

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

With respect to the amendment proposed yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition and on which I reserved my ruling, I would like to quote the following authorities and direct members' attention to them. I might say to hon. members at the outset that this matter is one of those questions of degree which always presents a difficult problem to the Chair. First of all I quote Standing Order 36 which states, "A Motion may be amended: (a) by leaving out certain words; (b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words; (c) by inserting or adding other words."

This amendment falls into category (b).

Secondly, Beauchesne, 5th Edition, Page 153, Paragraph 425 says, "The object of an amendment may be to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability, or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the question." It appears to me the purpose in this amendment coincides with this reference in Beauchesne, "That the object is to effect such an alteration in the Motion that it could obtain the support of those who could or would not support it in its original form!" So it appears to me that it is within the general principle and purpose of amendments as referred to specifically by Beauchesne in Paragraph 425.

And finally, I quote Erskine

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): May's Parliamentary Practice, 19th Edition, Page 387, and I quote, "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability, or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question."

The latter purpose may be effected by moving to omit all or most of the words of the question after the first word and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the purpose both of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under the consideration of the House as alternative propositions. Thus, having considered the matter thoroughly, I rule the amendment proposed yesterday by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to the motion then before the House, is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERSMR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I would like to make a formal statement, Mr. Speaker, in response to the recent report of the Economic Council of Canada.

The report of the Economic Council of Canada entitled, "Newfoundland, from Dependency to Self-Reliance" is now under intensive study by officials of my government and will be the subject of discussion in Cabinet and caucus, after which time a formal and detailed reaction will be given.

I would sincerely like to be positive in my initial reaction to the study as one can sense in it a general concern for this Province, its people and our economic situation.

However, while most of the Economic Council's recommendations appear well meaning (and some acceptable), the document as a whole appears fatally flawed, both technically and intellectually. It appears to be imbued with the same approach to social and economic development in this Province which has been characteristic of the past and which led, for instance, to programs like resettlement.

In one sense, however, the report serves the people of the Province well in that it defines the scope of our economic disparity, something which all of us through our own personal lives are very much aware of, but which unfortunately do not appear real enough to our fellow Canadians to galvanize them into the action needed to solve those problems. This report, in that respect, will certainly help in making our case to the Canadian people.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Having said that, however, I would like to take great issue with the approach which the Economic Council has used in searching for solutions to our problems. Throughout the document there are concepts of pseudo-centralization; user pay on the Gulf ; 'agglomeration economics', (under which we are told 'not to force the creation of jobs in outports' if within 'commuting distance of urban centres'); a pro-urbanization bias; an emphasis on offshore trawlers instead of the inshore fishery; severe limited entry proposals for fishermen; proposals for drastic changes in unemployment insurance benefits; and even a proposal for an 'early retirement program' for 'working age people born before 1925 who have been long-term residents of Newfoundland and who have limited education'. All of these are ideas which run counter to what I believe to be the real desires of the people of this Province.

The Economic Council would

PREMIER PECKFORD: have us believe that because of natural, and thus inevitable, economic forces which are at work, these are like policies must necessarily be adopted. This is just not so, we are, if we wish, masters of our own fates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: That is the first statement you made I agree with.

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'Whilst still the light holds out to burn/The vilest sinner may return.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Council has conveniently avoided addressing itself directly to three great issues facing this Province today and upon whose resolution our economic well-being will, in part, depend.

The Council states that "it is not indifferent to conflicts of interest between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia over offshore fishing rights, between Newfoundland and Quebec over access to Labrador power and the price of its hydro electricity or between Newfoundland and Canada over ownership of its offshore resources."

Having said this, and having commented upon the nature and magnitude of the economic losses which unfavourable policies in these areas bring, and having in particular demonstrated quite clearly the unreasonableness of federal offshore revenue proposals, it goes on to avoid recommendations in these areas as "matters of political jurisdiction or points of law. These are clearly beyond our field of competence."

