

VOL. 2

NO. 71

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I am sure hon. members would like to join me in welcoming to the gallery today, Mr. Robert Butler and Councillor Cecil Keating. Mr. Butler is the Chairman of the Community Council of Baine Harbour in the district of Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this hon. House the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was quite insistent that I table a copy of a telex recently sent to me by the Federal Justice Minister, Mr. Chretien. His telex to me was in response to an inquiry I made of the Prime Minister a couple of weeks ago, an inquiry on the proposed indirect taxation amendment which is supposed to be added to the new Constitution Act. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will recall that at the time he and the hon. Mr. Rompkey, Newfoundland's representative in the federal cabinet, held a joint news conference to announce the indirect taxation amendment that had been agreed to by the federal Liberals and the New Democratic Party. As a result of that news conference, the citizens of this Province were left with the distinct impression that this new taxation power would somehow eliminate our \$600 million annual loss to Hydro Quebec on the Upper Churchill. During that news conference, the hon. Leader of the Opposition left no doubt that this was so as he stated, and I quote, 'Specifically, what this means is on the Upper Churchill we have the right to tax power going out of the Upper Churchill.'

PREMIER PECKFORD: He further stated, 'If I were the Premier, I would be doing hand-stands at this good news.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, being a reasonable and cautious man, I did not do hand-stands but rather I wired the Prime Minister on November 14th., 1980 and asked him for further details on the proposed amendment. My instincts and legal advisors both told me that there might be some problems with our successfully imposing such a tax in light of the ironclad nature of the Upper Churchill contract. The levying of additional taxes could, in our opinion, effectively deliver control of CFLCo to Hydro Quebec. This surely would not be an acceptable consequence from this Province's point of view. However, as I stated earlier, being a reasonable man, I waited patiently for a response to my inquiry from the federal government.

During the waiting period my government introduced the new legislation on the Upper Churchill. In his reply to my introductory statement, the hon. Leader of the Opposition went out of his way to point out that this new legislation was but an additional second tool at our disposal, the indirect taxation amendment being the first.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad I did not resort to turning hand-stands at that time. Yesterday, the Federal Justice Minister did respond to my request for further details on the indirect taxation amendment. In his telex, Mr. Chretien did say the new amendment did apply to electricity, but went on to say, and I quote, 'whether this will enable Newfoundland to tax the Upper Churchill power in the manner you mentioned, I cannot say. I do not know the details of the contract and other documentation relevant to the Upper Churchill contract.'

PREMIER PECKFORD: I shall table herewith, Mr. Speaker, a copy of my telex and Mr. Chretien's reply. After two weeks of waiting, we find that the news conference jointly held by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and the hon. Mr. Rompkey was indeed much ado about nothing. Even the Federal Minister of Justice admits he does not know if the new taxation power will be of any use to us.

Mr. Speaker, I do wish that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his federal colleague had gotten sound legal advice initially on this matter and then perhaps they might not have raised the hopes of our citizens unnecessarily. Holding public office carries with it tremendous responsibility and we might do well to look before we leap.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am certainly glad that the Ministerial Statement is not provocative or provoked debate because the rules will not permit me to debate, just to make comments on half the time. I think it is significant that, in keeping with his pattern, the Premier has not given me the courtesy of an advanced copy of his Ministerial Statement, he has not provided me with a copy of the report from Mr. Chretien, or the six foot telex that he mentioned yesterday. And once again, Mr. Speaker, we have the spectacle of the Premier of this Province standing up in glee to say that he rejects another federal piece of legislation, another federal help.

Now let us cut away all the gobbly-gook and the political manoeuvrings that the Premier goes on with and let us look at the facts of the matter. And the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the federal government - the federal government that happens to be the government in power right now, the Federal Liberal Government - is prepared to

MR. STIRLING: accept an amendment which will give this Province the right to indirect taxation over our non-renewable resources and will extend it to include hydro electricity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: The Premier accuses me of a distortion. Well, I must admit that in all of the premiers that we have ever had in this Province, the one expert on distortion is the present Premier, the expert on twisting words, twisting the federal words.

Now let us take a look at the facts included in what he has just had to say, that the federal government is prepared to give us indirect taxation method, it includes the Lower Churchill, the Upper Churchill, all of the resources that come out of Quebec - come out of Newfoundland, everything that comes - in the iron ore.

MR. S. NEARY: Forestry.

MR. STIRLING: Now let us just look at the facts of the matter. Behind that great PR facade, what has actually been said is that the Federal Justice Minister has said quite properly to the Premier, "Look at your own legislation and decide whether or not it applies." What we are doing is bringing in enabling legislation. And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows I have done my homework on this, and he knows

MR. STIRLING:

that his legal advisors, the legal advisors told him that in examining this question -and he knows it to be the truth and that is what is so misleading about it- there were two-that this very exact consideration was looked into by his legal advisors and there were two problems, and one problem is that you did not have the legal right to do it under the constitution, and that is step number one been taken away. And the second one was the question of whether or not it would bring about the problems that he mentioned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier should have done in all honesty was to say that in order to take advantage of this indirect taxation method, he would have to make the same changes, the same changes in the agreement in this House of Assembly. And because he distorted it, because any quotation that he made out of the agreement was-the agreement that came from this House of Assembly and we will have to take the same action if we were going that route to make changes in the rights that this Province, the agreement that this Province made in this House of Assembly was they would not tax and that is what he quoted. And this House can do the same thing on that matter and that is change their minds as he is doing on his legislation. And I am saying there are two methods, Mr. Speaker, two methods that could be used.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member's time has just about expired.

MR. STIRLING: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. STIRLING: No, you are damn right, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: The by leave in this House only applies when they want something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!
MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
Further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
MR. SPEAKER: By leave, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.
MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Can the Minister of Finance tell us whether or not this Province -
PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.
The hon. the Premier.
PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not see the Minister of Finance in his Chair.
MR. OTTENHEIMER: And he is not under it.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition can refer his question to whomever he wishes and if anybody wishes to answer, fine.
The hon. Leader of the Opposition.
MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the absence of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I ask the question to the Premier. Can the Premier tell us whether or not we have to raise any additional finances this year? Does he anticipate that we will have to go to the bond market this year?
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.
PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the total details before me right now, but I think we have not borrowed our full limits as outlined in the Budget this past Spring and therefore we are looking now at the bond market,

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2605

AH-3

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We have been for about a month or so in New York and in Canada, and, secondly, we are in the process of fairly serious negotiations with the province of Alberta.

PREMIER PECKFORD: As the Leader of the Opposition knows, last year in the previous budgetary year we did borrow from the Heritage Trust Fund the sum of somewhere between \$110 million and \$120 million. It is anticipated that we can get access to this fund again primarily because it saves the taxpayers of Newfoundland a lot of money, because the Government of Alberta made a policy decision last year to allow the Province of Newfoundland and all provinces to be treated as Triple A credit rating. In other words, we get the same interest rate on our borrowing as the best credit-worthy customer would get in the bond market. So we save somewhere in the order of \$5 million to \$10 million, I think, a year in borrowing that amount of money from Alberta. So we are looking at Alberta as one of our sources of funds to fulfil the needs of the Province for this year in a capital way and we are now looking at the Toronto and New York markets. And, of course, those markets will be tapped at a time which is most convenient and which would give us the lowest kind of interest rate that we can get.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, can the Premier tell us whether or not we have been advised by our financial advisers that because of the Upper Churchill legislation that we should not approach the New York markets at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if we had taken the route that the Leader of the Opposition wanted us to take, undoubtedly it would have been suggested not to go to the market, but because we took the route we took, no, we have not been advised not to go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: How irresponsible that is!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: We must be getting close to the
truth, Mr. Speaker, when the member for St. John's East
(Mr. Marshall) has to protect the Premier - a sad day.

Mr. Speaker, in fact are we not
in a position right now where the only source of funds
that this Province can approach is Alberta? And, in fact,
are we now being paid back for our - by giving a Triple A
rating, is not Alberta the only source of funds for this
Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker. The implication
in the Leader of the Opposition's question is quite a serious
one and I have to take some time to go through this because
there is the implication in the question that obviously
the Province of Newfoundland, because of actions it has
taken on the Upper Churchill, and I guess other actions,
apparently, that we are not very credit worthy, and, therefore,
the international markets of the world do not look upon us
in a very - what shall I say? - complete and favourable
light.

Now, Mr. Speaker, number one, we
can borrow tomorrow morning if we wanted to - and I know
this from first-hand experience - from the European market.
The Swedish people, the Swiss people, the German people,
the French people and the English people whom I met with
a week and a half ago have told me that, no problem, we can,
that the market is ready there. It is extremely bullish,
as a matter of fact, as it relates to Newfoundland. There
is a very positive attitude in the financial markets of

December 3, 1980

Tape 2606

EC - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: Europe as it relates to Newfoundland and they would like very much now to be lending money to this Province, which is on the move. In the New York market, the same way, and the Canadian market the same way. There is

PREMIER PECKFORD:

no question that we can borrow in three or four different markets but, I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), we would be extremely irresponsible if we did not get the best deal for the people and the taxpayers of this Province as we can. And when we can borrow \$100 to \$120 million or more from the Province of Alberta at a triple A credit rating and save the taxpayers of Newfoundland \$5 to \$10 million a year, we are going to borrow as much as we can from the best markets. But we can borrow from New York, we can borrow in the Canadian market and we can borrow in the European market. And it is just a matter then of picking the suitors as they come to the door and getting the best deal that we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). As the minister knows, some two and one half to three years ago, as a matter of fact on June 10th, 1977 the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Hickman) made a Ministerial Statement in this House announcing the appointment of the Mahoney Commission into the spending practices of the Department of Public Works and Services. That was Gazetted on June 24th, 1977. Under the terms of reference the Commissioner was required to report with as little delay as possible. Can the minister tell this House when he expects to receive the report, whether he expects a preliminary report and, really, what is the delay in the matter right now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, you know, the reasons for the delay and that, I could not give. I suppose Mr. Justice Mahoney would be the only one, you know, who any detail could give that. It is my understanding that the report of the Royal Commission will be available within a

MR. OTTENHEIMER: two to three month period; that is my understanding. Obviously I cannot give an assurance because it is not my document, but that is my understanding.

MR. L. THOMS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the minister would tell the House how much this inquiry to date has cost the government of this Province and the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly undertake to get that. That is a specific mathematical figure and I do not carry it around in my head, perhaps I should, but I will certainly undertake to get it.

MR. S. NEARY: \$85,000.

MR. THOMS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the minister, when he is getting the actual figure to date, will also give this House what the projected cost of this inquiry will be to the government and the people?

MR. S. NEARY: \$150,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Sir, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) related to this matter. In view of the fact that this has gone on for nearly three years, careers of former ministers of the Crown are depending on this report coming out, a cloud hangs over many civil servants

MR. WHITE: because of the delay in this report coming out, can the Minister of Justice (G. Ottenheimer) tell us if there is any way this House or the government or any other way that we can get a firm date from Mr. Justice Mahoney with respect to the completion of this report to put an end to this once and for all?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would think the only, I suppose, practical way of achieving that would be, you know, I can ask the Justice if he could give a date when he would expect to have it completed and to have it in the hands of the government. I would certainly do that. My understanding, you know, as of the latest information is a two to three month period but, you know, I can certainly ask him if he can specify a day or a period within a week or two, but my understanding as of now is that within a two to three month period.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, as I understand what the Minister of Justice is saying then that he will indeed ask Mr. Justice Mahoney to give a firm date or as close to a firm date as possible. Would the minister also tell the House whether or not there has been a request for additional funding from the Mahoney Inquiry within recent months, additional funding so we can continue to investigate this matter and complete his report?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, that could well be, you know, the kind of administrative kind of thing that I would not necessarily be aware of. Obviously, any Royal

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Commission, whether it is this one or on the budworm or on the fisheries, you know, they are all financed and they have to send in financial statements, receipts covering their expenses and, you know, if and when further money is required then they indicate the reason for it, then the money is provided. But it would not be the kind of thing which would, you know, necessarily come to my attention unless I specifically asked, you know, to see it, which I have not. So, as I say, that would not be a matter which would specifically come to my attention whether there has been a request for additional funding within the past few months. But I can undertake to find out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier, the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, about the seal fishery. There seems to be some bad news for the Newfoundland seal fishery coming out of Norway these days, so much so that the provincial government and the federal government had to dispatch, in the case of the Province, the Deputy Minister of Fisheries to Norway to try to straighten this matter out and I believe there is an official of the Government of Canada also gone to Norway to try to save the seal fishery. Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what the problems are, identify the problems and tell us if indeed Newfoundland is going to have a seal fishery this year or next year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, there is nothing to change our minds in government as to whether we are going to have a seal fishery or not: Of course, we

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2608

EL - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: are going to have a seal
fishery unless something very unusual happens. There is a
lot of federal

PREMIER PECKFORD:

authority in this area and obviously they have a lot to say about it, but as I understand it they are as committed as we are to an ongoing seal fishery in our Province. I am not sure what the problem is with the Norwegians at the present moment. I do understand that there is a number of officials over there but I will get the details for the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) if he desires them as to what the Norwegians are saying. But from our point of view, the seal fishery will go on. It is a managed fishery right now and being managed very wisely, one of the best managed fisheries in the world as a matter of fact.

