principle, that is one thing, but there is no licence of anyone in this House to use the parliamentary immunity of this House to continue to slake the motivation and the good will and the intent of people, all members of this House on whatever side they sit.

So let this be rung out, as I say, loud and clear, that we were treated today to a spectacle in this House, a spectacle of a person acting on the basis of high courage, motivated very deeply by his convictions. It is not very easy for a man to stand in his place in the House of Assembly, or in any place, and depart from a group of people with whom he has been colleagues. And let us recognize that and let us recognize this four square. And I say this, Mr. Chairman, that when the history of this Province is written, the stand today taken by the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) will stand out in the annals of the history of this Province as one of the greatest acts of courage and one of the most significant actions that has been taken. Because I am hoping, and I am really hoping and I know it is going to occur, that this is going to awaken the people of Newfoundland - some of them are sleeping right now - so that they will realize that to ask for our own resources, to ask for the right to be able to manage our own resources to the betterment of the people of this Province does not mean that one is a separatist. And I hear what I consider to be the most empty-headed, stupid, biased type of insults hurled from time to time by, in one case

MR. MARSHALL: by the member for Windsor-Buchans
(Mr. Flight) when he was speaking in the Throne Speech, to which I
have not replied.

To ask for us to have the same rights
as other Canadians does not mean that we are not good Newfoundlanders,
but neither does it mean that because we ask for our rights that we
are not good Canadians. It is time for us to get away from our
Jim Crow attitude, or Joe Crow or whatever it is, attitude that
all great blessings come from Ottawa and what have you, and realize
that all that we are asking in this Province is the right to manage
our resources and to make a significant contribution to the Confederation
of Canada so that at one day in the future, while we are progressing
we will gladly make our equalization payments to our sister provinces
in Canada.

My time has expired, Mr. Speaker, or near
expired, but let me say this, and let me say this once again, let not
the members of the Opposition try to becloud and make seemy and seedy

MR. W. MARSHALL: an act of consummate political courage undertaken by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay today acting on a matter of deep ingrained principle which will be a shining light in the history of the Province in the years to come. And I know -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. MARSHALL: -the hon. members there opposite, you could see them, Mr. Chairman, their actions speak by the cynical little smiles that emote from some of their faces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Chairman, I did not hear the exchange that lead to that intervention by the hon. the President of Privy Council (Mr. W. Marshall). Even if I had, the chances are that I would not have responded to it in kind. I do not intend to discuss in detail what apparently went on. But after I came back into the House-and I was about, I can assure him,public business'-I did hear him make some references which suggested that we on this side seem to be the ones,or at least there are members on this side who are casting aspersions or who are attributing motives and, really, I think what we have to ask ourselves in this debate,and I do not mean the debate that is taking place this morning,but what we have to ask ourselves in this whole question of what the hon. the President of the Privy Council has talked about,namely of having control of our own destiny and our resources, I think we have to ask ourselves is it appropriate for members on either side to be casing aspersions and to be suggesting that if, in fact, we do not blindly and without any kind of questioning go along with what the government is proposing that somehow or other we are either unpatriotic or, if I may be so bold as to recall to the House, that we are in one instance being accused of being traitorous.

Now, there is no point in saying or no point in talking about people on this side of the House or anyone in the Opposition being critical or using unparliamentary language or

MR. D. JAMIESON: casting aspersions when, in fact, I myself a few days ago, and I hope that members would agree that I have tried, at least, during my period here to behave in a parliamentary manner, when I was accused -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - not once but twice of being a black-mailer -

MR. S. NEARY: Right on.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - and that did not come from anybody on this side of the House, it came from an intervention from the other side. Now I realize that in debate there are going to be times when people are going to become excessive in their language, and I have been around long enough to know that parliament - whatever level it happens to be or whatever jurisdiction it happens to be - is not always a bed of roses. And also we can forgive a certain amount of rhetoric and the like, but I do say two things, that, first of all, I think it is grossly unfair to suggest that we on this side of the House are in some way or other less anxious to see Newfoundland advance than are members on the government side of the House. I said, that on the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - first day of this session, and Let me, by the way, go back over a couple of things so that we get rid of this nonsense that of concerting with people in Ottawa or doing this or doing that; on the first day of this session, I reconfirmed when the Premier stood on the Northern cod stock issue and indicated what our position was, and it was supportive of the basic theme and principles. By the same token, just a few days ago, it is a little puzzling I admit, as I said with regard to the initiative that is being taken on the Upper Churchill and the related matters revolving around Quebec, but I also said that we on this side, once again, want to maximize the benefits for Newfoundland.

Now, it may very well be, sometimes it does not show, but there may be a lot of talent on the other side of the House but it is not all over there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - and it may be that the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall), who has such a really quite contemptuous attitude insofar as the Opposition is concerned it may well be that he thinks that we are a bunch of dodos and dumdums over here but let me remind him that even a stopped clock is right twice every day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON: - and it is just conceivable that there might come from this side of the House a sensible or a reasonable idea, at least once or twice during a session.

Now, I believe myself that unless the strategy of the government is simply to lay out its case and say, "Here it is, take it or leave it," that we would eliminate a great deal of the problems that we are having with regard to these major issues, and the Premier seems initially to wish to do these kinds of things but nothing happens on them. For example, I asked for a Select Committee because I believe that there are genuine questions, not questions with regard to the principle, that has been involved. I have quoted the final paragraph, I think it is, of the Premier's letter in which he said, at the time of the exchange with Mr. Clark, something about maximizing the benefits to Newfoundland and ensuring, and I am paraphrasing but I am close enough,

MR. JAMIESON: maximizing the benefits to Newfoundland, and at the same time ensuring that the Province has an effective and meaningful influence over the social and the economic aspects of that particular development.

I agree totally, and I do not think there is a single, solitary soul on this side of the House who thinks any differently. And furthermore, if the Premier in his judgement decides that he wishes to abandon negotiations with Quebec, decides that he wishes to have consultations with Ottawa, with regard to the transmission of electricity, once again I say first class. But in both cases, in both cases, surely it is not unreasonable for us to say, "Look, maybe it has to be in confidence, maybe it has to be in camera, maybe it has to be even with a smaller group of our caucus, but maybe things would be much clearer if we did have some answers to very specific questions."

I asked too this morning with regard to the Premier's pending visit to New York. They are legitimate questions. Because there is no doubt about the fact that if we are going to transmit large quantities of power via that route, and I do not quarrel with the idea that you can have alternative examination of both routes, but the truth of the matter is twenty-four or forty-eight hours after asking for a corridor through Quebec, what is the rationale for also emphasizing that we are talking about the Anglo-Saxon route? Are the two compatible? Is it a question of measuring off one against the other?

I am not saying these things in any sense critically. What I am saying is that until we know it is not enough every time we get up and ask a question to say, "You are disloyal to Newfoundland," that you are not doing your job in some way or another simply because you ask legitimate questions.

Now insofar as I personally am concerned, I have been saying for instance for a great long time that in terms of offshore development we have to take an examination and take a look at

MR. JAMIESON: what the impact would be with regard to equalization payments. And it was only when the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) in his budget got close to the end of it that he made some reference to the implications of the two and they are there. Now if that is not being unpatriotic. And I only have two minutes more and I want to say one thing here, by the way, that I think ought to be said more often; you know, we have a feeling in some way or other, and I do not know whether it is an inferiority complex of Newfoundlanders, an inferiority complex of various leaders, but this business of being a so-called have-not province, I wish we could take those two words out of the dictionary. We are making an enormous contribution to Canada, an enormous contribution.