While the Council feels that these three crucial matters are beyond "their field of competence,"

November 19, 1980

Tape No. 2234

SD - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: We also have important documents relating to constitutional change and will eventually have a report from the Royal Commission on the

PREMIER PECKFORD: inshore fishery, particularly as it relates to licencing policies. These documents could form the basis of widespread debate in the Province and my government stands ready to assist any group or individual who wishes to debate these matters and make recommendations on them. We should all remember that this Province has in its natural resources a source of wealth which can either be the basis of a better and brighter future for our people or put in motion events by others which may destroy this society. It is up to us to ensure that this does not happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the Economic Council of Canada joins the long list of enemies of the Premier. He has now got another enemy to fight.

AN HON. MEMBER: Enemies of Newfoundland.

MR. STIRLING: And it should be remembered that the Premier was a member of the Cabinet and this previous administration; it is one more stamp, they did not like anything that was done by the previous administration that they were members of. It is one more nail in the coffin of Mr. Moores, one more thing that he did which has to be rejected outright without debate. The Premier did not appoint the Economic Council of Canada; that was done by another Premier while he was in the Cabinet. And presumably the same minister who made a comment a minute ago agreed that it was not a bad idea when they asked the Economic Council of Canada to undertake the study.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may say that many of the comments of my colleagues in caucus were very much

MR. STIRLING: the same as the Premier's comments made a few minutes ago except that they said, 'Let us not rip this apart today. Let us take a look at it. Let us study it in depth. Just because as a Newfoundlander we feel that there are some things that they are questioning that we want to reject, let us take a look at it. Let us have a fresh look. Let us look at it from the point of view of people who were invited in by this Province' - they were invited by this Cabinet and they were saying, 'Look, come in and take a close look at Newfoundland, use your expertise, and give us an outside view.' The purpose of the study was not to give us a Newfoundland view, it was to give us an outside view.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we see another step in the long list of if it does not agree with the Premier's total concept, if he did not think of it first, if it is a view that conflicts in any way, then throw it out, it is all garbage. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have to

MR. L. STIRLING:

do in this House is that we have to take a look at views that do not necessarily agree with our views. And I would like to say and again repeat that the immediate reaction of some of my colleagues was very similiar to the Premier's, but they had the maturity and they had the foresight to say that we should take a look at this outside view and that we should look at it from an objective perspective of somebody looking at Newfoundland, and not reject it outright but to debate it. And I am glad that the Premier has mentioned his own Five Year Plan and I hope then at least that the Five Year Plan can be brought into this House and that we can be given the opportunity to have sane, sensible, sound debate . I hope that other studies will not get just thrown in the garbage because on first glance the Premier does not happen to like it in its entirety. I think that this is indicative of one of the reasons why we have an absolute breakdown with everybody with whom we used to have a relationship. We now are not talking to Ottawa, we are not talking to Nova Scotia, we are not talking to Quebec, we are not talking to any federal former Prime Ministers, we are not talking to anybody who does not agree absolutely and totally with the Premier and his comments.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that while we agree with some of the immediate, they are the immediate reactions of a Newfoundlander or a Labradorian and we should take a reasoned, sensible look at this before rejecting the whole concept.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Any further statements?

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I have another nail in the coffin that the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to. Hon. members may recall that during the consideration of estimates in one of the committees, hon. members asked for a review of the new Family Court and the statistics and general report on its progress. I mentioned at the time that an overall periodic review had not been completed at that time but as soon as it was I would pass it on, and I do that now.

As hon. members might recall, the Unified Family Court began operation in St. John's on June 18th., 1979. That is a significant date in terms of the Unified Family Court and in other matters as well. It is a three year pilot project which serves the city of St. John's and the surrounding area within a forty kilometer radius of the city, including Bell Island. The court is a division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and has comprehensive jurisdiction over family matters such as divorce, custody, access, maintenance, adoption, child protection and sections of the Criminal Code relating to inter-spousal and intra-familial disputes. A single judge presides over these matters, Mr. Justice Fagan. And revised divorce rules, new rules, of course, and centralization of court files have also been part of the organization of the judicial system relating to family law matters. I should say I do not have copies of this made now but it is not a controversial matter and I will have them available, certainly in a very short period after and will distribute them to hon. members.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Services attached to the court include the maintenance enforcement section and the social service section. As a matter of fact, in a sense the court is at an intersection of the administration of Justice and Social Services; it has functions relating to both.