I am also aware, of course, as perhaps many members of this House, that there is already a concerted effort underway through advertisements by a number of anti-seal fishery groups, including the International Fund For Animal Welfare, who have already begun major ad campaigns throughout Europe, and they are starting soon in the United States, so we can expect to see - apparently they are going to spend most of their money this coming year on the anti-seal campaign, these groups. But I will get the specifics on the Norwegian concern for the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be amazed at the vague answers you get from ministers in connection with very important subjects in this House and in this Province. Here we have a situation where the government dispatched their Deputy Minister of Fisheries to Norway, they are threatening not to become involved in the seal fishery this year because of the adverse publicity that Norway has gotten from the anti-seal

MR. NEARY: campaign and so forth. Surely the hon. gentleman could instruct his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to provide the House with the information. The Minister of Fisheries must know.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Is the hon. member asking a question or is he making a statement?

MR. NEARY: I am asking the hon. gentleman again -

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

MR. NEARY: No, no point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is not a point of order anyway, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, the hon. member has asked to ask a supplementary. Perhaps it would be appropriate to put his question.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am asking the hon. the Premier if this matter had been discussed by the government, if the Minister of Fisheries did inform the Premier that there was trouble brewing with the seal fishery, the Newfoundland seal fishery, and that he had to send his deputy minister to Norway to try to straighten it out and persuade the Norwegians to come back this year to the seal fishery. Surely the hon. gentleman must have been informed of that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Is that asking a question?

MR. NEARY: Was he informed? If not, would he ask his Minister of Fisheries to tell us?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are on top of every single item, every single issue of any consequence to this Province, so much so that we are very desirous of the Opposition, the member

PREMIER PECKFORD: for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and all the other members to ask as many questions of this side of the House as they can. We solicit their ongoing incisive questions and we hope that they will continue it in this way-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Answer the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD: -so that we can answer all the questions. Of course we are on top of every single issue in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier is getting awfully cocky, Mr. Speaker, and I remind him he can come down just as fast as he went up, just as quick.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: He thinks he is riding high now and he can ride roughshod over us. I did not get an answer to that question I will have to put it on

MR. S. NEARY: the Late Show tomorrow. But in the meantime I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to tell us, in the event that the Norwegians do not come back this year for the seal fishery, what are the alternatives? Can the Province arrange for sealing ships to go to the seal fishery? Can we process the pelts in this Province? Do we have canneries set up whereby we can process the carcasses, the meat and so forth? Would the hon. gentleman tell us what the alternatives are in the event that the Norwegians do not come back? And are they looking for any special concessions from the Newfoundland Government or from the Canadian Government if they do come back?

I mean, these are questions that the hon. gentleman - unless he is so wrapped up in Constitution and oil he cannot think of other matters - should be able to give this House the information asked for.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
I believe the hon. member has asked his question.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we have been trying for many, many years on many, many fronts to have greater consultation with the federal authorities on areas which affect this Province. One of them is the fishery. We solicit the support of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) for the Government of Newfoundland to have more say in the fishery of this Province. If we did, then we think the management of these resources would help Newfoundland a lot better.

MR. S. NEARY: That is completely irrelevant. It has nothing at all to do with it! It has nothing to do with it!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the direct answer to the member for LaPoile's question is: the more seals that are available for Canadian fishermen, the

PREMIER PECKFORD: better it will be for Newfoundland fishermen. And we will leave no stone unturned to see that if there is additional resource available to us, then we will make sure that Newfoundlanders get first crack at that additional resource.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of -

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

MR. T. LUSH: Oh, sorry. I will yield to the hon. member, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Let me ask the hon. the Premier, Mr. Speaker, to assure the people of this Province, if he can re-assure the people of this Province that there will, indeed, be a seal fishery this year?

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) there will be no seal fishery.

MR. S. NEARY: No, it has nothing to do with the federal government. It has nothing to do with the feds.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we do not have full control over that unfortunately. And I am extremely surprised that the member for LaPoile would persist in asking questions. And, obviously, no wonder a lot of Newfoundlanders have problems separating federal from provincial, when we have members in this hon. House who do not know the difference between the two. No wonder we have a problem, Mr. Speaker! The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) does not know the difference between what is federal jurisdiction and what is provincial jurisdiction. Let me assure the hon. member for LaPoile -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: - if I can speak and be heard in silence in the same way as I respected the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) when he asked the question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: But now I am getting at a sore point. The hon. member for LaPoile has lost his initiative in the Question Period and now he does not want to hear the answer. He does not want to hear the answer.

MR. S. NEARY: You are riding high (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
Every hon. member has the right to be heard in silence and it has been requested. I would ask hon. members to adhere to the rule.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name him! Name him!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! May I repeat that the hon. the Premier has asked to be heard in silence and every member has that right.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am very sorry if the member for LaPoile is sore. I am very, very sorry and we apologize. We apologize for having our homework done.

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government which has the jurisdiction, does not cut off the seal fishery that Newfoundlanders have traditionally had, well, then obviously there is going to be a seal fishery because we support it. Now even if they do - even if the federal government does we will argue to keep the seal fishery going. That is the point. We do not have full jurisdiction here. Where we have jurisdiction, we will ensure it continues; where we do not have jurisdiction, we will make representations to ensure that that part of the jurisdiction of the seal fishery which comes under the federal government continues the way it

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2610

DW - 4

PREMIER PECKFORD: has in the past so that Newfound-
landers can continue to prosecute a traditional fishery in
this Province.

So the hon. member for LaPoile
(Mr. Neary) need not worry.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Do not worry. We are on top of it and we will take care of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question -

MR. NEARY: You have lost the argument.

MR. LUSH: - for the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

MR. NEARY: It has nothing to do with the feds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think it is fair to point out that while the Chair has the responsibility of enforcing the rules of this hon. House, so too do all hon. members have the responsibility of adhering to those rules, and I trust that they will.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Labour and Manpower. In view of the complete breakdown in negotiations between the provincial government, or Treasury Board, and the union representing the support staff at the College of Trades and Technology, and in view of the fact that the minister indicated to this House yesterday that the main issue here was salary, money, wages; in view of these facts, Sir, I wonder if the minister can indicate whether there was a substantial difference in the amount offered by Treasury Board - and I assume that there was an offer before there was a breakdown in negotiations - can the minister indicate whether there was a substantial difference in the offer made by Treasury Board and that demanded by the support staff at the College of Trades and Technology?

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

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I could indicate what the difference was to just about the exact cent, but I will not indicate it in the House. As I said to the hon. member

MR. DINN: yesterday, I have no intention of laying out both sides of negotiation that is conducted in my department at any time in this House.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): A supplementary. The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate to the House that the difference is not so much in the salary per se but that the members of this particular union are asking for a different structure in their increases? For example, Mr. Speaker, is it not that rather than looking for a percentage increase, because a percentage increase of a small salary does nothing to narrow the gaps between lower and higher wages, so it is that they are looking for a different structure? Let us say, for example, a lump sum across the board as opposed to a percentage increase?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, again I have no intention of negotiating in this House or talking about what happened in negotiations. The hon. member did ask a specific question with respect to percentage versus lump sum payment and there is included in the latest offer both options.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: In view of the fact that the matter in question here, or the issue in question, is a very serious matter, namely that of salary, could the minister indicate what steps he has taken or the government have taken to get both groups of people back to the bargaining table again, or what steps he plans to take to ensure that these negotiations are settled as expeditiously as possible for the sake of good labour relations in this Province, particularly those with the government?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there are certain rights unions have in this Province and management have in this Province with respect to negotiations. There is no way that the Department of Labour or the Minister of Labour should impose his will upon either side in negotiations, and we have to tread that very difficult path of going right down the middle without taking sides on any issue and we have to listen to both sides and we have to maintain credibility during these very strenuous negotiations that go on. So it leaves me in a fairly difficult position when asked by the hon. member opposite, who knows the position that I am in, to answer specific questions with respect to negotiations. He asked what steps I have taken. I have taken all the steps that are capable of being taken with respect to negotiations, particularly with respect to the College of Trades and Technology.

My conciliation officer, who has been with this from day one, is in constant communications with both sides in the negotiation. I spoke to him not later than this morning and there is no change in either side, so that there is not much that can be done in this

MR. DINN: situation. The employees have a right in this Province to exercise the option of striking. We may not like it at times, it may be difficult at times for the employees and for government, but they have that right. I have no intention of taking that right away from them and, whilst I am Minister of Labour and Manpower, they shall maintain that right. It may not be helpful to either them or to government in this situation, but the fact of the matter is that they have that right.

Now, constant communications will be ongoing, and we will do everything within our power under the Act, and we will not impose our will on either side.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) or the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie).

A report was sent from the three development associations in Labrador with regard to a report on trail grooming equipment. This is where they are asking the equipment to double the trails instead of the one trail that is down in Labrador now, and this is needed for safety reasons. Also during the Winter, the main means of transportation is by skidoo. I, myself, when I was visiting the

MR. E. HISCOCK:

district last year, travelled over 125 miles on skidoos between these places. This equipment itself that is needed, they are asking the Department of Transportation and the Department of Rural Development for \$10,000 to operate the equipment and \$50,000 for the grant. Could either one of these ministers inform us of what progress is on this report?

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

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I will take the second half of the question. As the hon. member has suggested, there has been a submission from development associations for approximately \$50,000 to cover the capital costs of purchasing a trail grooming unit. It is being dealt with right now by officials in the department and should be brought to the Board's attention within a matter of a week or so, I would think, and the Board at that time will make their decision on the request.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: With regard to the question of the trail groomers, Mr. Speaker, it is not only needed for the trails for safety reasons, because the RCMP itself has pointed out the danger of only having one trail with two skidoos coming in different directions at 50 miles per hour, but Labrador Airways itself has sent out letters to these communities saying that if the government does not provide some type of equipment to clear ice strips on the harbours or on the ponds in these communities then they will not be delivering mail by way of the Twin Otter to Port Hope Simpson, St. Lewis, Charlottetown and Williams Harbour. Can the Minister of Transportation (Mr. C. Brett) on the first part of the question inform us if the \$10,000 is

MR. E. HISCOCK: coming from the Department of Transportation to look after an operator of this equipment if the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) provides the \$50,000 for the grant for the capital?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. C. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot give an answer in the affirmative. I do not know exactly where that stands now. I got involved in the trail grooming outfit sometime last year -

MR. NEARY: You are on top of everything alright, but we will not say what you are on top of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. BRETT: - and we agreed that such a piece of equipment was necessary, I suppose, from the point of view that the skidoo trails in Northern Labrador are equally as important as our Trans-Canada Highway on the Island. However, we felt that we should not be involved, we felt that this department should not be involved since we are concerned with the road network of the Province, so from the point of view it was handed over to my colleague's department. We clear the airstrips that are in Labrador now; whether we have ever gone out and actually cleared spots on the ponds or the harbours, I cannot be certain. And I do not recall getting a request for \$10,000. The one that I saw was for the grant to purchase a piece of equipment. I do not recall any request for a grant to operate it.

MR. HISCOCK: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the grant, Mr. Speaker, and for clearing the airstrips, the minister is quite right. His department has not gotten into the process of clearing the harbours or clearing the ponds. I wrote the minister last year asking him if his department would come up with some

MR. E. HISCOCK: money to clear the harbours and the airstrips on the ponds and the minister said, 'How can we clear the airstrip -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! If the hon. member has a question he has thirty seconds remaining if he wants to ask it.

MR. HISCOCK: The question to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) is that since they have requested \$10,000 by the development association, can the minister inform this House at a further date whether this money will be forthcoming?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, we will be taking a look at the request and I can inform the hon. member at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members' Day, I call Motion 2, moved by the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. W. Patterson).

The hon. the member for Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On opening day I introduced the following resolution, It reads;

'WHEREAS, before Confederation, this Province owned its offshore minerals and did not relinquish the same

MR. PATTERSON: under the Terms of Union;

AND WHEREAS the revenues, employment and industrial benefits which will result from offshore development will flow through the Province only if its ownership and control are confirmed; AND WHEREAS if the Province does not control the rate and type of development, many negative impacts will occur in our Province;

AND WHEREAS if certain proposed offshore development plans are permitted to go ahead, few employment or industrial benefits will accrue to the Province;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House supports the Conservative Administration in its effort to preserve this Province's historic, moral and legal claims to own and control its offshore and mineral resources.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, the Province's offshore oil and gas rights are not based on recent legal developments. Our right to ownership of these resources is based directly on the outcome of a number of well-known pre-Confederation and political and constitutional struggles in which our forefathers were successful in ensuring the protection of the territorial integrity of the Province and our rights to the marine resources of the surrounding seas.

The various provinces joined Confederation at different times. For instance, the original four provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in 1867, British Columbia in 1871, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in 1867. Thus, unlike any other provinces, Newfoundland's pre-Confederation offshore oil and gas rights were not those of a nineteenth century colony such as British Columbia in 1871, but those of a twentieth century self-governing British Dominion, with all the rights of a sovereign state, in 1949.

MR. PATTERSON: The booklet, Heritage of the Sea simply states, in part, our case for offshore oil and gas ownership. It reads, "That by the common law of England the Crown has from time immemorial claimed ownership of the bed of the seas surrounding England and the Crown's overseas dominions, extending seaward without limitation in absence of any international law limiting such rights and there was no such limit. Number two, that in any event, by 1949 international law, quite apart from common law, established that each coastal state was entitled to the minerals of its continental shelf. Number three, that in 1949, Newfoundland was or had all the rights of such a coastal state. Four, that by Term 37 of the Terms of Union, Newfoundland the Province retained after Confederation all of the continental shelf mineral: that Newfoundland, the coastal state had held prior to Confederation either by common law or by international law.