Transfer of payments are not dole from Ottawa. We have earned that money as Canadian citizens. Our fishermen have earned it. Our miners have earned it. We are a great generator, for example, of enormous of foreign exchange. So therefore to suggest that in some way or other the government of Canada is handing it out to us and that really there is something second class about that kind of arrangement is to overlook the very fabric of Confederation.

Now God knows, God and the Premier knows, that I spent more time extracting funds out of Ottawa, under more non-constitutional means, than almost any man alive, I suppose. And I must say that I would hate to think of the day in this country where all we did on both sides of the coin was to say, "I will stay in my constitutional backyard and you will stay in yours."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: If that day ever came, if that ever happens there are not enough oil wells on the Grand Banks to make the difference. Because ninety per cent of what we are doing, ninety per cent of what we are doing is strictly speaking non-constitutional, non-constitutional; highways, health, education, you name it, all of those things. So that

April 18, 1980

Tape No. 900

NM - 3

MR. JAMIESON: consequently I have never felt, and I do not believe that there is any Newfoundlander who should feel, that if there is DREE money put into a school here, or into a highway there, or if there is payment

MR. D. JAMIESON: made with regard to equalization or if we have a cost sharing with regard to health or if we helped immensely, on the one hand, Ottawa with our foreign exchange, that we should in some other way feel that we are second class because we take money in order to help with our hospital or our health services or something of that nature.

That is the key to the matter. The fact of the matter is that Confederation, and I will finish on this point, Mr. Chairman. I understand that I am at the end of my time but I hope I will be given leave for thirty seconds.

We are quite prepared to say without qualification, on these issues that are so broad and so important now, the fishery, the whole question of hydro development - incidentally, what is the constitutional position of the Newfoundland and Labrador - the Lower Churchill Development Corporation? The Federal Government had no real obligation to get itself involved in that, no real obligation at all to get itself involved in that. So what I hope will be clear in the future, is that what we would like to have is answers to some very basic questions, not argumentative questions, that is not what I am talking about at all. I am talking about a whole range of things which the Premier and I - I think he knows what I am talking about - where we could have a clear, unequivocal kind of situation put in front of us and say, 'Look, this is it.' We would have the right, as adult, elected Newfoundlanders, to say, 'Well, now, have you thought about this? Is this right or wrong?' We have heard at least four constitutional opinions in this House already.

The hon. member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) says, in effect, 'I have a view. Either accept my view or

MR. D. JAMIESON: you are letting down the side.'
There are other people who think differently. So what I am asking for, in terms of his intervention this morning, is let us have a cooling down of all the rhetoric straight across the board on this issue, because there are going to be a lot of things, I suspect, that are going to come back to haunt hon. members opposite if they are not extremely careful in terms of thinking things through very fully before taking the necessary action.

Perhaps I will get up again on this matter but I did want to get that on the record this morning.

SOME. HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would like to enter the debate for a few minutes. You see, the problem here that we have, Mr. Chairman, talking about this is that the Leader of the Opposition is on one level of debate and some of his colleagues are on another level of debate.

AN. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) statement (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: -exactly-so that you cannot go, you know, you are not talking about the same thing all the time as it relates to that. Now, the problem, the great problem that we have on this side of the House, obviously it has got nothing to do with whether all the answers reside on the other side or this side or whatever, the problem is, and we become convinced more and more every day, that the Liberal Opposition, from time to time, are trying to smoke-screen the principle issues, spelt with an le and an al, with detail rather than making the decision on the principle of the thing and there is no question then about the detail and the information flow that is necessary. You see, that is where the basic, fundamental problem lies between the Government of today and the Opposition of today in this province. Because,

PREMIER PECKFORD: as the Leader of the Opposition points out, when you talk about equalization, that is a negotiating, important detail which comes after you decide that it is in the best long-term interests of Newfoundland and Canada for this province to own and control its offshore oil and gas resources, not before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is not the issue of principle. The issue of principle is not equalization. The issue of principle is whether we own and control the oil and gas on the Continental Shelf, and then if we do and that revenue regime, under those regulations are applicable, then

PREMIER PECKFORD: how does that affect the existing equalization formula in place between the Provinces? Which one comes first? And the one that comes first in our minds is the question of ownership and control.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the clear thing. That is the issue of principle that has to be decided first. You cannot do it the other way around. You either believe in certain things or you do not. I do not care whether I have got to pay property tax in South Brook, Halls Bay or not, in my decision whether I am going to live there. That is one detail that can be worked out after I make the basic, fundamental decision that in looking at my family and looking at myself, looking at my lifestyle and the way I want to live, that that is not a matter of principle. The matter of principle is the place where I want to be for the next fifteen or twenty years in light of everything, and then the details come after it. You have to decide in your own mind which comes first. And obviously, given all the history - economic, cultural, physical - of this part of the world for the last 400 or 500 years, the issue of principle for me as a Newfoundlander is the question of the ownership and control of the resource. Now, that is on that issue because it is so - and, Mr. Chairman, let me just read into the record - because it is so dramatic and massive. The degree becomes the kind, it is so dramatic and massive.

Now, after saying that on the offshore ownership question, on oil and gas, which is so fantastically pervasive in the future - it is going to either make us, break us, destroy us, change us or whatever; it is in a field all of its own - then I can come to the issue of the Northern cod and we can talk about it differently, as one component of an overall fisheries policy. A different - it is not apples and apples. It is apples and apples only in the sense of the impact that it will have on our Province, and on a specific part of our Province. It does not still have the same dramatic, massive sociological and other things, although it is important and it is still big. Its magnitude is somewhat diminished but still it is very big.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So we look at the fishery, then, with the Northern cod as a component, the Gulf as a component, the seal fishery is a component, the West Coast fishery and the herring fishery and the Bay of Islands and all up there and we try to develop a fisheries policy on that, but in the first instance, we understand and know that on the Northern cod, forgetting the constitution of it, that from a sheer, sensible point of view you cannot go digging fish offshore even for our own plants, theoretically - we are doing it wrong now, even - until you know what you are about. And we do not know what we are about on the Northern cod. We, the government, have charged up now a scientific study which we will have within about eight or ten weeks to try to substantiate this point, that at this point is a belief with us. We believe that it is wrong to attack the Northern cod stock offshore - but whosoever will, we believe.

MR. JAMIESON: That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And now we will try to substantiate that with scientific and historic proof. Secondly, we believe, because of economics and every other way, that that fish in the first instance must continue to be harvested by Newfoundlanders, just for survival purposes, from Cape St. Mary's to Nain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And then, coming down from that, or above that somewhere, is the understanding and the belief, again nurtured from our own particular constituencies, that there has to be - and we have tried this over the last number of years - regularized, meaningful, effective