The maintenance enforcement service looks after the receipt and disbursement of maintenance payments as well as the automatic enforcements of maintenance orders in the event of default, and that particular procedure is going very well.

During the past year the Department of Social Services has arranged with the court to undertake enforcement of maintenance orders for deserted and separated spouses who receive social assistance, and that also is working very well.

In the first year of operation the court has collected about \$160,000 on account of maintenance. The projected collection figure to June 15, 1981 is \$320,000, and it is anticipated that by June 15, 1982 when the pilot project ends, the collection figure may reach \$700,000 annually. So there used to be quite a serious problem in terms of maintenance due to be paid and not being paid has not totally been solved, but is largely alleviated by the system whereby these payments are now made to the court.

The Social Services section of the court provides a number of services, family and marital counselling, conciliation, investigation and referral to outside agencies. The intake service is the main point of entry into the court system and during the first year of operation 1,390 clients were seen by a counsellor who channels clients through the courts.

The counselling service provides counselling to families or individuals who have financial, marital

MR. OTTENHEIMER: or child related problems. In the first year of operation, 182 clients were seen for counselling. The conciliation service is intended to aid clients in bringing about settlement of specific issues such as custody, access, maintenance, and property. To date, 69 clients have been offered conciliation services through the Social Service arm of the family court.

The investigative service which can be used in matters of custody, access, and wardship provides the judge with investigative reports and recommendations regarding the living arrangements that will serve the best interests of children concerned. There have been 15 court ordered investigations in the past year.

The Crisis Counselling Service is a demonstration project within the court which is funded by Health and Welfare Canada. This service, which began in March 1980, provides counselling to family members who are involved in a severe crisis, usually in some aspect of family violence. To date 206 clients have been seen for counselling in this area. The Family Crisis Counsellor project is placing great emphasis on the mobilization of community resources toward creation of new services to victims of intra-family violence. The counsellor is assisting in the development of proposals for a transition house for victims of violence and is investigating the possibility of the establishment of an after hours crisis line. Also in the planning stages are the creation of a

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Citizens' Committee on Family Violence and a Psychiatric Family Clinic. The Unified Family Court project is being continually evaluated by a research team from Memorial University which reports to a Committee which is responsible to the Minister of Justice. It is our hope that this project will prove to be very worthwhile for the citizens of the Province which it is designed to serve and that it will help to provide humane and constructive solutions to very difficult family problems. I might just add that within the past approximately three weeks I have on two occasions had an opportunity to visit the Family Court and there is no doubt in my mind that those involved in it are doing a very worthwhile service. And in the area as well of young offenders, juvenile offenders, they have developed a mediator system where volunteers from the community work with young people who have been in conflict with the law and it would appear that certainly the Family Court integrated approach to problems of family and young offenders is a progressive and a very worthwhile step forward. And certainly in the best of my knowledge and in my judgement, during its first approximately year and a half of operation the Family Court seems to be serving the people in the area very well indeed.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have to take the minister's word for it that that was a report of something that we would support. It sounded good but since we did not have a copy of it—I would like to get the minister's attention if I can. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister, and the House Leader and the Premier to get together to tighten up this procedure a little bit. If a Ministerial Statement is important enough to make and yet is not so urgent that it

MR. STIRLING: has to be dashed into the House, the very least that could be done is that time could be taken to give us a copy in advance so that we can make a reasonable response. I think what the minister had to say was a very good report on something that we would like to support, but I am sure that the minister realizes that he mumbled out something that none of us could follow and I really do believe that on a question of procedure that if something is important enough to be brought in, it should be important enough to give us an advance copy so that we can make some kind of reasonable comment on it. And I would like to support him in this, what sounds like a positive report. We would like to see more things done in the way of proper counselling and assistance and the development of the Crisis Center. But it does require that we get at least the courtesy of having the information far enough in advance. And I would hope that the senior people over there would at least say, 'Look, if we cannot get it ready in time to give the Opposition an advance copy of it two minutes before we speak, then we should save it for the next day,' Mr. Speaker.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Could I just comment on the hon. Leader's comments, which I think the rules permit?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Certainly whenever there is anything of any controversial nature I have always made copies available