Mr. Speaker, during the continental shelf negotiations between the United States of America, Newfoundland and Canada from 1943 to 1945, Canada did not protest the automatic continental shelf rights theory. In light of Newfoundland's written position supporting that theory, should Ottawa now be able to rest on its silence and say that the continental shelf rights were not automatic because Newfoundland did not ensure a proclamation claiming them? Such rights are not to be excluded from the meaning of Term 37.

Surely if that was Canada's position, it was the responsibility of the negotiators to point that out during the 1948 discussions on Term 37.

MR. PATTERSON: As a people, Mr. Speaker, control the rate and type of development within our Province, federal ownership and control of Newfoundland's offshore petroleum resources would place Ottawa in an overwhelmingly dominant position with regard to determining the rate of social and economic change within the Province.

This factor is the planning response to the impact of North Sea Oil developments in Scotland especially in the Highlands and the island areas. However, Norway has taken consideration of the social consequences of offshore oil much further and has recognized it not only as a

MR. PATTERSON: potential danger, but also as a potential tool for solving social problems.

The Royal Norwegian Ministry of Social Affairs noted that the changes can be desirable and can contribute to solving social tasks, but if they take place too rapidly considerable social problems could evolve.

Our government has indicated that this will not be the case. The offshore resource will be development in a planned manner for Newfoundland by Newfoundlanders, where possible. We have stated in the firmest terms that our way of life and traditions will not be compromised and sacrificed in a boom and bust syndrome. Ownership of our offshore resource would assure control of our economic and social destinies and allow the Newfoundland economy some time to develop the skills and infrastructure needed to respond to the development opportunities.

If Ottawa were to succeed in its present claims, it would control not only Newfoundland's offshore mineral resource, but also the level and kind of onshore development required to develop these resources and, indirectly, the rate and kind of social change. With no control over these developments, Newfoundland's existing constitutional powers would be severely eroded. In essence, Newfoundland would exist as a Province in name only. Such a development would not be in the national interest. The national interest would be better served if offshore resource development occurred in a manner which would serve and contribute to the regional development and promote the preservation of strong, viable provinces, the cornerstones of Confederation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MR. PATTERSON: Provincial ownership and control, Mr. Speaker, of any future petroleum industry can better provide the intimate knowledge of local, social and economic and physical conditions which are vital to sound resource management.

MR. PATTERSON: In addition there is and will be a greater need to co-ordinate the development of offshore resources with decisions and policies in exclusively provincial fields such as education, highways, industrial parks, housing and health. More than anything else we must not allow ourselves to be pressured into developing our offshore resource too fast, or in a wrong manner.

The industry and revenues associated with the offshore oil and gas can be means whereby our industrial base, including the fisheries, can be revitalized. We must ensure this opportunity is not squandered. The questions posed by those activities make provincial ownership of offshore oil and gas an absolute necessity.

Will residents of the Province be given preference in oil related employment? Will supply bases and large construction and fabrication sites be located in the Province and where? Will oil and gas be landed, processed and used within the Province? The answer to these practical questions will determine Newfoundland's future. The issue is simply too important to leave the answers to Ottawa. If the Province is to remain a distinct and viable member of Confederation there is no question that federal control would mean that our offshore oil and gas resource would be developed at a rate and under conditions which would more reflect the needs of Central Canada than those of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I find this direction to be simply unacceptable. Ottawa must recognize the legitimate interests of our people as it recognizes the interests of several other provinces when it handed over ownership and control in a number of resource sectors.

Why is our case so different? Are we to be singled out among our sister provinces, given our historic, legal, historic and moral claim to our offshore resources and watch again the painful demise of our development?

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2615

NM - 3

MR. PATTERSON: We cannot stand idly by and allow this to happen. Our people are looking more than ever before to a bright, secure future, to our Province becoming a viable, contributing partner in Confederation. We must, and will ensure that this optimism does not simply become another faded dream. I thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I enjoyed the discourse by the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). I must say though that I find him a lot more interesting when he is up in his own style flailing away instead of when he is quoting legal begals or quoting the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry).

Mr. Speaker, let us for a second take a look at the resolution. It say, "Mr. Patterson to move: WHEREAS, before Confederation, this Province" (this is the first clause), "before Confederation this Province". Well, before Confederation this was not a Province. That is the first clause, Mr. Speaker.

"AND WHEREAS the revenues, employment and industrial benefits which will result from offshore development will flow to the Province only if its ownership and control are confirmed."

Now I will remind the member that in the Premier's worst scenario, in his famous three-barrel theory, his famous propaganda sheet, in the worst scenario you could think about Newfoundland would get twenty per cent - not that we are going to accept that but that is the very worst, so obviously there will be some benefit flow, twenty per cent of all the billions of petro dollars that are going to come ashore out there if you are to believe the party or the Cabinet or minister that the hon. member supports. So I mean that is a little ambiguous too.

"AND WHEREAS if the Province does not control the rate and type of development, many negative impacts will occur."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell this hon. House that a lot of people in this Province are afraid that there are going to be negative impacts whether the

December 3, 1980.

Tape No. 2616

AH-2

MR. FLIGHT: Province controls or whether it does not.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: The fishermen on the Grand Banks have no assurance yet that a blowout will not wipe out their way of life, so regardless of who supports, Mr. Speaker - or who controls there may well be negative impacts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: "AND WHEREAS if certain," listen to this for ambiguity, "AND WHEREAS if certain proposed offshore development plans" - it does not say which ones, just "certain offshore development plans are permitted to go ahead, few employment or industrial benefits will accrue to this Province." Now how is that for being ambiguous? "WHEREAS if certain offshore development plans are permitted to go ahead" -

MR. MOORES: Leo Barry.

MR. FLIGHT: We do not know what the certain offshore plans are. So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the member is talking about in that particular clause, I doubt if the House knows, and I do not think the member knows. So that takes care of that particular clause

MR. MOORES: A typical Leo Barry resolution.

MR. NEARY: It sounds like politics.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. House, let me tell the House that we have a position, this party has a position on offshore. It is well established in the House, in a resolution presented to this House in 1975, February 26, 1975 one of the whereases, "WHEREAS the resources of the seabed belongs to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." There is a plaque, Mr. Speaker, for anyone who might want to know, there is a plaque somewhere out on the Grand Banks, put there before the previous, previous administration

MR. FLIGHT: was in power in this Province, put there by a Liberal Premier asserting ownership to the seabed.

MR. LUSH: Dr. Hugh Lilly.

MR. FLIGHT: Dr. Hugh Lilly, if somebody wants to look it up. So there is no question, Mr. Speaker, about how we stand on the ownership of offshore or the right to develop or the rate of control. Let me tell the minister something. The Premier indicated last year before the House closed that he was off to Ottawa to discuss offshore with the Prime Minister. And I recall the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) speaking on behalf of this side and he was saying in effect, 'Mr. Premier, go to Ottawa, do the best job you can do. You have our support, you have a mandate, you have been elected by the people of Newfoundland to run the affairs of this Province, now go up and do what you must do to get the best possible deal you can get for Newfoundland. You have our support. Now away to go.'

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, that should tell the government where we stand. There is no need of this resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, there are circumstances under which I can support this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: There are circumstances under which I can support this resolution. If the Minister of

MR. FLIGHT: Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is prepared to prove to me that he is prepared to take this debate outside of the realm of politics, that anything he is saying about offshore is said in the better interests of Newfoundland, politics notwithstanding, then I will support his Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And to find out, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Minister of Mines and Energy or the hon. the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is prepared to take the debate, the offshore issue, outside of the realm of politics and prove to the people of Newfoundland that he has only one motivation in this and that is to develop that offshore in the better interests of Newfoundlanders, I will support the Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And we will find out whether this hon. government is using the offshore issue for political argument or not. And, Mr. Speaker, I propose to make an amendment to the Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: I will second it.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, listen to the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) that the Resolution be amended by deleting all the words after 'Therefore be it resolved' and replacing them with the following: now, Mr. Speaker, the following' in the Resolution itself - Where is the Resolution? Now, Mr. Speaker, for anyone who wants to wonder whether I am concerned about let us debate this issue outside of the realm of politics - I am looking for the - oh, yes, now we will see, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: 'Therefore be it resolved'-
there is the Resolution: 'Therefore be it resolved that
this hon. House supports the Conservative administration
in its efforts to preserve this Province's historic, moral and
legal claims to ownership and control of the offshore.'
My amendment, Sir, says this, that the Resolution be
amended by deleting the words 'Therefore be it now resolved'
and replacing it with the following: 'that this hon. House
supports the Province's' - Newfoundland's - 'historic, moral
and legal claim to own and control its offshore mineral
resources.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have one
motivation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The Chair would like to have a look
at the amendment before it rules it in order and allows the
hon. member to speak.

MR. FLIGHT: I assumed you had accepted it,
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised
by the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that
the amendment is in order, that its alteration is merely
cosmetic. It goes into that it be resolved that this House
'supports the Province's historic, moral and legal claim
to own and control its offshore mineral resources.' It leaves
out the words 'Conservative administration' but everybody
knows it is a Conservative administration which has led the
fight for that recognition and we certainly think it is

MR. OTTENHEIMER: in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) goes along with that particular resolution, but I would like to say to the Minister of Justice that the Minister of Justice very well knows that that is a Liberal stand and has been a Liberal stand for many, many years. In fact, the late Dr. John Lilly put a plaque, as the hon. member said -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HODDER: - on the floor of the Grand Banks and that has never changed at our federal/provincial conferences at any time since this issue has arisen. That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, with respect to the point of order - I do not know if it is a point of order, really - I suspect that hon. members from both sides were trying to offer the Chair advice in helping him make his decision whether or not the amendment is in order.

I rule that the amendment, as proposed by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), is in order.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The only matter I was debating was the questioning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Windsor -
Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We
will see now, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Mines and
Energy (Mr. Barry) and the other hon. members on the govern-
ment side are prepared to stand by what they indicated a few
minutes ago, that they wanted to take it out of the realm of
partisan politics.

Because, Mr. Speaker, the
problem in this Province is that this debate, the offshore
issue has been perceived by the people as being nothing only
a political power play by this administration. Nothing only
a political power play! We have supported - there is nobody
sitting on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, there
is really no need for this resolution. There has been no
statements made by anyone representing the official Opposi-
tion in this House that we are opposed to ownership, that
we are opposed to the rate and type of development, and
there is no need for this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT:

Let us look, Mr. Speaker, at
where we are in this debate. We are -

MR. MARSHALL:

Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. T. LUSH:

No

MR. G. FLIGHT:

No.

The hon. House Leader can

speak -

MR. R. MOORES:

No questions.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in this debate, as this offshore issue we are in, if there was ever a Mexican stand-off we are in a stand off. The Government of Newfoundland has a mandate, they have a two to one seat majority practically in this House, and they are charged with the responsibility of negotiating with Ottawa, or whoever they have to negotiate with, on getting our offshore resource, number one, under exploration; number two, into development and then into production. Now, that is where it is, Mr. Speaker.

To date, Mr. Speaker, this administration has not been able to cut away the politics. They have not been able to come up with any kind of agreements. The people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, are saying, 'What is wrong?' Let us assume we accept, as the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W.N. Rowe) pointed out yesterday, the government's theory that we do not want to prove, we do not want to go to court to prove our ownership. Let us assume we accept that on the basis that because that centralist Supreme Court will rule in mainland Canada's favour, will rule in Ottawa's favour, let us assume we accept that. So that is the court issue aside.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do? This government says we own it, they say we are going to control it; Ottawa says you do not own it and you are not going to control it. When are we going to come to some kind of a negotiated settlement on the jurisdiction? Mr. Speaker, the next speaker in this debate - the people of Newfoundland need to know what this government is going to do - how they are going to settle this jurisdictional debate? How are they going to settle it?

MR. G. FLIGHT: The Premier has hinted two or three times. In the Constitutional Conference he said if he did not get his own way he may call an election. Well, that is difficult to figure out, Mr. Speaker. I cannot see how the Prime Minister of Canada would be any more concerned dealing with the Premier after an election than before. As I said, he has got a two to one seat majority in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when is the government - I want to hear the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) or the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) or the Premier tell the people of Newfoundland how they expect to settle this situation. How are they going to determine that we have the ownership, that we have control and that we are going to go into development?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people are well aware that it is possible for Newfoundland to go into production on the Hibernia by 1985. They are well aware that it will take the next five years to put the infrastructure that will be required in place in order to go into production. They do not want production at any cost. They are prepared to wait until 1986, 1987 or 1988 if it takes that long to develop the offshore resource in our interest. But there are some people concerned, Mr. Speaker, that this government is playing more politics than anything. They are not looking at getting that offshore resource developed in a way that will bring on production in the quickest possible period, always making sure that the Province's interest is protected.

So, Mr. Speaker, when all the rhetoric that we have been hearing from the Minister of - if the minister would tell the people of Newfoundland, tell this House, since we are into such a stand-off as we are, since the minister is not prepared to accept a court ruling - and he may be right in that: I do not know, but he may be -

MR. FLIGHT: I want the minister to tell the House how they intend to resolve this situation? We have a federal government in Ottawa that will be there for the next five years -

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. FLIGHT: - and maybe for the next five after that, I do not know. There is no indication that the federal government, or the Prime Minister, is going to change his attitude. The Premier going to Ottawa with forty-nine of fifty-two seats makes no difference, he has got two to one now. That will not impact on the present administration in Ottawa. I want the minister to stand up and tell us what he sees as a resolution to this.

MR. LUSH: Sure the Premier told us.

MR. FLIGHT: Ottawa says no, Newfoundland says yes. So we sit on the resource until what? Until we get a change of attitude in Ottawa? Until we get a change of government in Ottawa?

MR. LUSH: The Premier said a negotiated settlement.