PREMIER PECKFORD: consultation with the provincial authorities as it relates to this whole question of fisheries management. There has not been, is not today, anywhere near that kind of thing. There seems to be a total absence of trying even to consult with us on things affecting herring off Cockles Cove and we are in daily contact with all levels of the Federal Department of Fisheries to try and make that happen and have written them. It is on file, the evidence is there for the last three or four years, in the last year and a half especially. So what we are saying there, we can see down the road with this massive fishery again if we manage the stocks properly offshore and they come ashore. Now once again you are looking at a fairly fantastic thing for this Province in the long-term. In licensing, who do all the fishermen come to down in St. Mary's-The Capes? Cannot get any license. 'You have to get a crab license for me. You have to get my fishing license for me. You have to get this license for me.' Complaining about how high the quota is within the bays-within the bays, not offshore, in the bays - where you can take your dory or your punt and go for a few hours. Should not we, as a part of Canada, have some say in that establishment? In one place now in Newfoundland they have changed the quota three times in the last two or three weeks, the herring quota. Three times they have changed it, unknown to us. So it is only shared jurisdiction. It is not a fantastic matter of principle in the same way as the offshore oil and gas, but it still has massive repercussions and we are the ones that are on the front lines talking about it all the time. And thirdly, on hydro development, it is a different story again altogether. We have tried. And so there is a difference in my view on where you start making certain fundamental basic decisions from which flow a whole lot of details, complex, intricate that the Leader of the Opposition was talking about and which we are prepared to talk about. But in the first instance there must be a basic fundamental decision by all Newfoundlanders as to where they stand on the offshore ownership question, first, and then you can move into the whole area that obviously - and I am not against it, I am not against it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I told Mr. Leugheed and I told all the premiers and the members in the federal government that we can look at changes. That is one of the problems. There is a lot of intransigence around us. There should be changes to the equalization formula to reflect, as I call it, the momentary flirtation with wealth that Alberta now has, but let us work out some more flexibility in the formula for that. Leave the ownership question out of it, because you are never going to solve it that way. Talk about balkanization. It will come from Ottawa out if you start - you cannot do that. The history of the making of this country, go back and look at the Charlottetown Conference and the Quebec Conference and look how it happened. As a matter of fact, it is a funny thing today, it is ironic that PEI was one of the delegations which was saying no to almost everything at that time but I guess they are more supportive now for obvious reasons, of the present set-up in Confederation. You cannot go doing that now. It is a federation. But you just change the nature of the federation, you do not destroy the federation. You do not destroy the family. You make certain different changes so that the communication and camaraderie and friendliness and links between the various groups in the family act differently because the nature of their existence is different than it was when they joined. And that brings you back to the fundamental issues of it and that is why you have the alienation in the West, that is why you have the problem here in this Province, and it is has nothing to do with being anti-Canadian. It has got to do with seeing a different economic basis on which you jump to make certain decisions. But you have to because you have no choice but to.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Butt): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: As far as overall information flow and detail, that is where the fundamental difference lies in my view in how we are approaching these very, very important issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. JAMIESON: I am not quite sure, and I do not think we ought to prolong this exchange, although it is very interesting, but it does, I think, and when I read the Premier's remarks I believe I will be able to find a basis for arguing that it does lend support to the proposition that I have made with regard to having a thorough, what I call a select committee, I do not care what other technique or whatever form is taken because the Premier has made a couple of rather basic statements here which, I am quite certain, reasonable men could differ on. I am not going to get into the rhetoric, or I am not going to get into any of those things; what he says basically is you settle on the matter of principle first, and then after you have settled on the principle then you work out the detail.

Well, surely that is an arguable way of going. He said his decision to live in a place, he would make that first before he decided, for instance, whether the taxes - or what the taxes were, the property taxes were. Well, surely one of the decisions you make with regard to whether you are going to live somewhere is how much your taxes are going to cost you to live there. And you do the two things in concert. You do them simultaneously.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Obviously. Sure.

MR. JAMIESON: Obviously. That is what I am saying. That is why it seems to me also, and I will rest on this point for now because this is not probably the place for this kind of discussion, I hope there will be on it.

By the way, can I say just parenthetically that insofar as the Northern cod stock issue is concerned, I do not have any argument about the fact other than, for instance, that I am dubious as to whether there is any - I think it was somebody on the other side who said it yesterday - whether in fact there is any surplus at all for anybody to go fooling around with.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) offshore effort (inaudible).

MR. JAMIESON: And as the hon. member knows -

MR. NEARY: Not even for our own crime.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Exactly. Because there might not be.

MR. NEARY: That is what I said the other day.

MR. JAMIESON: It is a very good question.

MR. NEARY: And here you are the biggest culprit.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Thank you very much, my hon. friend.

MR. NEARY: He is getting your measurement there now. You had better watch it.

MR. JAMIESON: By the way, speaking of measurements, in case anybody gets any real concerns over the weekend, do not worry about it, if you hear I am in the hospital it is a routine check-up. So do not let the hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) get his eyes lit up yet a while.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Our CIA is very good (inaudible).

MR. JAMIESON: Oh, very good. In any event, what I was going to say ways that surely what has to be - what we are looking for in terms of information and the like, is the hon. the Premier again has used the word "ownership", we have heard "control", we have heard "jurisdiction." I really want to know, and I am not asking for the answers today, but what I am saying is that what we should be discussing, and I do not know what the forum is unless it is a select committee, is in fact - you know, ownership also implies very great responsibilities unless you have made a deal which ensures that you have got the ownership without an inordinate burden of cost imposed on you at the same time.

I used the analogy some time ago, which I think is fairly apt, and that is that you suddenly get excited about the fact that you have just been informed that you have inherited a big castle in Scotland somewhere until you discover that the upkeep on it is far more

MR. JAMIESON: than you are able to afford. And conceivably what I can see happening is an ownership situation, a constitutional - the cure situation developing where the onus on the Province of Newfoundland would be inordinately and unreasonably high. So that therefore I am not sure you say you are going to settle on the principle and you will not talk anything else until you get the principle out of the way, unless you also say to yourself, "Okay, what goes with this?" Let me ask what I think are a half a dozen quite legitimate questions here.

If, for instance, there were to be, as the hon. the Premier said, agreement on the principle of ownership, who has responsibility, who continues to have responsibility for such things as environment control? That is one of the things. To what extent, and by the way, I said this, I think, before I came into this House, that the oil and gas regulations for which the Premier is responsible are good regulations; I have read them and re-read them recently.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

What I do have some problems with is saying to myself, 'Okay, if they are our regulations to implement, who is going to pay the shot? Is it going to be, in a sense, people - let us say at the federal level saying, 'Ownership is there but along with it go these costly responsibilities' and there are a whole range that one could list. We have not had any real indication in this House - indeed my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who took such, I think, an unfair hammering this morning from the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) -

MR. S. NEARY:

I am not finished with him yet.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Oh, you are not finished, I see. Well, in any event he has asked repeatedly who settles the relationship between oil and gas on the one hand and fisheries on the other and the difficulties that experts in the field have raised repeatedly on the issue of these two key industries - and the Premier and members opposite put the fishery first sometimes - but if those two are going to co-exist, once again where is the responsibility? Do we say in effect - and by the way, I suggest to the Premier that the kind of situation that he has outlined and described is not going to be much different than the Upper Churchill. We own the Upper Churchill, we own every last drop of water there is in Labrador, we do not have to go to Ottawa for a light bulb insofar as that goes. We do not need the Federal Government in the sense of ownership but what we have to do - we saw the demonstration of it in the establishment of the Labrador Lower Churchill Corporation, we see it now in the necessity to have some kind of federal intervention. We saw it at the time of the Upper Churchill, incidentally, despite - and that is historical and I will not go into it now - some claims that nothing was done. I recall that Mr. Pearson made some quite significant changes which were necessary for that particular project to go ahead. But we may well be in the position with regard to offshore where