MR. NEARY: Or a change in Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT: Or a change of government in Newfoundland?

MR. S. NEARY: Which is the most likely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. LUSH: Until Hell freezes over.

MR. FLIGHT: Until Hell freezes over.

MR. LUSH: That is what the Premier said.

MR. FLIGHT: Until Hell freezes over?

Mr. Speaker, this is what has got the people in this Province so concerned about this government's approach, the confrontation situation with Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows in Newfoundland, everyone knows that we would not know but for Ottawa's involvement, in an indirect and a direct way, we would not even know Hibernia

MR. FLIGHT: was out there, there would have been no exploration in the first place. You know, it was the Ottawa funding, it was the Ottawa concessions to the oil companies, the indirect and direct involvement that made the exploration programme possible in the first place. But that is not to their credit. Let us not give them any credit for that. Well, let us decide, let this administration tell this House of Assembly how it is that we are going to get into production on Hibernia, or any other oil discovered offshore. What it is, how they see, given the stalemate that we have re this government in Ottawa over the jurisdictional dispute, then let somebody stand in his place on the other side and tell this House how it is that they propose to break that stalemate, how it is they propose to break that stalemate.

MR. LUSH: Negotiated settlement, the Premier said.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the Premier knows, and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) knows, and the hon. House Leader knows that one day there will be a settlement, a negotiated, political settlement.

MR. LUSH: That is what the Premier said. That is what the Premier said.

MR. FLIGHT: The last thing that this administration, Mr. Speaker - and here is the reason for the amendment - the last thing that this administration wants, the Premier would fall out of his seat, dry up and blow away, the Minister of Mines and Energy would have nothing else to talk about, if Mr. Trudeau picked up the phone today and said to the Premier of Newfoundland, "We have just made a decision. It is yours. Ownership is yours. Jurisdictional control is yours. Legislative control is yours. It is all yours. And ten or fifteen years from now, after you have become the have Province that you want to be, that you should be, then

MR. FLIGHT: if you feel like sending a few dollars up our way, we will accept that." He would blow up, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier would have just then lost the one political issue that he has hung his hat on, the one political issue that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the Premier have been espousing. The last thing they want is a settlement.

MR. BARRY: Which one is that? ERCO or the Churchill?

MR. FLIGHT: They do not want a settlement, Mr. Speaker. We will have something to say about the Upper Churchill and the Lower Churchill development, maybe in the ERCO bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the issue and more and more people are beginning to realize the political, the blatant politics that this administration is playing with our offshore resource.

MR. LUSH: We are sick and tired of it.

MR. FLIGHT: They are more concerned, Mr. Speaker, of where the sites for the development are going to be. This administration has got communities in this Province fighting with each other, Mr. Speaker, as to where the development sites, the service centres are going to be. They are concerned about whether they will be here or there. They are looking for some sense of direction. They are looking for some indication that that offshore will ever be developed.

MR. LUSH: That will mean something.

MR. FLIGHT: That will mean something to them.

They are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that - the member when he was talking about funding for industrial parks, and funding for municipal service fees, and municipal services - and, Mr. Speaker, they are concerned that that kind of money will ever be generated. And maybe the government is prepared to take the attitude, 'Till hell freezes over'. Maybe the government in this Province is prepared to take the attitude that we will

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2619

NM- 4

MR. FLIGHT: not develop the offshore till hell freezes over unless we get our way, but the moment of truth is going to come, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is going to have to stand up one day, maybe in the very near future, and tell the people of Newfoundland how he proposed to break this deadlock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: The oil companies, Mr. Speaker, are prepared by his own figures to get

MR. FLIGHT: into production by 1985 - 86, they need four or five years to get ready and one day, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) is going to have to sand up and tell us how he resolved this situation.

MR. LUSH: He is going to be judged one day, one day.

MR. L. BARRY: It will not be long now.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: Good, we will hear it now in a few minutes. Well, fine, then we will have taken it out of the realm of politics and you will say to the people, here it is, ladies and gentlemen, here is what we have negotiated, right? And I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, it will be a negotiated settlement. It will not be a recognition of offshore ownership per se.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland are concerned today about the impact that the offshore related economy is having on this Province. It was interesting to see a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, St. John's next to Vancouver in escalation in housing costs. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell this House that every person in St. John's, every person in St. John's who needs a house is not an oil executive. The twenty-five per cent increase in housing in one year we saw in this Province, Mr. Speaker is impacting very badly, is creating real problems for the people, Mr. Speaker, who will never work in the offshore, who will never benefit from offshore by way of employment. The oil executives can afford to buy \$40,000 houses that have escalated to \$125,000.

Central Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, is wondering how they will benefit And when the member for Placentia (W. Patterson) talks about the government spending

MR. FLIGHT: the revenues from offshore on industrial parks and municipal services and hospitals, then they will have to have a change of heart, Mr. Speaker, because all I have heard from this administration since 1972 is balance the budget, pay off the provincial debt - well, we will need some Hibernias. If the attitude from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the House Leader (W. Marshall) and the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) is the same attitude that their predecessors had, we will need some Hibernias, Mr. Speaker, before any money is allocated from revenue offshore to build an industrial park in Placentia. They will first want, Mr. Speaker, they will first want to pay off the provincial debt, to balance the budget.

The minister should get up - and I will tell this hon. House and I will tell the Minister, when the election comes and the offshore is an issue, I will tell you the question that is going to be asked in my district; every PC candidate that comes into the district, somebody is going to say, 'Yes, we will give you ownership, you tell us what you are going to do with the money that comes as a result. Are you going to balance the budget, are you going to pay off the provincial debt before some of it flows to Badger or Millertown or Buchans Junction?'

The few essential services we have now, Mr. Speaker, and we have had no improvement since 1972, were not based on the ability of this Province to make money on the offshore. The contribution to the economy of this Province that offshore will make was not a factor in the money that was borrowed to provide the various services that we have and, Mr. Speaker, it is Liberal policy, it is Liberal policy that the money that is made of the offshore will in the

MR. FLIGHT: first instance go to improve the way of life of ordinary Newfoundlanders. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, will a Tory - the member for St. John's East (W. Marshall), President of the Council, will feel very uncomfortable, Mr. Speaker, if he has a Tory, if he has a Tory out in Windsor-Buchans telling the people that he is prepared to spend the revenue we make from offshore on upgrading their services, recapping their roads, putting in water and sewerage systems -

MR. LUSH: It will not be the Marshall plan.

MR. FLIGHT: - before a cent is applied to the Provincial debt or to balancing the Budget. I will tell you something else the people are wondering about, Mr. Speaker, is this Come By Chance attitude of the minister with regards to Hibernia and offshore. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we first talked about an oil refinery in this Province, it was an accepted fact that the oil refinery should have been, had things gone right, had there been a crude supply, had it been operated properly and if all the things that should have been done were done, the first step was to have been the refinery. And from that was supposed to have flowed a petro chemical complex, all possible under God, Mr. Speaker, all possible. And it was the petro chemical complex, Mr. Speaker, that was supposed to have provided a basis of the economy for that particular area, ten or twelve thousand people, if it had worked out.

Now, the people are wondering, Mr. Speaker, they accepted the bankruptcy, no crude supply, you know, all the problems with obtaining an oil supply, bankruptcies and all that, but now suddenly they are told-the guy on the street is told that we have all the oil, almost as much oil as Alberta a couple of hundred miles off our coast and we are going to land it onshore in Newfoundland. Well, it seems second nature to them that that refinery would be now re-activated to use that product. We have our

MR. G. FLIGHT:

own oil to put into our own refinery. They do not understand how a refinery, given those circumstances, can be shutdown, how our government can unload a refinery for \$17 million to Petro-Canada or anybody else with no commitments or no obligations that that refinery will be re-activated, that it may, indeed, be let go for scrap. They do not understand that, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, when the government talks about all the employment that is going to be created as a result of the offshore effort, development of the offshore resources - we are told, Mr. Speaker, and it is based on research that 10,000 jobs could have been provided in the Come By Chance area with a petro-chemical industry. And we are going to let that oil refinery go to scrap, we are going to let Petrocan sell it possibly, mothball it, decide what they want to do with it before we are in a position, Mr. Speaker, to utilize the oil we have off our coast in that refinery. People do not understand that. The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) might understand it, he might know all the technical reasons why it should not be, but the people do not understand it and he has not done a very good job explaining it to them. He could not care less, I guess, Mr. Speaker, whether they understand it or not, but they do not understand it.

Mr. Speaker, I do not understand, nor do many other people in Newfoundland, this concept, this 100 per cent revenue for Newfoundland under the three barrels. I mean, I have great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, watching the constitutional conference when the PC Premier of Nova Scotia, Mr. Buchanan, said that they joined Newfoundland, they refused to accept the seventy-five, they opted out of it - they had agreed on a 75/25 - and then Newfoundland pushed the case for 100 per cent, I guess, or the 100 per cent was offered; anyway, Nova Scotia pulled out of that, would not accept it anymore. But here is Mr. Buchanan, the Premier of Nova Scotia,

MR. G. FLIGHT: who believes they got oil off the Coast of Nova Scotia, off Sable Island, saying, 'We will accept the 100 per cent but I want to make it clear that 100 per cent means -

AN HON. MEMBER: How much more time do you have,

MR. G. FLIGHT: - I do not know, Another half an hour?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Three minutes.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Do I not get a notification, Mr. Speaker, Do I not get a five minute notification?

MR. SPEAKER: Three.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. G. FLIGHT: How is it, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Buchanan can say on national television that 'we accept 100 per cent but let me make it clear that 100 per cent means all royalties, all sources of direct or indirect taxation, every dollar made on our offshore, that is what I mean when I say I accept that.' And they were nodding in accordance around the table and he said, 'I accept that'. Hatfield accepted it, another Tory Premier; and the people of Newfoundland are confused. The minister may be right, maybe 100 per cent is nothing, maybe 100 per cent does not mean a thing to us, but the two premiers - the two PC Premiers, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia - the people are concerned that they do not understand why it is that 100 per cent would have been acceptable.

MR. F. STAGG: 100 per cent of what?

MR. FLIGHT: That is what I am going to have the minister to explain now. If the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) will stay around the House long enough, he will understand.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) explain it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: No, because I am like the great bulk of Newfoundlanders, do not really understand it, And I am not sure the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) understands it, or the minister understands it.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: He understands the politics that is in it.

MR. F. STAGG: I am not the energy critic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland want to know the - the kind of questions they are interested in also are when we go into this production in 1985, is the oil going to come ashore by pipeline? It is only five years down the road and we have to start putting in the infrastructure, Pipeline or tanker? If it is tanker, is it going to come ashore in Newfoundland or will some of it go directly from the wellhead to refineries on the Eastern seaboard? We are only four or five years away from production now, we have been talking about this for eight years; none of those answers. And I want to ask the minister something else with regard to his provincial control over exploration. How was it that the federal government a few days ago had to insist that the oil companies use higher pressure blowout? How did that policy come from Ottawa? Where was the minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not be so foolish.

MR. FLIGHT: Never mind, 'Do not be so foolish.'
I am talking about when the people read, they say,

MR. FLIGHT: 'Oh! The federal government insisted' that to make sure that the depth we had to go, that the equipment that the company was using at certain depths was safe, how come the federal government had to point that out?

MR. BARRY: Who said they pointed it out?

MR. FLIGHT: I did not see the minister associated with insisting, pointing out that Mobil was told not to continue drilling below certain depths unless they - the equipment is going to take another six months - blowout preventers.

MR. BARRY: When did they decide that?

MR. FLIGHT: About two weeks ago. Is the minister going to -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) on the contract six months ago.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, it just goes to show how little information the minister gives the general public with regard to offshore.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the House, out of a sincere desire to prove to the people of Newfoundland that together we want to develop that resource in the better interests of this Province, that we do not want to keep it in the political realm, we do not want to make a political issue of it, I would hope that the House sees fit to support this amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: It is with great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to say that I will be supporting the Resolution of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), a Resolution which is affected in no way by the amendment, and, therefore, I take great pleasure in saying that I am prepared to support the cosmetic amendment proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that pains me is that the Opposition feel that it is important to engage in this type of cosmetic surgery -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - instead of helping government get at what needs surgery in this Province. And what needs surgery in this Province, Mr. Speaker, are problems such as the highest unemployment rate in Canada, an unemployment rate which my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is valiantly bringing down; problems, Mr. Speaker, that need surgery, like the fact that too many of our young men and women have to go away to work; problems, Mr. Speaker, like the fact that government does not have sufficient revenue to provide types of roads our people want and expect because they see them elsewhere; the hospitals, the schools, other medical facilities in addition to hospitals; Mr. Speaker, water and sewer facilities, the whole litany that the member for Windsor - Buchans mentioned - he mentioned some of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is that type of basic issue which the people of this Province elected all members, not just members here in government, all members were elected to deal with those issues, and instead, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I have to say that since we have come back in this session we have seen nothing but political posturing, cosmetic weasel-wording. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us to stop that. The time has come for us to

MR. BARRY: get down and do the business of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, have been whipping the government with the statement that the people are not interested in the Constitution, they want to get down to bread and butter issues, and yet we see members opposite not being content to put one amendment and debate it ad nauseam. Mr. Speaker, when they lose on that amendment, they attempt to put another one, which fortunately was ruled out of order.

But now, Mr. Speaker, let us for a moment just point out just how much bread and butter is involved in the constitutional amendment, how much bread and butter is involved in the Resolution of the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), and how little bread and butter is involved in the cosmetic amendment proposed by the member for Windsor - Buchans.