MR. D. JAMIESON: even if the issue of ownership did not exist, you would be sitting back in this Province and saying, 'Boys, there is no way we can handle this kind of situation without having an enormous amount of federal input. Therefore, to argue that you want to own it and set everything else aside until that is resolved, is not, it seems to me, a very practical point. It is not to take away from, let me emphasize, the argument about ownership, that can stay there. But I am told, by the way, by the best experts in the field, the very best and they are working for the same government now that wrote the letters for Mr. Clark—that is, they are working in the same federal arrangement that the Clark proposals would probably with good will from everybody concerned take four to five to six years to implement. Now I do not, once again I am asking a question, you see, that, let us say, that process is going on, is an interim arrangement—presumably some kind of an interim arrangement was contemplated and is contemplated—is that sufficient to allow the kind of development that we are speaking of and if there is an interim arrangement that it is going to be necessary, what is its format? What is it? Is it unreasonable? Am I being a non-Newfoundlander, am I being a traitor because I say, 'Well, how do you work this thing while you are trying to get it through. I had the agony for ten years of trying to get constitutional reform. The hon. the Premier knows about it, he knows that I agree whole-heartedly and 100 per cent with those who maintain that we have to have a difference and a change in the areas of responsibility but I know how long it takes. So what do we do in the meantime? What do we do? It is not going to be enough and he knows it is not going to be enough to have a lot of long-range - when I say long-range I mean in the geographic sense - declarations of one position or the other. What has to happen, and I suggest surely has to happen very quickly, is that the two levels

MR. D. JAMIESON: of government must get together and say, 'Okay, whatever the big issue is, whatever it is, even if it was on the so-called Clark formula which has holes in it, by the way, that you could shoot a cannon through it and the Premier knows that very well - but the truth of the matter is what arrangements do we have now? What arrangement within, if Hibernia, as we all hope, comes into play, what are

MR. D. JAMIESON: we going to be doing six months, twelve months from now? And really, the final point I want to make in this regard - and I understand that this is an inadequate response, because there is not enough time - but you know, the Premier was a complete cop-out yesterday to say really that the reason that there are problems with land speculation - and I do not, by the way, I would not be as sure or I would not be as confident as the Premier seems to be that all is roses in the garden in terms of everything is in place and everything is controlled on land. I know differently and I think others in this House know differently. And I will tell you that unless hon. gentlemen opposite are different than I am, there is not a week goes by that some developer does not phone me from some remote place or other, and they are in here like flies around a molasses puncheon as the old expression puts it.

MR. S. NEARY: This week eight companies moved in.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Eight. Well, that is it. All you have to do, by the way, is look in the yellow pages of the telephone directory to see how many people are active now. And 90 per cent of that is exclusively and at this moment under provincial control.

MR. S. NEARY: Exactly.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. D. JAMIESON: It does not need anything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time is expired.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Well, I have finished my remarks, Mr. Chairman, but I end by again saying to the members opposite that I think that we are all mature enough, that if the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) or the Premier or both, or their officials, were to come before a committee, we could ask these kinds of questions. And we might well come to the same conclusion that they have, that yes, this is right, or we might well be able to say, 'Look, you are on a sticky wicket there and you should move in a different kind of direction.' But in the absence of the specifics, it is not, I repeat, that I am anxious to be obstructionist, I just want to know, that is all, and so

MR. D. JAMIESON:

do my friends.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the detail does not become the principle. There are certain things that everybody can agree on. The detail does not become the principle. And that is what the Leader of the Opposition is really saying. Obviously - and I am going to mention five or six points; he mentioned one or two as it relates to this. Look, there are certain things that are basic - you breathe and you move and you have your being. There are certain things that are basic. And obviously, we have been all over the world - I have been almost in every place, the government has. Our Heritage of the Sea points it out, our White Paper points it out, our regulations point that out, that we know - this is not a foreign concept, and this is why I think the Leader of the Opposition is either deliberately or accidentally or whatever, because he has some concerns about it, inflating these concerns to confuse the principle of it. That is the point - inflating them, because we now exist, we have been a Province, we have been around here for a while and we have ongoing co-operative arrangements constitutionally and otherwise with the Government of Canada on how you operate Labrador City and Wabush which are resources that belong to the Province of Newfoundland, over which there is joint environmental control, for example, or over the fisheries inland and offshore or whatever there is joint environmental control. So on the environment side, we said in Ottawa three years ago when I talked to Mr. Gillespie, when the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was a minister, I said it in his office before about six people when we got to dispute over it, 'Just hold on one second.' I do not know, the Leader of the Opposition might have been there. 'Just hold on one second,' I said, 'on that matter,' on the environment thing, 'there is no question there has to be joint -' and we had established at that time an intent to jointly work on the environmental things in the meantime, but you do not walk into a situation unless you know what the terms of the negotiations are. And one of our terms is the principle of ownership and control residing in the Province. And then you sit down on the other things. You do not walk in there talking about these details

PREMIER PECKFORD: and then later you work out some kind of an interim agreement only to find out you really do not have any effective control outside of that kind of an agreement.

So that, I mean, it begs the whole issue. That is not the issue. There have to be certain principles which you agree to.

Now, does the federal government of Canada agree with the Province of Newfoundland that in the long-term best interests of both, ownership and control of this resource should reside in Newfoundland in the same way as we have it on our trees and our iron ore? C'est la question - That is it. That is the question. That is the question - in the same way we had to establish terms for Mr. Levesque, because he was taking us for a ride for five years. Five years? Taking us for a ride since he was Minister of Natural Resources in Quebec in the former Liberal Government there! That is when he started it. And since whenever that was, 1965 or 1966 to yesterday he sweet-talked everybody - gullible approaches and packages and all the rest of it. And we had to establish certain principles or guidelines under which we were willing to talk to him. I do not talk to everybody in the world under no principles or guidelines.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I set and the other person hopefully sets the parameters in which we are going to work. And for Mr. Levesque, as far as this government is concerned one of the parameters, one of the principles that must be understood by both and agreed to by both before we sit down and talk about any further developments in Labrador is the principle of the Upper Churchill and that they must agree in principle to the reopening of the Upper Churchill contract and in principle to recall some of that power. Now we did not say how much it would be, we did not say how much it would be. It is now 3.1 mils. We did not say to Mr. Levesque, 'Hey, if you do not agree to 25 mils' - that is what is getting out sometimes by some people: 'Peckford and the government are saying that you must agree to pay thirty mils for Upper Churchill power.' They must pay us thirty or forty mils. Oh, no. We asked for principles to be established so that we knew what we are talking about, that you would agree in principle to reopening how much you pay for our power. That is all. And then we will negotiate, after the principle is established from 3.1 up to wherever, over a long period of time, obviously. That is a pretty fair condition, a pretty fair principle. We never used any numbers. Mr. Levesque cannot prove or show that we ever did. I never did. And that is what we are saying here, that there are certain basic things that you must agree to beforehand and that is one of them. If the federal government will agree to those principles which have been clearly laid down by us there is no problem in sitting down on the interim arrangements, on environmental and the impact and the saw-off between oil and gas and fisheries. No question the federal government must be involved. Absolutely. We are part of Canada. They have some constitutional responsibilities that we do not want to infringe upon. The pricing of it, the National Energy Board and the distribution of it outside the country. No question. But you do not do that, you cannot do that, if in fact you do not know certain basic things; that you are going to be able to control it, that you are going to get a fair return from it, that is where it comes down. So the interim arrangement is all possible but only after you have agreed

PREMIER PECKFORD: to certain basic principles which are important for the future of your existence. That is the point and you cannot escape that kind of principle as being so necessary. How foolish would we be again to ever entertain talking down, as much as we might want to, co-operatively do it. And we have tried. We have tried from 1972 upward in talking to the federal authorities and they would never agree to these kind of principles. Now if that can be agreed to then the other things - they are not foreign to us, we are dealing with it every day and have been, with Labrador City and with the fishery and with mining and with forestry. We are doing it every day. DREE gets involved in incentive grants for the forest industry. You know, the federal government gets involved in environmental controls for Price (Nfld) and Bowaters. It is going to cost Bowaters \$4.5 million to meet the federal Canadian environmental regulations.