Mr. Speaker, members opposite refer to the fact that an old friend of mine, Dr. Hugh Lilly, was involved in installing a plaque on the floor of the Grand Banks, and that one of our previous Premiers had been involved in that exercise. Well, fortunately, Mr. Speaker,

MR. L. BARRY: it was only elements of theatre like that that the previous Premier was involved in. When this administration came in in 1972, the previous Premier and the previous, previous administration were flinging permits around like rock candy. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I had a friend of mine mention to me the other day - it must be the attitude has still hung over up on the mainland and they think that we still operate that way - apparently, a friend of mine said that a friend of his told him that there is a chap walking around somewhere in Vancouver - I am not sure if he has arrived here or not - who is holding himself out as a relative of mine, whether a long lost relative or not but he is holding himself out as a relative of mine who has the inside on leases. If you want an oil lease, Mr. Speaker, you just track down this chap - and they gave me a name, I had never heard of him before -

AN HON. MEMBER: Give him a licence to get him going.

MR. L. BARRY: So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if we have a gentleman out there trying to pull a scam on gullible members of the investment community or not. And if I can find out more details, I will be happy to have the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) try and get on his tail to track him down. But you can understand, Mr. Speaker, how you might have the occasional gullible individual out there if they can remember back before 1972, because that is exactly the sort of administration of these offshore resources that we had. When they were not out putting plaques on the floor of the Grand Banks, Mr. Speaker - that was going to solidify our rights for all time: -they were out flinging permits around as if they were rock candy, as if they were jelly beans, as if they were peanuts. And all you had to was to know somebody in government - it did not matter if you had ever seen a drop of oil, it did not matter if you knew what 'Three-in-One' oil was, Mr. Speaker. If you knew somebody you could expect to get a permit, a drilling permit. And then they

MR. L. BARRY: would go out and they would flog them to somebody who had a little bit of drilling expertise and hold themselves out as great oil magnates.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this government is determined we will never see resources abused in this Province again as they were in the past. Never! Never! Never!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the first few years I spent in politics, I would say close to 50 per cent of the time was involved with dealing with offshore resources. A good chunk of that time, Mr. Speaker, was dealt with attempting to negotiate a settlement, a political settlement with the Maritime Provinces, Quebec and the federal government. We were all sitting down, for a couple of years -

MR. WHITE: The Premier should have (inaudible)

MR. L. BARRY: - and the Premier did a darn good job when he was in Mines and Energy. The Premier called the bluff of the companies who were, 'Oh, no, they cannot live under our regulations.' He called their bluff. They walked away. He said, 'Go away.' They came back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we spent a number of years attempting to negotiate a political settlement. And anybody who wants to go back to the record will find, Mr. Speaker, a detailed proposal that was set out at that time by this Province, which I have tabled earlier and which hon. members should be familiar with, a proposal for a negotiated settlement. In the Fall of 1974, Mr. Speaker, after a couple of years of negotiation, we sent that off to the federal government, we proposed joint administration where the federal government could have a veto and have a direct input into certain matters of high policy. But we said, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line was that this Province should have, 'A substantial degree of control with respect to managing those resources.' And the

MR. L. BARRY: letter we got back from the present Prime Minister, who was then also Prime Minister, was: 'Gentlemen you had better see to your court case.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, members opposite ask why are we not negotiating. Remember the old song, Mr. Speaker, that 'It Takes Two to Tango'?

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the letter?

MR. BARRY: The letter has been tabled.

It was signed by the then

MR. BARRY: Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs the hon. John Crosbie.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who wrote it?

MR. BARRY: I wrote it and it was sent Mr. Speaker, in the Fall of 1974 and, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government rejected it out of hand. They said, 'Go to court,' when what we were seeking was a substantial degree of control over the offshore. Now, hon. members opposite say, 'Why do you not negotiate?' It does take two to tango, Mr. Speaker, and it takes two to negotiate and there has been absolutely no evidence, no indication that the Federal Government has any bona fide willingness to negotiate, no intent to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, the great university formula; what is this, another Newfie joke, that the Prime Minister offers us 100 per cent and we turn it down? And then he turns around and he changes his offer and he makes a new offer and it is a new 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier at the First Ministers' Conference had the opportunity of saying to the Prime Minister face to face, in living colour, on television, 'I will tell you what, Mr. Prime Minister, if you are offering us 100 percent, I will tell you what, I will take what you would get under that arrangement and you give me what we would get.' You did not see the Prime Minister of Canada accepting that, did you?

And that offer, Mr. Speaker, was made on television, prime time, before the people of Canada. And the Prime Minister? A few shrugs! I guess Hansard cannot pick them up, Mr. Speaker, but that was the extent.

MR. MORGAN: I will check and see.

MR. BARRY: Now, we have published an economic analysis of Hibernia which spells out exactly - and if hon. members opposite would care to read it they would see that this so-called university formula, this so-called 100 per cent of revenues offered, would end up with this government getting - before the last budget - it would have been around 30 per cent of the economic rent; since the budget it would be down around 25 to 20 - 20 to 25 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, do members opposite say, do hon. members opposite say that we should agree to that type of rip-off, attempted rip-off by the Federal Government? No, Mr. Speaker, no! Now, Mr. Speaker, that has been the position of the Federal Liberal administration when in government. Fortunately we had a Federal PC administration which very clearly showed the difference between, for my point of view, between Tories and Liberals. The Tories were prepared to recognize the right of provinces to own their natural resources. Prime Minister Clark wrote the Premier - was not just putting these weaselly words across the House of Commons that would later be followed up by an amendment introduced by the Leader of the NDP or some other opposition leader. He was prepared to put it on the line and he was prepared to put it in writing, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Conservative Party and the government of the day recognized Newfoundland's right of ownership and was prepared to treat Newfoundland offshore resources the same as if they were on land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, members opposite want to know what might be the resolution of this dispute. I will tell you, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that today the Prime Minister of Canada could telex this government with the same letter that was sent by Prime Minister Clark and I would be on the plane the next morning ready to work out the details, as we

MR. BARRY: were with Prime Minister Clark, of what was necessary to see the confirmation of Newfoundland's ownership rights. Tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning and I would ask hon. members opposite, who are supposed, they tell us, to have the ear, to have the ear of the Federal Liberal Government, I ask them as interested Newfoundlanders, I ask them as elected representatives of their people, use your good offices; you are elected representatives of the people. We are the government but you also have a responsibility. You have a political connection. You have a political connection with the present Liberal government, you have a political connection. I have yet to see, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to see hon. members opposite get up and say about a federal proposal with respect to offshore. That is wrong.' The closest I have

MR. L BARRY:

seen, and I was very happy to see it, was the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) yesterday in supporting our proposition on the constitution.

MR. NEARY:

Taking some comfort in that are you?

MR. L. BARRY:

Which requires me to ask,

requires me to ask how could members opposite yesterday vote against the offshore and today propose an amendment supporting our position on the offshore?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY:

What is happening here? Has

schizophrenia set in? I thought, Mr. Speaker, it was quite clearly pointed out that our offshore mineral rights could be in jeopardy if the proposed constitutional amendments go through as proposed by the federal government, that even if there was a successful court case that the Prime Minister of Canada could bring about a national referendum to take our rights away, to strip us of our offshore mineral rights. And members opposite voted against our attempts to see this not happen. And now today, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to have their cake and eat it too. They come out in support of a government resolution.

MR. STIRLING:

A private member's resolution.

MR. BARRY:

A private member's resolution by a member who is a very important part of this government, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

And not only

that, a good Placentia bayman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on. Right

on.

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest

that hon. members opposite have spent too much time pushing or trying to push the Province into an early court case. Hon.

MR. BARRY: members opposite should bear in mind that the timing of a court case can be quite important, Mr. Speaker, and this government will make a decision as to when is the appropriate time to have a judicial resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Province's legitimate claim to offshore resources received a tremendous increase in credibility, not legitimacy because the claim has been legitimate all along, but because of the obfuscation and confusion and attempts to confound raised by hon. members opposite, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there were a few people in Canada who questioned whether Newfoundland had a legitimate claim to the offshore. I do not think too many in the Province questioned it, but there might have been some credibility problem across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister Clark, as he then was, solved that credibility problem once and for all.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never again, but he was.

MR. BARRY: And as he will be! Who today, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: Who today, Mr. Speaker, would deny that Newfoundland has a clear, moral, equitable and legal right to offshore resources? Maybe hon. members opposite, I do not know, they have not yet got up and put it on the line that they did not believe that the proposals made by their compatriots in Ottawa were fair. Now I challenge members, Mr. Speaker, as they speak to this resolution to let us know what they think about the proposals that have been made by the federal government. Do they, Mr. Speaker, believe that there has been a sincere expression of intent to negotiate on the part of the federal government? I ask hon. members opposite, members opposite, please tell us,

MR. BARRY: get up and tell your constituents,
do you believe that from what you have heard to date
from your colleagues in the Liberal Party in Ottawa?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for
Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) asked what is it that we
intend to do . Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) for another while.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: I will tell you one thing we intend to do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - and that is to ensure that the offshore Resolution will not be a giveaway, Mr. Speaker. That is one thing that we intend to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: And that is why I said, Mr. Speaker, it will remain unsettled until hell freezes over if we have to have a giveaway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: If we have to roll over, play dead -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - and accept the few tidbits, the few scraps thrown by the Liberal Government in Ottawa, then, Mr. Speaker, we will all be able to play ice hockey in Hades.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has one minute to clue up.

MR. BARRY: One minute to go. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, more than enough time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our position is there. We will not accept anything less than a substantial degree of control with respect to the offshore that sees us treated in the same way as resources on land are treated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Now, let us have hon. members get up and say that. Let us have them tell the Prime Minister of Canada that the offshore resource must be treated the same as though it were on land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, let hon. members opposite get up and say that this Province should not have to be dragged through the courts like a common criminal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Let hon. members get up and say that, Mr. Speaker, in order to establish our legitimate rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: I am getting the word that it is all over, Mr. Speaker, and it is disappointing, because I was really about to tell them what we are going to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, on the main part of this Resolution, I will have another opportunity. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I rise to support the amendment to the Resolution brought in by my friend and colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight).

MR. CARTER: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. THOMS: The hon. the member, the scion for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), will have his opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I must say I was a little disappointed in my friend from Placentia. I expected a more rousing speech from him. He usually gives an excellent speech in the House of Assembly. I certainly hope he is not going to disappoint me when he concludes the debate on this Resolution; throw away your notes and give us a good speech.

Mr. Speaker, the Sheik from Mount Scio had his few words to say on this amendment. He started off by saying, 'Let us have no political

MR. THOMS: 'posturing.'

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. THOMS: That is something like the kettle calling the pot black, or whatever the expression is. This administration, in connection not only with the offshore oil and gas question, but on many, many other questions, all they do is indulge in political posturing. As a matter of fact, all that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) did this afternoon was politically posture.

Mr. Speaker, for the record - and I am not accepting. I was not a member of this House prior to June 18th, 1979.

MR. STAGG: You were defeated on Black Friday.

MR. THOMS: That is another comment that can be analogous to the kettle calling the pot black. Because if I am not mistaken, the hon. member, himself, could not get re-elected in 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Now, let him make those comments, Mr. Speaker, after the next election when he is not going to get elected again in Stephenville. He will hold a record for being defeated and elected and defeated.

Mr. Speaker, any political posturing in connection with this Resolution and with these matters, most of it is done by the present administration.

We saw again with the Minister of Mines and Energy a backward step, not the forward step that we were promised in June, 1979, not the promise that was made to deceive the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: This government is forever taking one step forward and eighteen steps backwards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, let the record show that since I have been elected to this House in June, 1979 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. L. THOMS: - let the record show that I have supported Newfoundland's claim to ownership and control of offshore oil and gas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMS: I have said it over and over and over and over.

MR. FLIGHT: As we all have.

MR. THOMS: It must be getting embarrassing to this administration that we are not at odds with them on this particular question: We own and we should control the offshore oil resources.

Mr. Speaker, you know, I do not care whether we have a good court case or not; I just do not care whether we have a good court case or not. From the point of view that I believe that even if we have the worst court case in the world, even if we have absolutely no chance of winning a court case in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, the Appeal Court of Newfoundland, Supreme Court of Canada, even if we have no chance of winning it, I do not think we should have to go there; I think that we should have the ownership, we should have 100 per-cent maximum benefits from offshore oil and gas and that we should have the principal control over that resource. Newfoundland deserves it, Newfoundlanders deserve whatever is to come from the offshore oil and gas. And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. W. MARSHALL: Why did the hon. member vote against us yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STIRLING: We were talking about the patriation of the Constitution yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS: I think it was quite a different issue yesterday, quite a different issue yesterday. It is not going to be the last time that I am going to vote against this government of this Province, but I believe, and, like I say, let the record show that I am in full agreement that this Province should have ownership and control over offshore oil and gas.

There has been a lot said, Mr. Speaker, about this and I have made my views known to my federal minister, to my federal member of what my position is.

MR. STAGG: Your federal member is John Crosbie.

MR. L. THOMS: John Crosbie will never be my member. If he ever became -

MR. STAGG: If you do not live in your district (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: - my member I would move out of the district.

MR. HANCOCK: I would too only I have too much tied up.

MR. THOMS: And if you are talking about where I reside, where I live, I happen to live in the district of a man that I have a great deal of admiration for and that is the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. McGrath. I happen to be in his district, not Mr. Crosbie's district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not believe we should have to go through a court case, I believe it is unnecessary. I will use whatever influence I have on the Liberal Party that is in power in Ottawa, which is not very much, mind you, but I will use it to see that Newfoundland gets the best possible deal -

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell them that.