MR. JAMIESON: (Inaudible) federal government (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Exactly. But what I am saying is that the principle of co-operative arrangements, after one accepts that the Province has some ownership rights, is well established. And this is not foreign, this is not alien, this is not unnatural, this is not unknown. We know about all these things and it is easy. We can do the same thing. Sure it is more dramatic, vicious, 'oil in the water' but it is no less, theoretically in thought and in practice, we just have to put other environmental regulations in place. So all these things, they should not prevent the Leader of the Opposition, they are not of enough consequence in the thought processes in my view to prevent or inhibit full and total support of ownership and control by this Province over oil and gas. That is the point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Here, here!

PREMIER PECKFORD: They are not of sufficient magnitude in themselves or within the whole context of it to prevent any thinking

PREMIER PECKFORD: person from giving full support that we should have the same kind of ownership control over oil and gas on the Continental Shelf as we have on trees on land and iron ore in Labrador City. There is just no question.

MR. MARSHALL: Plain as anything.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And that is the point and there is no other point. Institute of Public Policy - somebody mentioned it the other day in my estimates and said why was there twenty - there was a four year agreement between the Province and the Institute of Public Policy and now the four

PREMIER PECKFORD: years is up and so the money has been paid. They have a \$17 million endowment, a trust fund anyway. They can live off their interest and do a lot of their studies without us having to cough it up every time.

MR. JAMIESON: They have hired David MacDonald too now.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the group that hired David MacDonald.

MR. ROBERTS: The Province has done what it undertook to do is what I since learned.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. But that is why there is no money allotted there.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully actually to most of what has been said here this morning. Sometimes listening to the Premier of this Province, and to his Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), who I heard on radio a short time ago, I sometimes wonder who really is the government, who forms the government of this Province, whether it is the Conservative Party or members of the Liberal Party?

I have no problems with our position on the oil and gas in this Province, none whatsoever. None whatsoever. And I make no apologies to anybody. I do resent though, and it has been brought up and I am going to go back to it, I resented it a month ago, I resented it when the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) gave the impression this morning, I resented it when the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) made his remarks, and I will keep on resenting it, that because I hold an opinion, which I am not sure is different than that of the government of this Province, I am not sure it is different than that of the government of this Province but some people conceive to be different from the position taken by the government, that because I hold that position that I am somewhat less a Newfoundlander than others. I am not. I am no better, no better, but I am certainly no

MR. THOMS:

worse a Newfoundlander than anybody else.

I also find myself quite inadequate

to be quite frank with you, in the discussions on oil and gas in this House, as I am sure an awful lot of members of this House must feel totally inadequate. And we are here as elected members of this House to make decisions concerning ownership, jurisdiction, the social impact, etc., on this Province, and really what does most of us know about it? When have ever come in contact with oil and gas? I fill up my car once a week and that is about as much as I get, and the little bit of reading that I do on it.

There have been a few ministers, and maybe others, but very few, on the other side of the House, who have been in Aberdeen, or they have been in Calgary, or they have been down to the Mexican Gulf, and they have seen what the impact of oil and gas has on a city or a town or a district or county or what have you. And here we are asked to make decisions, asked to discuss this very important issue in this Province, and apart from a handful, apart from a handful of us, none of us have actually been able to see and experience what it is all about.

Now the same probably cannot be said for the Civil Service in this Province. Anytime you go to the airport you can see Civil Servants who are either going or coming to Aberdeen or to Calgary, or the Gulf of Mexico, or Louisiana, some place like that. I suppose there is hardly a businessman, I know I can hardly think of a client of mine who is in private business here in St. John's who has not only been to Calgary but as well Aberdeen, to get a firsthand view, a firsthand knowledge of what goes on.

In my mind I really cannot conceive of an Aberdeen, or a Shetland Islands, or a Calgary, and I think it is about time that this House, this government, decided that if we are going to be making decisions affecting this Province for the next thirty or forty or fifty years, or hundreds years, then I think we should seriously give consideration to giving the members of this House, who are the ultimate

MR. THOMS: authority, the ultimate decision should be made here, then I think we should get a firsthand knowledge of these things.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Agreed. Agreed. We are all ready to start in a couple of weeks, in the next couple of weeks. I am going to start briefings, sessions, seminars, for all the members of the House to fully inform them and I intend at the same time - that is already in place, okay; I can prove to you that that was done a long time ago in documentation-and then for me to sit down with the Leader of the Opposition and so on, a number of the ministers, with other people there who have particular responsibilities as shadow ministers or whatever, to further discuss it. But that is in place to be done so that members on the opposite side have as much information flow on it as members on this side. That is in place to do.

MR. THOMS: I am glad

MR. L. THOMS: to see that planning along those lines are in place. I had no idea that it was going on.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I agree with the hon. member, absolutely. But our problem has been in trying to put that all together because of establishing the Petroleum Directorate and doing it right so that the numerous people who wanted to apply for those positions had the opportunity to do so, otherwise we would have had to run roughshod over a whole bunch of people and then we would have had a lot of people saying that we were appointing and anointing people rather than getting them from the pool, if you will. Plus a whole bunch of other things.

MR. L. THOMS: Well, I am happy to hear that, because you know, like I say, when I argued oil and gas in my caucus, from the extent that I know about it, ad nauseum, and you know, I have heard it discussed here in this House. And really, as I said, apart from a few people that have the firsthand experience, such as the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry), others have not had any experience whatsoever and cannot really intelligently get up in this House and discuss it and I am certainly glad to hear the Premier say that hopefully this will be corrected.

I have already mentioned the one thing that has bothered me in the statement that is made. I have said I certainly am not going to defend myself as a Newfoundlander. I do not think it needs any defense and I refuse to do it. I agree wholeheartedly with my friend from LaPoile (S. Neary) and I would like to make this statement for public consumption so that everybody in the district of Grand Bank will know it and these are the people that, in the first instance, I care about. That if I ever become disenchanted with the Liberal party of this province, if that should ever happen, or if there is some great principle—and my position on oil and gas is not that great principle,—if I should ever become disenchanted or there is some great

MR. L. THOMS: principle which I cannot sit with this party, then I believe - and I think we should also give some serious consideration to this - I believe it is my duty and my responsibility to go back to the people of Grand Bank to resign, to go back to the people of Grand Bank for their endorsement in an election or a by-election.

Then if I want to become the Tory candidate, then I go down, I seek the nomination. If I get it, I would run and then they elect me as a Tory, then - or defeat me as a Tory, one or the other. I think we should give serious consideration to that particular point.

The member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) was not elected as a Liberal. He was elected as a Conservative.

MR. STAGG: He was elected (inaudible) -

MR. L. THOMS: Yes, he was. You know, you can be as semantic about this as you want to. When they voted for Les Thoms down in Grand Bank they were voting for a Liberal. They knew they were voting for a Liberal and they gave it an overwhelming majority in that district. They did not vote for a Tory.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) electoral process

MR. L. THOMS: And if I ever, as I say, if I ever decide - let us look at the electoral process. Let us look at it. You know, there is nothing wrong with looking at it.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Why did you not run as an independent?

MR. L. THOMS: We all run as, in one sense, we all run as individuals. There is nobody questioning that. But how many people, how many people in Grand Bank or on the shore, or in St. John's East, you know, may vote differently? If the hon. member for St. John's East (W. Marshall) went down and said, 'I am not running for any party, I am just running on my own name:

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Order, please. Order, please. The

April 18, 1980

Tape No 909

EL - 3

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. L. THOMS: Thank you very much , Mr.Chairman.

There is much more I could say about this but that is enough for now.

AN .HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I had not anticipated getting into this particular debate this morning but in view of the comments that were made by the hon. member from St. John's East (W. Marshall) I, too, feel obligated to get up and to say a few words for the public record. I was not here this morning to witness that great Damascus road episode, or was it the situation of Nicodemus? I am not sure, but anyway I am not all that sorry that I missed it because it really does not affect me one way or the other. And if hon. members, or if any hon. member feels that that is the way he should go, on a matter of principle, that is fine with me. But, I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that as the hon. member from Grand Bank(L. Thoms) suggested, I find no difficulty in accepting this party's position on oil and gas, or with respect to the Northern cod stocks. And again, I am not so sure that it is

MR. T. LUSH: any different from what the government stand is. Every motion that has come out here in this hon. House in this session we have supported. The Leader of the Opposition went through the major issues this morning that we have supported. We have certainly supported the Province's claim to ownership so I do not know what it is that the government want, I do not know what it is that they have been saying when they have been asking us to stand up and be counted. And we have supported them on the major issues, on the issues that count in this Province and I as a Newfoundlander will forever support the government on issues that are important to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: And I find it offensive when the remark is made that, for some reason or other, members on this side of the House, and I being one of them are unpatriotic, that they do not care about this Province. Well, let me say, this morning - I have never very often said this - I have served in this House for four years at a greater sacrifice than possibly any other member here.

It has been said here, I have never said it before, but it has been said by the former former Premier of this Province when speaking about salaries and speaking about which members have lost the most salary by coming into this House. I came here four years at the top of the teaching profession in qualifications and in experience and came here as a supervisor and I came here losing \$14,000 or \$15,000 a year. For what? To be called an unpatriotic Newfoundlander, for somebody who does not care about Newfoundland, for somebody who is going to sell Newfoundland down the drain? This is one hon. member who

MR. T. LUSH: is not going to sell Newfoundland down the drain, this is one Newfoundlander who is not going to sit idly by and see our resources exploited.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are going to cross the floor!

MR. T. LUSH: I do not have to cross the floor. Mr. Speaker, that will be a frosty Friday I do not have to do that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) cross the floor.

MR. T. LUSH: Sure why do we not all cross the floor. Let us forget about democracy, let us give this a one party -

MR. MORGAN: Some of you we would not have over here.

MR. T. LUSH: - in Newfoundland. What nonsense! What nonsense! This hon. member, Mr. Speaker, does not need to cross the floor but as I said before I will not sit idly by and watch the resources of this Province being exploited by some other level of government or by multi-nationals or whatever. But whatever I can do, whatever I can do to ensure that Newfoundland is going to get the maximum benefits from its resources be they offshore or onshore, I know where I stand, and I am going to continue to stand there.

It is absolutely, Mr. Speaker, absolutely offensive to hear hon. members get up to make that sort of accusation about their own fellow Newfoundlanders. It is nothing other than for political gain. I stood in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, for four years and there are some things that I said that I should not have, I expect, in that time but one thing I can say, that I have never, ever accused an hon. member of being unpatriotic, never have accused any hon. member on this side of the House or the other side, the government side of being unpatriotic, because I do not think we are unpatriotic Newfoundlanders. Why did we get into this game? Heavens knows there are enough headaches

MR. T. LUSH: in it for people to get here. Why would a person want to get into political life if he is not concerned about Newfoundland, if he is not concerned about the development of this Province, if he is not concerned about his people and his resources? Why would he enter the political arena? Absolute trash! Absolute nonsense! A lot of nonsense for any person of integrity to get up and to accuse any hon. member of being unpatriotic or being a traitor.

MR. JAMIESON: And they ask for our support.

MR. T. LUSH: Absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ROBERTS: They are going to destroy public life in the Province if they keep this up.

MR. LUSH: And I just simply want to say, Mr. Chairman like the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), that I am no better a Newfoundlander or no worse a Newfoundlander than anyone else

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH:

-than any other hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH:

But I am going to continue to fight like other members for what I believe are the right directions for this Province to go in. And as I have said before and I have said it today after the Premier made his great speech, when the Premier made that, what I conclude to be his great change in the approach to the development of offshore oil and gas. I said on that day that I saw no philosophical difference in the government's approach to the development of offshore oil and gas and this party's philosophy. There was no difference, the difference was mainly in the approach that was being used. I am not going to go into that again. But that is how I see the situation, Mr. Chairman. I see no philosophical difference in the approach of this government and this party's approach to the development of our offshore oil and gas, the development of this Province's resources as they relate to the offshore. I see no difference, it has not been shown to me. Maybe I have got to witness that, maybe I have got to come to that Damascus road yet; I do not know but I see no reason, I see no difference in the philosophical approach in the philosophy of this party with respect to offshore oil and gas of what I see in our own party. The difference to me has been entirely in approach.

But, Mr. Speaker, again the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, he went through this morning in great detail the major issues on which this party went on record to be supportive of the government. And what do we have to do to let them know, what do we have to do to let the people of Newfoundland know where we stand on those issues? We stand here and we support them but to find out the next day or somebody has said in the press that we are unpatriotic, that we do not want Newfoundland to get the maximum benefits from the development of the offshore oil and gas. What a lot of tweedledum, you know, Mr. Chairman, what a lot of

MR. T. LUSH:

higgledy-piggledy.

MR. JAMIESON:

Fuddle-duddle.

MR. T. LUSH:

It aggravates a person, it frustrates a person, it almost leaves you without words; you do not know how to respond to it, to hear hon. members opposite getting on with that sort of nonsense. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have just got two minutes left and again I just want to say that it is so annoying, so offensive to a politician, to a member of this hon. House who has given up his time and effort to become a part of the political process of this Province, to become a part of the political life, to try and make a contribution in the best way he knows how to be accused by hon. members, to be accused by colleagues, that he is somehow less than patriotic for having done that. It is a sad day, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that some day somebody will see the light for the enhancement of political life in this Province and certainly change that sort of nonsense around and let us start talking positively and let us start talking about the - let us get some action, let us stop talking about offshore oil and gas and let us stop philosophizing but let us get some action in this Province so that people of this Province would clearly see that we are one. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Seeing that I was the one who started this debate earlier this morning -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You always do.

MR. S. NEARY:

- and I am glad I did because we did get some information, not too much, we did get a little information while we are on the Premier's estimates, but let me go back to what triggered this debate in the beginning when the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) decided that he had to leap in to defend a certain event that took place in this House this morning. Let me go back to that situation, and my time ran out before I had an opportunity to deal with it to my own satisfaction. Let me say this

April 18, 1980

Tape No. 911

SD - 3

MR. S. NEARY:

straight away, Mr. Chairman, that

MR. NEARY: there are members sitting over on the government benches at the moment gloating and beckoning to my colleagues over here, "Come on over." They enjoy watching people on this side of the House bare their souls. They are almost sadistic about it, because they think they have put us on the defensive, they put us on the defensive. But, Mr. Chairman, let me remind this House that it was the Liberal Party of this Province that brought the oil companies to Newfoundland.

Now the hon. the Premier seems to be
so -

MR. THOMS: They cannot conceal their joy.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier seems to be so selfish and so greedy about anybody else getting a little bit of credit that therein lies the problem, Mr. Chairman. There is the problem. But before I deal with the oil situation let me say that in my opinion - the word will go out now, oh they are over there now, I can see they are grinning like pussy cats. They are saying, "Oh, they are in disarray over there. There are a couple of more over there discontented." Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say this. That I, in my eighteen years or longer in the Liberal Party of this Province, and in the Liberal Caucus, that I have never seen the Liberal Party in as good a shape as it is today. I have never seen it. I have never seen the -

MR. MORGAN: What a laugh!