MR. THOMS: Yes, I have told them that. I have told Mr. Rompkey that, I have told Mr. Simmons that, I have

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2627

SD - 3

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Tobin that, I have told Mr. Rooney that, I have told Mr. Baker that, I have told them all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: I believe they want what is best for Newfoundland as well. I believe that every one of them wants what is best for Newfoundland just like everybody in this House wants what is best for Newfoundland.

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2628

GH-1

MR. THOMS: Do not put that puzzled look on your face.

MR. MARSHALL: Your actions say the opposite.

MR. THOMS: Of course the actions do not say the opposite, of course not.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It seems we have a private conversation going on down below and the Chair is having a great difficulty to hear. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: In other words, shut up.

MR. MORGAN: You are lowering the level of debate.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like for somebody on the other side - there are lots of questions, though, that one can ask about the offshore oil and gas. The fishermen in my district are concerned. They are concerned if there is a blowout and oil is pumped into the ocean at the rate of 15,000 gallons a minute or something God-awful like that. They are wondering what is going to happen to the fishery in this Province. The fish companies are concerned about what is going to happen if their diesel mechanics and other skilled workers are taken out of the fishery to go into the oil industry. They are concerned if it is decided that a pipeline is to be laid on the floor of the sea. They are concerned about what can happen when an iceberg which can scour some twenty-one feet, some twenty-one feet, what will happen if there is a break in that pipeline. They may be chances that this Province is going to have to take, but I think that every possible step should be taken to make sure that something like this does not happen and to try to ease the concerns of the fishermen of this Province.

As I understand it, the fishery in Scotland has suffered greatly, has suffered greatly. I

MR. THOMS: gather this from the delegation that went to Scotland recently to look at the effect of oil and gas on the fisheries. It bothers me that they can report back that there is not the right kind of concern in London about the Scottish fishery. We may not always have that exemplary Minister of Fisheries, Mr. LeBlanc, in Ottawa who will show the concern to the fisheries that he shows, that he shows. Maybe Ottawa will not show this concern for the Newfoundland fishery that it deserves all the time, and I think that the principal control, if for no other reason than that reason, should be in the hands of this Province. I hope that this Province can show the maturity to handle control of the offshore oil and gas.

The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, referred to the First Ministers' Conference that was on television. I saw the lack of maturity on the part of the Premier of this Province and a good many other premiers across this country at that Conference, and I question whether the ability is in the front seats of this administration to handle the control of offshore oil and gas. I asked a question and I would like to get an answer to it. If the Federal Government, if Mr. Trudeau, as I believe he should, turned over the ownership and control of the offshore oil and gas to Newfoundland tomorrow, would Newfoundland be able to administer the development of that offshore resource?

MR. L. THOMS: Could we do it or would we have to turn around and ask Ottawa to help us out? Now, that would be a little bit embarrassing too if that had to happen. Nobody has answered that question of whether or not this Province has the capability I know that the present administration does not have the competence, but maybe we can go beyond the front benches of this administration, maybe the oil directorate, maybe that haven for defeated Tory hacks, maybe that haven, this oil directorate, the Petroleum Directorate: I happen to have been invited down aboard of a rig, and I think that every member of this Petroleum Directorate who walked on board was a defeated Tory candidate or somebody who worked in the campaign for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) in the Mount Scio district.

MR. NEARY: Looking for a job, no doubt.

MR. L. THOMS: They have all been placed very nicely and very neatly into nice, comfortable jobs.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has to include the federal ones yet.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the defeated candidate trying to get a job cooking for the offshore.

MR. L. THOMS: And then you wonder why I question the competency of the Petroleum Directorate in this Province or the front benches of this administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. L. THOMS: If the cap fits the minister can wear it. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that was brought in by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), one of the whereas clauses, "WHEREAS the revenues, employment and industrial benefits which will result from offshore development will flow to the Province only if its ownership and control are confirmed;" Mr. Speaker, that could be challenged but I am not going to sneak out from under supporting this resolution just to vote against it because of the confusion

MR. L. THOMS: that is obviously in the mind of the person who drafted this resolution. This whereas clause brings to mind the odious policy of the present administration. The one provision in the constitutional proposals that I certainly have no hesitation whatsoever without really having to give it a great deal of thought supporting is the mobility clause. I spoke the other day in connection with the Constitution and I spoke about the mobility clause and I said at that time, and I will say it again, that I do not want this administration, I do not want the administration in Ottawa, Quebec City, Victoria or any place in this nation telling me where I can work and where I can live. If we took it to its logical conclusion there would be members who probably would not be sitting in this House of Assembly today, there are members who would not be sitting in this House of Assembly. Now, I want to see as many Newfoundlanders as possible working in the oil industry in this Province. I want for Newfoundland no different from what the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) or the member from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) wants, nothing any different.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, I will predict - we have heard a lot about a court case, we are hearing a lot about ownership, we are hearing a lot about the local preference policy - and Mr. Speaker, I will predict that this Premier of the Province, that the present Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), that this administration will end up in a political settlement. They will end up with a political settlement. This matter will not go to court, Mr. Speaker, it will not go to court.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. L. THOMS:

Is my time up, Mr. Speaker?

That was a short five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

The member's time is up. I assume you have your concluding remarks.

MR. L. THOMS:

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker, by predicting that this Premier and this administration and the Minister of Mines and Energy that this Province will end up with a political settlement and one that will benefit every single, solitary person in this Province. We will not have to go to court. We will not have to go to court and I do not think we should have to go to court. As I said, we own the resource, we deserve the resource and I do not care what the legal case is or is not. I do not care!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS:

We own it, we deserve to have it and Prime Minister Trudeau should give it to us. That is the way I feel about this resolution and this Province.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as I did in my last speech, I request that hon. members opposite observe the rules of the House so that I can continue with my remarks as we will give opportunity to all hon. members who wish to speak.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just to have a look at what the last hon. member spoke about and get that out of the way quickly, He stood up and he supported our claim, he spoke for twenty minutes and he said nothing and we gave him leave to continue to say nothing. The one thing that he did have to say was that he was against our mobility clause. He is against our mobility clause. Now, Mr. Speaker, that concludes the total speech of the hon. member opposite, that concludes the total speech of the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

MR. J. DINN:

So, Mr. Speaker, I will get on with number one, the amendment to the resolution. And basically what the amendment to the resolution, just to repeat for the record is: 'Therefore Be It Resolved that this hon. House supports this province's historic, moral and legal claim To own and Control its offshore mineral resources.' And what was left out? They do not want to support the Conservative administration in its effort to preserve and they do not want to be political.

MR. L. THOMS:

Surprise! Surprise!

MR. J. DINN:

So, Mr. Speaker, I will not be political. What I will do is I will, first of all, on the one point that the hon. member for Grand Bank attacked, which was the mobility rights, I will say my normal few words on the mobility rights. Hon. members will remember, of course, the CBC programme they had on the other night where a team from CBC went out and interviewed people on the rigs and

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2630

DW - 3

MR. J. DINN: they saw how happy they were,
how interested they were in the work they were doing. They
also found people from many areas of the Province, I believe,
one was from Carbonear and the other one was from the hon.
member for St. Mary's - The Capes district (Mr. Hancock),
who continues to speak against mobility rights in this
Province. And,

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, if they had checked at the peak of the season in August they would have found 900 happy Newfoundlanders doing their job. Now, Mr. Speaker, the attack by hon. members opposite on mobility, one of the attacks is why do we not train our Newfoundlanders so that they can compete and get the jobs. Well, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, on the rigs offshore there is no training programme involved. What you have to do is you go on the rigs as a roustabout and roughneck and you work your way up through the system to a point where you get a job on the drilling platform and you become a driller, and from there on you can move into the administrative side of it where you become the operations manager. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is how it is done. It is experience on the rig. That is why the criteria is and that is what we started out with when we asked Newfoundlanders from all over the Province to write their names in, give us an indication of their experience so that we could talk to the oil companies and make sure that they got preference in those jobs because they were experienced in doing those jobs.

We also, Mr. Speaker, through co-operation with these oil companies, got people on there as trainees. In other words, they went on, if it was their first year or if they had no particular experience on the rigs, we got them on thirty or forty or fifty at a time, we got them on to get some training so that they could go on, take over the jobs as roustabouts and roughnecks and so on and so that they could work their way up. And I saw a gentleman on there the other night who was so happy that he was on the oil rigs and talked about how he thought he would make a career out of the opportunity that was given him due to our mobility rights in the offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this started, when our regulations were approved and when this started

MR. DINN: we met with the oil companies. I remember particularly the first group of companies that came in and the first rig that we got Newfoundlanders on which was the Discover Seven Seas and we set up and I believe we met them in the Cabinet room upstairs and there were gentlemen there from Texeco and several of the oil companies. We met with them upstairs in the Cabinet room-or downstairs in the Cabinet room and, Mr. Speaker, the litany of reasons and excuses why they could not employ Newfoundlanders on the rigs and the offshore was so long that one would think that there was nobody could do these jobs only the people who were on there. Well, Mr. Speaker, we talked about the specific positions and we went down through the list of positions, the roustabouts and the roughnecks and the messmen and the cooks and we went through a list and we went through the number of people who were on or going to come in on the Discover Seven Seas and we felt at the time that we could get at least ninety-eight replacements on that ship.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we talked about it with them. They complained bitterly because what they really want, what they would really love to have would be they would love to have a crew on a rig and that rig could move anywhere in the world and they would not have to change or they would not have to do anything. So, Mr. Speaker, we went through the different categories and we talked and we listened, and we were very concerned because of the possibilities that the oil companies were presenting to us of the fact that we did not have the experience and we did not have the people and so on. Anyway we convinced them, having listened to their argument, we convinced them over a period of days that they should employ Newfoundlanders, that we did have a list, that they did have experience. And, Mr. Speaker, on that one rig, the first rig that we talked to the oil companies on, we had ninety-eight people from the

MR. DINN: Philippines who had been working on the rigs were replaced by Newfoundlanders. As a matter of fact, 128 Newfoundlanders went on because they took on extra Newfoundlanders in trainee positions so that they could work their way up and become roustabouts and roughnecks and work their way up through. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Did they have any problem with their pride, these Newfoundlanders, did they have any problem with their pride?

MR. DINN: They had absolutely no problem at all. They are willing workers and willing learners, people who get in there and can do a good job when they get at the job.

So, Mr. Speaker, I went out to the Discover Seven Seas about a month to a month and a half after they started drilling and I talked to the people on the rig, the operations manager and the personnel manager on the rig and, Mr. Speaker, they were so delighted with the Newfoundlanders and with their capability. They talked to us - I remember the gentleman from Texeco talking to me

MR. DINN:

downstairs in the Cabinet room and saying the Newfoundland cooks would not be able to keep the crew happy because they did not know how to cook or they could not cook the type of food that some of the Filipinos who were on the rigs in administrative positions would normally eat. Well, Mr. Speaker, I went out and I talked to the operations manager and the personnel manager and the administrative staff on the ship and they were so delighted that they were talking about the possibility of getting some of these Newfoundlanders to go with them to their next position, which was off the coast of Spain.

I remember another gentleman.

On the drill rig, it takes three people to operate on the drill platform. And they had one Newfoundlander there who had some experience in the Beaufort Sea. He was on the drill platform the day that I was there and, Mr. Speaker, he was a veritable pearl in the oil industry. He was one of the best drillers that the administrative staff in the operations of that vessel had ever seen. He handled that complete drilling platform - he did not have to, now; you still have to have three people on there for safety purposes, but just to demonstrate what this Newfoundlander could do - and, of course, he did it with some pride, I will tell you that, Mr. Speaker. I watched him do it. He did the complete change by himself. He changed the complete drilling section by himself, and, Mr. Speaker, it normally takes three people to do that. But just to demonstrate his capability on the rigs, on that drilling platform - and these drilling platforms, by the way, Mr. Speaker, with the barite mud that comes up from the drilling, they are more slippery than ice. I mean, it is hard to stand on there without special shoes and everything,

MR. DINN: and he skated around there like Bobby Orr and changed that drilling section by himself and, Mr. Speaker, he walked away and stuck his chest out. And as a matter of fact, they offered him a contract to go to Spain. They asked him if he would stay with the ship and go to Spain, and during the three month period that they were going to spend in Spain, they offered that Newfoundlander \$25,000 to stay with the crew.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of people that we have in this Province. And I have 6,000 on a list. Now, I do not say that all 6,000 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Or more -

MR. DINN: And more. I do not say that all 6,000 and more are as qualified as they should be, nor are they qualified for all the positions. There are certain positions that they are not qualified for and they never will become qualified for these higher positions unless they work up through the system. There is no training programme available for the operation that they have in the offshore on these drill ships.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are cooks, and we have lots of cooks, but there are certain positions. And just to talk about the training for a little while, I talked to Mr. Axworthy when he was down here, because there are higher technologies. There are courses in higher technology - you get the electronics technician - there are courses in higher technology that we will need in the future and that we have identified, and I talked to the federal minister about this in my office. As a matter of fact, the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) was in my office the day that Mr. Axworthy was here, and in my office he agreed with our mobility

MR. DINN: clause in the regulations - in my office, it can be confirmed by the Minister of Education - and went out. Half an hour later I sat over in the Holiday Inn at a Board of Trade luncheon and he got up and spoke and said the exact opposite. But in my office, the hon. the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Mr. Axworthy) agreed with our regulations with respect to -

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. the Minister of Education (inaudible).