MR. NEARY: - the comraderie. I have never seen the spirit so good, the spirit of co-operation. I have never seen the morale of the Liberal Party as good as it is in this Province today. And God only knows we have had a rough time in the last few years. We have had a rough time in the last few months. But, Mr. Chairman, we have managed to keep our act together. And we realize that the responsibility on our shoulders is heavy indeed, that where you have the - I suppose you could say - I do not know if it is right to say it, I suppose I can say it, where

MR. NEARY: you have the two party system, that the responsibility that falls on the shoulders of the Liberals, the Liberal Party and the Liberal members in this Province is very heavy indeed. Because people look to us, look to the Liberal Party as the alternative to the government.

MR. J. CARTER: Tell us what principles you like.

MR. THOMS: The Premier is gone, he is (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that in my opinion that we have as good a Leader of our Party as any Party has ever had in the whole history of Newfoundland. We have him today with us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A good Leader. A man who went out and made his mark not only in Canada but in the whole world, a man who Newfoundlanders, while they may not always subscribed or agreed with his politics -

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you say no, Sir?

MR. CARTER: Is this an obituary?

MR. NEARY: No, it is not an obituary, Sir. I am hoping the word will go out because I can hear it now. I can hear it now. The rumours will start to fly, "The Liberal Party is in disarray." The Liberal Party is not in disarray. The Liberal Party is in great shape and half the trouble with the government is that they still think they are in Opposition. They have the Opposition syndrome. They have not forgotten the fact that they are now the government and they are not governing the Province, and they are getting up tilting at windmills half the time because they still think they are in Opposition.

MR. BARRY: You have us shellshocked.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am so proud and happy to be a Liberal, to be a member of the Liberal Party of this Province. Praise the Lord, I am proud of it. And I would say that today we are

MR. NEARY: more united than we have ever been in our history.

MR. BARRY: As late as yesterday you were still disagreeing on things.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is one of the attributes -

MR. THOMS: That is good -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: There is the real test of a real democratic party, Mr. Chairman. In this Party, and we saw it happen a few weeks ago, before we rose for the Easter recess, when the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) stood in his place in this House and disagreed with his colleagues and with the policy or philosophy of his own party and the party nationally, was he flung out? Was he flung out?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Did anybody insult him?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Did anybody insult him? Did anybody think any less of him? He was welcomed

MR. S. NEARY: back in our caucus. He came down and he sat there - I will not tell you how he sat there. And I was there when that meeting took place with Mr. Rompkey, and I never heard one peep out of the hon. gentleman.

MR. THOMS: Not one.

MR. S. NEARY: I do not think he even asked a question. And then he told us this morning -

MR. CARTER: You cannot reveal secrets in caucus.

MR. S. NEARY: It was not that caucus. That was a meeting at the Battery Motel.

AN HON. MEMBER: You worry about your caucus, we will worry about ours.

MR. S. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, let the word go out that we were never as united and as dedicated to the Province and to the Liberal Party as we are at the present time. People of this Province are looking to the Liberal Party, Mr. Chairman. The ordinary people of this Province are looking to the Liberal Party to form the next government of this Province.

MR. BARRY: Are you backing Mr. Trudeau's position on the offshore?

AN HON. MEMBER: What is his position?

MR. L. BARRY: A substantial control over the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will tell Your Honour the trouble, what I think is the real trouble. And, you know, I hope that we will give up this behaving like seals and pounding on the desks when somebody on either side of the House gets up and bares his soul, because I am not going to fall into that trap. That is the kind of a situation that the member for St. John's East, the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) likes to see us in. He likes to see members in that position - 'Bring them to their knees!' How many times have I heard him at it? He hates everything that is Liberal. He is a walking bag of hate

MR. S. NEARY: for anything that is Liberal. And that is what he does. That is half the trouble on that side of the House. You have the ultra-Conservatives over there pushing the Premier and saying to the Premier, 'Bring them to their knees! Force them to do that, force them to do the other thing.' And therein lies the problem. And the next thing, Mr. Chairman, if this keeps up, it would not surprise me with the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the member for St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) and Mr. Cabot Martin and a few others who are pushing the Premier, it would not surprise me that pretty soon you will see a similar situation develop in Newfoundland as developed in Quebec, you will be having a referendum. That will be the next thing we will hear in this Province, in this House. 'Hold a referendum,' that will be the next thing you will hear. Because they are trying to imitate Peter Lougheed and Rene Levesque. But the real, real trouble, Mr. Chairman, with the people of this Province and with the Opposition and with members on the government side of the House is that they do not know from day to day what the government's position is, what the policy is. They have outlined five different positions on offshore oil and gas and we do not know yet what route the government are going to take. We do not know if they are going for the Clark formula, whether they are going the Supreme Court route, whether they are going to negotiate the same as P.E.I. and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, whether they are going for concurrent legislation - we do not know. The Premier tells us one thing, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) tells us another and the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) tells us something else. Now how can we take a position? Why do they not get up -

MR. THOMS: He is expecting us to negotiate the agreement.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, on this side of the House, everybody to a man has said, 'We believe that Newfoundland owns the offshore resources.' Okay?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: We have said it time and time again that

MR. S. NEARY: Newfoundland owns the resources, but, Mr. Chairman, that has to be confirmed. The Premier admits that, the minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) admits it, the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall) admits it. Newfoundlanders understand it has to be confirmed, we understand it. Now, how is it going to be confirmed? And that is what we would like to know. What route, what policy, what position is the government taking in order to get this thing confirmed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I am glad that there will be a couple of minutes here.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: The hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. L. Barry) keeps throwing across a question. He has been doing it now for the longest time, for the last three or four or five weeks.

MR. JAMIESON: Setting aside his, what I think is a quite unreasonable position which he takes both in the House and saying, either you stand with us or there is something inferior about your approach to Newfoundland. But the question that he raised this morning and said, 'do you support Mr. Trudeau's position?' I asked the Premier of this Province -

MR. BARRY: You were in the Cabinet when we took this (inaudible).

MR. JAMIESON: I want to finish, if you do not mind, Mr. Chairman. I asked the Premier as recently as this past week had there been any submission to the Government of Canada? Now remember we had an election on the 18th of February. We have a new government in Ottawa. Not a day too soon, I might say. By the way, when people opposite talk about co-operation, I have had occasion to find out in the last few days that for the eight or nine months the Tories were there it was not a frosty Friday, every day was a frosty Friday. Sinclair Stevens froze every nickle to come to Newfoundland. And now we are hearing all about we have to get speedy action on DREE and we have to get this and that and the other thing. The whole thing was in a deepfreeze for nine solid months and members opposite know it and they do not take the time to even admit it.

MR. STAGG: You do not know it.

MR. JAMIESON: But that is aside. What I want to say is that the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) reminds me, Mr. Chairman, you know what he reminds me off? He reminds me of the fellow you see who starts out to borrow his neighbour's lawn mower, and he goes out through his door and he says, 'I suppose he will loan it to me,' and he walks a little bit further and he says, you know the last time he loaned it to me he did not do it with very good grace.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. JAMIESON: Just hang on now. 'He did not do it with very good grace.' He gets a little bit further along and he says, 'You know, that son of a gun is not going to loan me that lawn mower.' And then he is going to go and ring the doorbell and the neighbour is going

MR. JAMIESON: to come out and he is going to punch him right in the face. He has talked himself into it. Now the situation is that effective whenever the election was held, the 18th, despite all of the rhetoric, despite all of the speeches, despite everything else - and maybe there is good reason for it - but the fact of the matter is that he has not even started out yet to see whether he can borrow the lawn mower. He has not even started yet and he is already assuming before he even starts that in some way or other, in some way or other he is going to get a terribly bad reception or that there is not going to be any willingness to co-operate, there is not going to be any willingness to examine. You know, all of those things are all assumptions until such time as Newfoundland - and I saw the hon. member smiling about what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) said about what route, but I am still confused -

MR. BARRY: Who owns the lawn mower?

MR. JAMIESON: Yes, but there is a vast difference between whose lawn mower -

MR. BARRY: Whose lawn mower is it?

MR. JAMIESON: In this particular case? We have no problem with that. Incidentally, I did not even -

MR. BARRY: I am going to get back my lawn mower.

MR. JAMIESON: Not necessarily. But let me finish what I started to say. If the hon. members in the government would really put down what approach they want to take, surely goodness it is not unreasonable to say that it is confusing when we have had about four different kinds of proposals. We have had in speeches -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) proposal that went to your government when you were in the federal cabinet.

MR. JAMIESON: I have just reminded the hon. member, and there is not time, obviously, before one now, that first of all I am no longer a member of that government and, secondly, that government no longer exists, thirdly, there have been very, very significant changes.

MR. JAMIESON: I was just going to say of all the pieces of glaring nonsense that I have ever heard, here is a government, here is a government that turned its back on everything that happened before the 18th of June of last year does not even acknowledge its existence. If I say to the hon. member, 'What did you predecessor do or what did your former Premier do?' oh, it does not even count but now in this particular case, where there has been an interregnum, God blessedly short interregnum - I beg your pardon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do we have a new prime minister?

MR. JAMIESON: It is quite conceivable that you have a prime minister who in this occasion, it is quite conceivable. The hon. gentleman asked me a legitimate question. He may be the same prime minister in terms of-what was it the Premier said?-his soul and body and mind and all the rest of it, but remember we have a prime minister who members opposite will know and particularly the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) will know, who I believe is going to be far more successful at bringing about meaningful constitutional change in this Province and in this country and who tried desperately, as I said this in earlier remarks, to do it

MR. D. JAMIESON: and who might this time just have the chance to do so. And I emphasize that I have no problem whatever in saying that there should be constitutional change. My friend, the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should remember that a lot of these issues - and this is the tragedy of this situation, in my judgement, that we are on to it on such a superficial basis and unfortunately there are limitations on what I am able to say, unless hon. members opposite want to table documents, but there is in existence an exchange of letters between the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources of Canada and the then Minister of Mines and Energy in Newfoundland which showed a good deal of co-operation, co-operation, by the way, without which you would not have had the offshore exploration that has brought the situation to where it is today. Now that is a fact that has never been stated. We know it is true. Why do we have to argue about it? Why should I be - he talks about my having been a member of the former government - why should I have to be accused in some way or other of not standing up for Newfoundland when I was the one among others who said, 'Look, make the deal with Newfoundland to get this exploration going, support it, the superdepletion allowance which were the real motor behind it, not the oil and gas regulations, not any of those things!

So what I am saying here in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, because I presume we will rise in just a moment, is this: that I want to emphasize what the member for Terra Nova said, that even I was surprised to discover that the first resolution on ownership was brought up during the Liberal Government back in about 1965 or 1966 or something of that order. Secondly, I read in detail the other day an exchange between the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts) and the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) in which our private resolution, as I understand it, was

MR. D. JAMIESON: turned into a government resolution. There was co-operation on the drafting of the resolution and the whole House voted unanimously for it, initiated by this party, initiated on this side and co-operated in over there. So when they ask, 'Where do you stand? We have said, I gather -

MR. BARRY: (inaudible) two leaders since.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Now look! That is really a cheap shot surely, that is surely a cheap shot if in fact if I am reading what the hon. member was trying to say that somehow or other I would be less insistent. Is that the implication?

MR. BARRY: You were in the federal Cabinet when when it rejected it.

MR. S. NEARY: That is a low dig.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Once again, you are really down in the dregs when you are saying that. I am saying to you, and there is not time this afternoon to do it. I ask the hon. member this - will he do one thing for me - if the Federal Government is prepared to table all of the documentation, will the Newfoundland Government agree that it all be tabled?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. JAMIESON: Because if that will happen -

MR. BARRY: (inaudible)

MR. D. JAMIESON: No, it has not.

MR. ROBERTS: Let the hon. gentleman answer the question, yes or no.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Baird): Order, please!

MR. D. JAMIESON: I want to say to the hon. member that there is a good deal of information coming out of the federal/provincial conferences leading up to the Constitutional Conference of last Fall. There is in fact, in existence, substantial documentation when a Newfoundland official

MR. D. JAMIESON: was Chairman of the Official's Committee. There is also an exchange between the Premier, as he then was, and I am not sure if it was the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources or perhaps the Prime Minister but there is clear record. Now do not question my word on this, My only problem is that I am not in any position to make these kinds of documents public, clearly. I am bound by an oath and I intend to abide by that oath. What I am saying is that it is over-simplified to say that the Newfoundland position was put and that in some way or another in just a straight 'No' basis it was turned down. That is not the case. There is a significant body of evidence to show how many complexities there were, there were a variety of things done -

MR. BARRY:

Do we own it or do we not own it -

is the complexity?

MR. D. JAMIESON:

That is so simplistic.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

What I

am asking the hon. member, or telling him really, is that if the full documentation were put forward you would see that there is considerably more by way of sympathy and support for the Newfoundland position than he realizes.

MR. BARRY:

Would you explain?

MR. D. JAMIESON:

No, because I have not had time

today but I will be glad if I am back in the House in the budget debate or if the hon. member, and by the way - if I can be given one minute - I was delighted to hear the Premier indicate today, after a month of stonewalling, that presumably something the equivalent of a Select Committee or a briefing session is going to be set up. Now, if you want to have one of those in camera, I will go into it in detail with you, I will even buy you a drink somewhere so that I can explain to you what I am talking about, but that is what worries me, Mr.

Chairman, is that if the hon. member really feels that in some way or other it was a casual dismissal of Newfoundland's case, it simply is not true.

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible)

very carefully thought out dismissal (inaudible)

MR. D. JAMIESON:

No.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you agree to table that?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER:

You wanted me to table -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Did I not agree? I did not get

a chance to answer the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

April 18, 1980

Tape No. 916

SD - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

South.

The hon. member for Conception Bay

MR. J. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred, reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment I would like to inform the House of the following committees will be meeting on Tuesday and Wednesday at the following times and places: Resources Committee from 10:00 to 1:00 at Colonial Building; Government Services from 10:00 to 1:00 at the Colonial Building; Social Services from 7:30 in the evening to 10:30 in the evening at the Colonial Building; and Resources from 7:30 to 10:30 at the Colonial Building. And then next Wednesday we can announce those next Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn, but before we put it I think I should inform the hon. members opposite that government's intention on Tuesday will be to get back into the adjourned debate on the cultural bill and we will come back Thursday on the financial bills

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. W. MARSHALL:

I think the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) was speaking at the time and I believe or -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed to stop the clock?

Agreed.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: My hon. and learned friend,
If everybody is ready I will ask the question The government is going to call the Arts and Culture Council Bill, well and good. I just want to know is it the government's intent to carry on with that until that debate finishes its second reading because there may well be a number of us who wish to speak on that Bill?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: The intention is to have, while the committees are considering the estimates, I think we should like to get Committee of the Whole through first but then we will go into two days of legislation and two days of the budget debate. That is the general format. I can give the hon. member more information again on Tuesday but certainly on Thursday we will be coming back to the financial matter.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Committee of the Whole on Thursday.

MR. W. MARSHALL: One of the reasons for going into legislation, I might say on Tuesday, as all hon. members know, the Premier will be in New York on Tuesday and it is his estimates that are being considered.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Fair enough.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 22, 1980 at 3:00 P.M.