MR. DINN: The hon. the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) was there in my office and heard the exact same words from the federal Minister of Employment and Immigration. And not only that, but he said, 'Sure, that is exactly what we are doing.' He said, 'That is exactly what the federal government is doing.' And the Minister of Employment and Immigration, in my office, cited the case of the Michelin plant in Nova Scotia and he knew to the exact number the number of people who would work there and who would have to be trained to go to work there, and that nobody else could go there unless they were Nova Scotian, and not only that, but from that area, and I believe it is near Windsor or Kentville that that new plant is going. And 230 Nova Scotians, he told me, he was proud to say, would work in that plant as a result of

MR. DINN: monies that the Michelin Company had received from DREE as a result of a contract signed as between the company, the Federal Government and the provincial government of that day, and he called the program 'affirmative action'. Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not have it called affirmative action in our clause but that is exactly -

AN HON. MEMBER: We are talking about it (inaudible).

MR. DINN: - that is exactly what we are talking about, within our country. Nova Scotians, before anyone - not only before anyone else, only Nova Scotians is in that clause as read out by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) here in the House only a few days ago. Only Nova Scotians: they have to train and they have to employ only Nova Scotians in that Michelin plant on monies that were given by the Federal Government monies given by the Federal Government. It makes it right from this point of view: Number one is that you will never get on a drilling ship if you do not have some sort of a clause like that. You will never get on them. I quoted, for hon. members opposite I quoted 1978 statistics where we had two drilling rigs out there, the Pelerin and the Ben Ocean Lancer, and there was not one Canadian on those two drill ships. Now, there were years when we did have some Canadians on there. As I recall, the SEDCO ships, one or two of the SEDCO ships were built in Halifax and because they were Canadian registered we had Canadians on them, but the other ones -

MR. THOMS: The whole principle is wrong.

MR. DINN: The principle is not wrong. The fact of the matter is that we had ninety-eight Filipinos, people from the Philippines, on the rig exploring our resource during the exploration and as far as the companies were concerned they should not be replaced. Now, to me that is

MR. DINN: wrong, especially when I have the problem. The hon. member may not think that I have a big problem, but I have the problem in Newfoundland of 14 per cent unemployment, and I just cannot take when somebody comes into our Province exploring or developing our resource that we cannot employ Newfoundlanders. I mean, I take exception to that. I just do not agree with the hon. member. He has heard my case. I have put my case out before him many times before, he has put his, but the fact of the matter is that I am not going to allow that to happen as long as I am here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the '78 situation with the two rigs out there, we had the '79 situation where we 730. Some of them were trainees, some of them were not actually doing the job, were just replacing another person. They took not only the people who went out there but they also took people to train, and that is part of the program, Mr. Speaker. And the fact of the matter is that we would never have that program, we would never have those jobs, unless we had the local preference out there, And not only would Newfoundlanders -

MR. THOMS: That is the lowest (inaudible).

MR. DINN: - and not only would Newfoundlanders not be employed out there, but Canadians would not. And I stated the statistics. If the hon. member has statistics that prove those wrong, I would suggest that he get up in the House and speak on the main motion if he gets an opportunity and tell me about the different statistics that he has, because I have them and nobody has challenged them to this point in time. The hon. member cannot because that is the truth. I mean, these are the facts. Zero Canadians and zero Newfoundlanders.

MR. DINN: The hon. member may not like that but that is the way it has been going.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not the only resource that has been developed that way. The hon. member should know that we have a railway in Western Labrador with 1,250 employees, 47 of whom are Newfoundlanders, and two-thirds of the track is in Newfoundland, and I cannot do anything about that because it is federal-provincial - it is interprovincial trade. I would if I could because I think that is grossly unfair. All they are doing up there now is ripping the iron ore out of the ground and bringing it down to Sept Iles. A former, former premier in this Province said that over his dead body they would have a pellet plant -

AN HON. MEMBER: What are you (inaudible).

MR. DINN: - over his dead body a former, former premier said, they would put a pellet plant in Sept Iles. Well, that is where it went and he has not died. He has more lives than the average -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: - I know, I know. I know what the hon. member is saying, but that is exactly what can happen when you do not have anything in place. That is exactly what I am saying, and that is my argument. My argument is that if you let these things go, if you allow the oil companies or anyone else to do their thing, they are not going to change crews when they come to Newfoundland, and that is wrong. If they are going to go out and explore, if they are going to develop a resource in this Province, we have to get some advantage, and one of the advantages is in developing our human resource while they are exploring and taking our natural resources. If the hon. member cannot believe in that basic philosophy, then there is something wrong. I mean, he is just totally against what we stand for.

December 3, 1980

Tape No. 2633

GH-4

MR. DINN:

Now, the other point, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

- and I only have a minute or two left so I would ask the hon. member to just give me my minute or two.

The other point is that there were 1,600 jobs out there at peak this year, and

MR. J. DINN:

we got 900 of them. A little simple mathematics says that there are 700 others. The federal Minister of Employment and Immigration did absolutely nothing with respect to those other 700. Now I can say without too much fear of contradiction-and it is not my job, if it were I would go after them-but the fact of the matter is that I can say without too much fear of contradiction that the other 700 jobs, well over half of them could be filled by Canadians, Mr. Speaker, and there is no attempt at all by the federal minister to do anything about it and I brought it up to him and he said to me that he did not have the capability. And I said, 'Well, Mr. Axworthy, you should be the last one to complain about what we are doing.' He said, 'Well, as I have said before I agree with the clause that you have in your regulations.' He said, 'We are doing it in Nova Scotia and we are doing it in Northern Canada.' And then he left my office, we shook hands amicably, we had a coffee - the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) is down there now and she is listening and she is nodding - shook hands, we had a coffee in my office and then when over to the Board of Trade and I went over and sat next to him at the Board of Trade, and he got up in front of a microphone and said the exact opposite. So it is very difficult for me, it is absolutely very difficult for me to sit down with Mr. Axworthy and be serious with him because, I mean, if you cannot sit down and talk back and forth and talk about education programmes and talk about employment in this country, things that he should be interested in, and then get him to leave your office, having agreed completely with everything you said, and then go and say the exact opposite at the St. John's Board of Trade luncheon, then where are you? I mean what do you do with people like that?

MR. STAGG:

Those are the sort of people who hold press conferences like Mr. Rompkey and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling).

MR. J. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who spoke before me attacked our mobility rights, he obviously do not believe them, the 900 people out there should not be there, he says. I have given him evidence and proof, evidence that he cannot -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)

MR. J. DINN: - refute, he has no evidence himself, he has done no investigation on it, he cannot refute it and, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there is none as blind as he who will not see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to stand here and compliment the member who brought in this resolution for bringing in a fine resolution on Private Member's Day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WHITE: - and I am happy to say as well that things seem to be going okay to the point that I think I can support this resolution now that the government side has indicated that they are going to go along with our amendment and try to remove some of this politics from the resolution. I am glad they agreed to do that because I had some information here that I was going to talk about to prove that they should do that because I remember a resolution brought into this House back in 1978 by the then Leader of the Opposition -

AN HON. MEMBER: Which one?

MR. F. WHITE: The resolution, the one on Labrador, the resolution happened to have had the word 'Liberal' in it. The member for St. John's East at that time moved an amendment, that the word 'Liberal' should be removed and at the same time he said he would be just as adamant in having the word 'Conservative' removed from a resolution if it came into the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WHITE: - and that is very clear from Hansard.

MR. WHITE: So I am glad that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has a good memory and agreed today to have the word 'Conservative administration' removed from the resolution. Because I could not get up here, Mr. Speaker, and support the Conservative administration in its efforts to preserve the Province's historical, moral and legal claim to own and control its offshore natural resources because I do not agree with everything the Conservative administration has done, I do not agree with the methods they have used and I do not agree with the way they have approached this matter.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the government has agreed to go along with our amendment, I am glad that the resolution will get unanimous support of this House because I think it is time that the people of Newfoundland realize that on the basic principle of ownership and control of offshore oil and gas that the two parties in this House are alike on that matter, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WHITE: It is the methodology and so on that we have disagreed with all along and will continue to disagree with if we see fit to do so. Mr. Speaker, I just listened to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) once again getting up bragging about the 900 jobs that Newfoundlanders have on the offshore, the 900 jobs. I think it is great that we have 900 jobs on the offshore, but I think, Mr. Speaker, we would have 1800 jobs on the offshore if this government had been doing what it should have been doing in the last few years and that is carrying out a training programme, a training programme for Newfoundlanders. If the Minister of Manpower and Labour wants to take credit for the 900 jobs, then he should also take the criticism and the blame for hundreds of other Newfoundlanders who are not working on the offshore rigs and the offshore service vessels in this Province because this government has failed to put into place any kind of training programme whatsoever for the offshore and there are hundreds of Newfoundlanders who are looking to get training for the various jobs that are coming into play. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that a large number of the Newfoundlanders, the 900 Newfoundlanders who are working on the offshore, received their training in other provinces of Canada -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. WHITE: -in Alberta and other provinces in this country. And I know them, I know them from my own district who came back to Newfoundland who had been roughnecks in the North West Territories and in Alberta and they immediately were placed on the offshore because they had the training and that is what we are talking about. The government should put in place major training programmes .

MR. F. WHITE: for the offshore right across this Province. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that most of the jobs held by Newfoundlanders on the offshore are what we would call the low level labour jobs. They are well paid, but the top level jobs, the captain, the mates, the officers, the high paying top level jobs in the offshore are still held by mainlanders, Americans and people from other countries. Those are the facts and the minister just said they cannot put a training programme into place. I do not buy that. I do not buy that for one second, Mr. Speaker, I think every single vocational school in this Province should have training programmes for offshore oil and gas related jobs, every single vocational school in this Province should have that. The Premier said here yesterday in this House when he was speaking on the resolution, he said that we do not have the time to get involved. I think we do have the time, Mr. Speaker. It is going to be 1985 before production starts on the Hibernia well. We should know now what jobs are going to be available there, what categories of jobs, what skilled labours are going to be needed in those particular industries that are going to be associated with the production of oil and gas on the offshore and it is time now to start immediately to begin training Newfoundlanders. I get calls, Mr. Speaker, from guidance counsellors in high schools in my own district who tell me that they have the largest number of students coming to them at the moment looking for jobs with respect to any particular vocation is the offshore oil and gas related industries. They want to get jobs, they want to find out where to get trained, they want to enrol in classes that would give them some background and some training with

MR. F. WHITE: respect to offshore oil and gas, but there is nowhere for them to go, nowhere, Mr. Speaker, for them to get training. There are a few jobs at the Trades College in St. John's and that is about it. So, this government has failed miserably, Mr. Speaker, miserably in providing the kind of training for Newfoundlanders that is needed, the basic training that is needed for our young people to get involved in the offshore oil and gas industry, and it is time they admitted their blame.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. WHITE: It is time they accepted their blame and started to put together some creative training programme for the jobs that are coming up not only now that exploration is under way but production begins a few years down the road. It is time that those training programmes started. And the Minister of Manpower and Labour should not be let off the hook with claiming that he has got 900 jobs out there when there are hundreds more he could have if he had done what he should have done and that was to set up a training programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. WHITE: And I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that this government should go after the oil companies to help put money into training programmes, it is in

MR. WHITE: the government's regulation and they should enforce it, get the companies to contribute to a training programme for Newfoundlanders and let us get this training programme organized and underway. Not only the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn) but the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) as well should become more deeply involved in this. Instead of getting up day after day bragging about the few jobs we have got, they should be looking to the future and finding out how many more jobs we can get and how we go about training our people for those particular jobs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: I was reading an article here today on the front page of the Telegram about some comments that concern me and I just thought I would throw this in in passing, Mr. Speaker, and hope the government looks into this. It was some statements made yesterday at a conference in St. John's by a gentleman by the name of Lyndon Watkins, who is a free lance reporter who spoke here, and he cautioned that the oil industry may be insensitive to Newfoundland culture and he already sees forms of cultural imperialism creeping into the offshore oil and gas programme here in this Province. He talks about already you can see on the oil rigs off Newfoundland where the influence of the Americans and the Canadians - not necessarily the Canadians in this case, but the Americans are moving in and on some of the oil rigs you can only see television programmes from Dallas and Houston and other parts of the United States. I do not think that is good enough and I think the government should undertake to look into this matter and to find out why we cannot get some of our own cultural activities injected into the offshore oil and gas programmes that are put on for the people who have to spend so many lonely hours on those rigs time after time again.

MR. WHITE: I think the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn) should tell us sometime too, Mr. Speaker, what the turnover is on the offshore oil and gas drilling programmes. I understand the turnover is pretty high, that you get Newfoundlanders working out there for a short period of time and then quitting and giving it up because of the intensity of the loneliness and the long periods of time they must stay out there. And I would like to see some statistics on that sometime about the turnover on the offshore and oil and gas rigs and the supply vessels in the future so that we can know and see if there is not a way that we can keep those Newfoundlanders on the job for a longer period of time, make the working conditions better, make it more conducive to the way, the kind of lifestyle they want to lead and so on, and I think we would be well advised to do something along those lines.

But once again, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that we have finally seen the government and the governing party back off from its political treadmill with respect to the offshore oil and gas. Politics has been played by this party, this administration, for years now. We saw by-elections years ago with big slogans, "This land is our land and we will not give it up", and all this, running and again using the emotional impact on the people of this Province. We saw in the election last year the same thing being used. And this is the first time since I have been in this House that I have seen any indication on the part of this government that they are prepared to compromise and try to bring this issue out of the political arena and get it into a sound, sensible debating procedure where we can come together on this matter and try and resolve the issues as we see fit.

I was very disappointed, Mr. Speaker, today with the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). My colleague from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) stood in his place and asked the minister to tell us what

MR. WHITE: he was going to do or what the government was going to do with respect to the stalemate with Ottawa. And he stood there for twenty minutes of political rhetoric and told us nothing whatsoever what the government's plans were for the future, what the government's plans were for resolving the stalemate with Ottawa, not one single word. Towards the end of his speech when he has got one minute left he throws it off, says, "Well, I have no time to tell you about what our plans are", because we would like to know. If this stalemate continues the forces in North America are far greater than this government. Are we going to see drill ships on the Grand Banks drilling the oil, taking the oil from Hibernia, Halifax getting the major portion of jobs and this Province being bypassed completely, are we going to see that? Is that a possibility? I hope not, Mr. Speaker. I hope that day never comes. But I would like to know from the government how they envisage preventing that kind of thing from happening. That is what I would like to know from them, what their plans are. They can talk about guerilla warfare and everything they want, they can talk about sitting on the resource until

MR. F. WHITE:

hell freezes over. That is going to do no good whatsoever. If companies are given permits by Ottawa to drill on the Grand Banks, to produce on the Grand Banks, industry goes to Nova Scotia and we are bypassed again in Newfoundland. It could very well happen, and I would like to know what the contingency plans of this government are in that kind of situation.

Only yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we saw in Halifax where the town of Halifax has set up a twelve or fifteen member task force to get prepared for what the news said, Hibernia and Sable Island. They talked specifically about that, that they have this major task force. It is being headed up by Brian Fleming, who so happens to be a former assistant to the Prime Minister. Naturally his federalist views are going to come into play in that regard. And that concerns me a great deal, that with Halifax planning and the connections between this particular group into the Prime Minister's office in Canada, what kind of deals are going to be made. Is Newfoundland going to be bypassed totally and completely with respect to offshore oil and gas? I am more scared by the day, Mr. Speaker, that the procrastination by this government, the refusal by this government to negotiate, the antagonistic way it approaches Ottawa is going to do untold damage to this Province in future and we could lose out because of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. F. WHITE:

So, Mr. Speaker, it is time we found out from the government what their plans are. They just cannot sit idly over there and let things happen and take their natural course because the forces are too great, they are too great for us to continue to contend with, Mr. Speaker, the forces are too great.

MR. F. WHITE: I read an article recently in Fortune magazine where Southern Oil of California, who are inter-connected with the companies involved here, they make it plain they can hardly wait for the day to come when oil comes off the Grand Banks so the dependency on the Arab nations will be decreased. The article was entitled 'Social Looks Homeward,' calling the Grand Banks home for them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those are huge forces at play. Mobile Oil, one of the largest conglomerates in the world, how long are they going to sit around waiting for this government to come to terms with Ottawa? And that is the key issue; the companies will not undertake in my opinion, and in the opinion of a lot of other people, a lot of experts, I might add, Mr. Speaker, the opinion is that the companies will not plan to get involved to put the Hibernia onstream, to start production until a settlement is reached between this government and the government in Ottawa. The government here cannot procrastinate any longer. We have to see some evidence that they are concerned enough to want to start negotiations because I think the federal government are prepared to negotiate in a meaningful way if they see some indication from this government that they are prepared to negotiate as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I give the government full credit for the things they have done they should also take the blame for the things they have not done. I mentioned the training programme earlier; it should be started. We cannot continue any longer to do without this major training programme. Young people all over Newfoundland want to be trained and, Mr. Speaker, even if no oil exists on the Grand Banks, the training will not hurt those young Newfoundlanders because they could elsewhere and use their training. They could go

MR. F. WHITE: to other parts of Canada and use their training if they are not kept out because of the policies that are adopted by this government here.

And I also say to the government, guard against being bypassed and let us make sure that we are covered on every issue. And the only way to do that, Mr. Speaker, is for this government to enter into serious negotiations with Ottawa, serious negotiations and come to an agreement as quickly as possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member for Burgeo -

Bay d' Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit surprised. I know it is only about a little over a year since I have been sitting in this chair, but all day yesterday and all day today, and I think all day this week, the hon. members on this side of the House have been accused of playing politics.

MR. ANDREWS: Are the hon. member on the other side ashamed of their chosen profession? Because this is what we are, politicians, and this is a very political issue that we are dealing with here because our dearly beloved friends in Ottawa are also playing politics with this, the worse and most serious kind of politics, the type of politics that will leave us continually poor in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: And I think if we are going to play politics we should play better politics than they are playing up there and I think that we have it in the cards to do it.

I am also a little bit surprised, Mr. Speaker, in the ability of the Opposition to support this resolution brought in by my dear friend from Placentia (Mr. Patterson). Yesterday most of the members on the other side of the House voted against a resolution that would have settled this issue, that I believe could have settled this issue if the Trudeau administration in Ottawa would only listen to this Province, and that was to enshrine this very thing in the constitution. That would rule out the necessity of a court case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: I am not a lawyer, but I believe that would rule out the necessity of a court case in this matter. If this was enshrined in the constitution there would be no need for a court case, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on! Right on!

MR. ANDREWS: The Premier in his motion called for confirmation of provincial rights to offshore resources to be enshrined in the Constitution of Canada. The Opposition to a man, minus one, voted against that. So in other words they are telling us that they do not want it enshrined or they do not believe that we own it. I find that hard to believe. The

MR. ANDREWS: hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. R. Moores) wants to go to court. He said that today. The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) does not want to go to court. He wants a settlement out of court.

We had a situation with the First Ministers' meeting in Ottawa on the constitution that all ten provinces, all ten governments except one government, the federal government in Ottawa, agreed on Newfoundland's stand on the offshore. Ottawa does not. The ten provinces, the ten provincial governments of this nation wanted it enshrined in the constitution. The P.C. federal party in this country want it enshrined in the constitution. The P.C. Government of Newfoundland want it enshrined in the constitution. The Liberal Opposition in Newfoundland does not want it enshrined in the constitution, therefore they are saying that we do not own it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: You are saying that we do not own it.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are not saying that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: We did not say it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I wanted to make a comment when the hon. member takes his seat. There are times as everybody is aware when interjections and interruptions by members on both sides of the House are an accepted practice of parliamentary tradition, and when that appears to be the case and it is done with the acquiescence of members speaking, then the Chair will not interrupt. But when it becomes excessive and loud, that could tend to lead to disorder in the House. And in that particular instance the Chair will interject. I would ask hon. members to restrain

MR. SPEAKER: themselves and ask the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) to continue his speech.

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There was some mention made today also about the lack of planning by this government and I will certainly oppose that statement, Mr. Speaker. The oil and gas regulations that are in place, the Petroleum Directorate that is in place and operable right now and the thinking amongst the members of the government on this side as I talk to them on a fairly constant basis with regard to this very important subject is that we do have a good handle on what is happening. Certainly there are going to be mistakes made. It is very difficult to predict what the next oil well will bring forth. If it brings forth another 50,000 barrels a day tomorrow morning watch out, things are going to happen very quickly. But the mechanism is in place, the mechanism is so well in place that was adopted at the drop of a pin by the government of Nova Scotia because they could not improve on it one little bit.

I travelled with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and other people, including a member from the Opposition, to Scotland this past

MR. DINN: Summer, and I have been there twice before, the fishing industry on the mainland of Scotland certainly did suffer. It suffered considerably. It was very localized in places like Aberdeen and Peterhead where there was direct confrontation with the oil companies, and the fishing companies in many cases were forced out and forced to move to other places. This is a very big danger, Mr. Speaker, a very big danger for us in Newfoundland, and I would, at this point in time, like to bring it down to a very particular issue and that is the proposal by the DAC group of companies to establish in Mortier Bay.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) should take note of these words that I am going to say now. If the DAC group go to Mortier Bay there is a potential disaster for the traditional industry on the Burin Peninsula, and that is the fishing industry. I have been told that 2,800 unskilled jobs are at stake if this goes ahead on the Burin Peninsula. These jobs are the unskilled jobs in the fish plants, the packing plants, the fish plant workers, the trimmers. The danger lies in this, Mr. Speaker, that such a highly sophisticated, high-paying industry will be able to attract almost - more than almost - all plus skilled tradesmen on the Burin Peninsula. Every stationary engineer, every foreman and every middle management type will be attracted to this construction job. I believe that we must remember that this activity is just that, a construction job, and the further away these construction jobs are from traditional industries and established industries, the better it will be for Newfoundland.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) your district.

MR. DINN: I was going to suggest one possible location would be Bay d'Espoir, but if I had said that I would be accused of being political. Far be it from

MR. DINN: me to be political with my own district. But places like Bay d'Espoir, Mr. Speaker, are good locations for that. They have the geography, they have the unemployment and they have the people who are willing to work, but more important, whether it goes to Bay d'Espoir or not, is the danger of such a massive construction job taking away traditional - and ruining traditional industries, because the fishing industry is only beginning now to come into its own in its ability to pay good wages and give good working conditions to both fishermen and plant workers. I would advise the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) to take that quite seriously.

Mr. Speaker, that is about all I have to say to this motion. I am glad to see that the Opposition is supporting the main motion with a phrase, I think, one phrase changed to eliminate the word 'Conservative' and put in 'this hon. House'. So with those few remarks I will take my seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House call it six o'clock and adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to adjourn the debate (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: Adjourning the debate and just call it six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there an objection?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

On a point of order, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

Well, not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, but if the hon. gentleman is not going to speak in the debate, I am prepared to speak in the debate. I was looking forward to doing so -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. STAGG:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! With respect to the point of order, I recognize the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just going on the rules that we have been practising, when it has usually got around ten to six for the past

MR. HISCOCK:

several days, we have called it 6:00, so I was following in that tradition, not from the point of undermining the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to cut into his speaking, I am sure next Wednesday he will have as much time to speak as any other members of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to this Resolution, it has been pointed out by many speakers on this side that the Resolution itself has been a long-standing Liberal Resolution. And the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) informed me while the member for Placentia was speaking that every year - and if it was not every year then at least every two years - a joint motion of this House was sent to Ottawa on claiming the offshore ownership and rights and control for this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: A joint Resolution by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and also by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was put forward to this House to go to Ottawa, and the present House Leader ended up saying, 'Delete the word 'Liberal Government' or 'Liberal convention' at that time. And that was deleted and it was supported.

So I am very glad to see that this House itself is supporting this Resolution from the point of view of taking it outside the realm of politics and putting it in the realm of what one would call sacred rights or our rights as a Province and saying that the offshore resources control and development is the birthright of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) pointed out that that when it was pointed out to him that Mr. Smallwood back in 1964 with two professors went out and laid a plaque on the Grand Banks, he ended up saying, 'Well, he only did that from the grandstand of publicizing and getting exposure.'

I would like to also point out with our Premier that that was the case and it was a case of giving out oil permits to - like rock candy, he called it. It was not too long ago when in a grandstanding the Premier was going to go down to the boundary between Labrador and Quebec and have a grandstand. So when it comes to grandstanding, I do not think it really matters when it comes down to the crunch. This party under various leaders and various M.H.A.s in the past have said that the offshore resource is ours and we can control it.

One of the things that I am always amused at, as the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) pointed out, is that we are accusing the government of being political and that we should take this outside the realm of politics. I am surprised from the point of view that when the Premier goes on television let us take this outside the realm of politics, of sacred rights. So it is a two-way thing. There is such a thing as 'outside the realm of politics' and most people in this Province would agree that instead of having the confrontation issues, instead of having the problems we are having with the offshore, we should come to some agreement between the federal and provincial governments and solve the problem once and for all.

With the environmental conferences here in St. John's now, one of the things that I was rather

MR. HISCOCK: surprised to hear is that there will not be a pipeline coming from Hibernia into some area of this Province. Because of the terrain it is totally impossible. So, as a result, you are going to see tankers go out by the wells, load up, and now the question is, Where do they go?

MR. HICKEY: First they pay their royalties.

MR. HISCOCK: Even if they pay a royalty, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, it will be shown continually in my various speeches that when I will be giving a speech in this House I will not be asking anybody to interrupt me by permitting a question,

MR. HISCOCK: and I will not be interrupting anybody on the other side by permitting a question or asking one. So if the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) wants to ask a question, I suggest that he jot it down and when he gets up to make a point then he will make that point then. But with regard to the royalties -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - with regard to the royalties my question is, if it happens that you are going to go in the tankers and then where are they going to go? Are they going to go down to the Eastern Seaboard? Are they going to go over to Europe? Are they going to go to Nova Scotia or to Montreal or whatever? Or are they going to come to Come By Chance? The questions that the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) ended up asking the Minister of Mines and Energy, these are the questions we want to know. We want to know what is going to be happening with the oil and gas off the coast. Are we going to get the maximum benefits? Are we going to get, as the Premier is saying, that we are going to bring it in and we are going to have infrastructure? What is the sense of going down to Mortier Bay or down in Argenticia or Bay Roberts or Harbour Grace if they are going to turn around and go out to the well head, take it in the tanker and go on?

MR. HICKEY: We would like to know what your position is.

MR. HISCOCK: My position is the position of this resolution and that basically is the ownership, the control of the resource belongs to this Province. And we have been saying this in the past and we will be saying this in the future .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: And I will go so far as to say, Mr. Speaker, that this side of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador will have to continually say it to the members on the government side, will have to still say it after this resolution is jointly sent to Ottawa like it was under the House Leader, Mr. Marshall and Mr. Barry and Mr. Roberts. We said it then and we will say it now. But in two weeks down the line I will have some minister or some other private member asking one member over here, what is your position. I suppose we will have to turn around and write it in - what?

MR. WHITE: Write it in oil.

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the questions in - Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate and call it six o'clock, one minute to.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three of the clock.