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

to the opposite side and in cases of this nature it certainly is not required by the laws, nor do I regard it as any discourtesy. To take the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's remarks to their ultimate conclusion, before any hon. member made a speech he would have to distribute copies of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: I read this morning, Mr. Speaker, an ad that I thought was our ad; it says, 'Do not talk about the constitution, talk about bread and butter issues.' Then I saw that it was signed by the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, the question I have for the Premier is, is this advertising campaign and mailout and bringing in all of the news media, is that being paid for by the PC Party or is it being paid for by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is impossible today for it to be an ad to which the Liberal Party of Newfoundland can align itself because yesterday in an amendment to the constitution they have rejected offshore, rejected fisheries -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - rejected hydro-transmission, so the party opposite is no longer interested in bread and butter issues, they are only interested in other theoretical things

PREMIER PECKFORD: and have no interest in the totality of approach as it relates to the constitution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - they have now sold out Newfoundland again. The lower will be the same as the upper, and the fish will be ignored, and hydro-transmission will be ignored.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The great Liberal policies of the past have continued to this day even under this new leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, and to get to the substance of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks, I hope, and question, yes, this ad campaign is being paid for by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Would the Premier advise, since it is a political campaign as evidenced by his opening remarks and his misinterpretation of the amendment yesterday, and also an indication of how honourable and great and wonderful and unanimous we are going to be in this House because we happened to bring in an amendment that specifically picks up the two issues that -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I am afraid that we are beginning to drift into a fair bit of debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did not rule the Premier out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We are beginning to drift into a fair area of debate. I believe the question perhaps was provocative and maybe that is why there was some

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): debate earlier. I would ask the hon. member please to ask the question that he has to ask and not to enter into the area of debate.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, as always I have great confidence in your ability to control both sides of the House, and no doubt will intercede if the answer gets out of hand as well. Dealing specifically with the question,

MR. STIRLING: a supplementary question,
can the Premier advise this House whether or not a Budget has been set up? What is the total amount of the Budget to be spent on an advertising campaign which is essentially an anti-Canadian campaign?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, you know, that is a very offensive question, especially in its latter part. Just let me say that all the advertising that we are doing is being done in-house, and we have not hired any firm or anything to do it, in order to keep costs down. The brochure that has been put out to all the households has been done in-house so that we do not waste any money; so have all the ads and so have the radio ads as well. The largest sum of money spent to date was on postage for the brochure, which was somewhere around \$9,000 just for the postage for 155,000 households. We are budgeting about \$20,000 in total for the ad campaign. I regret that the Leader of the Opposition sees fit to continue to try to put appellations upon me and other members of this administration as being anti-Canadian. I regret that he takes that approach.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I can only go by the tone of the advertising campaign. If a business were to put out the same kind of material as was put out in the booklet, it would be charged with misleading advertising. I presume that the Premier would not submit it to the Better Business Bureau for approval.

The supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is, Is this the top priority in spending by the Province? Instead of spending money, say, on roads or unemployment, is this the top

MR. STIRLING: priority, the top \$20,000
must be spent on this advertising campaign? Is this the number
one campaign, number one priority of the Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend, as
long as I am a member of this House, to get involved in personal
attack and I will resist every opportunity and every attack that
is put on me by the Leader of the Opposition or anybody there to
become involved in personalities. I respect the Leader of the
Opposition as a leader of a political party in this House and in
this Province. I will continue to debate the issues but I shall
never, as long as I am here, impugn motives or otherwise personally
attack any hon. member on the opposite side of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I ask him to -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the
Leader of the Opposition.

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

Nothing in any of the questions that I asked indicated anything
in the way of a personal attack and if the Premier would care to
check with Hansard, he has gotten away from what was the question.
The question is, Is this the top priority of this government to
spend the first

MR. L. STIRLING: \$20,000 that it has on an advertising campaign. I have never attacked anyone personally since I have been involved in politics for ten years and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. L. STIRLING: - I am suggesting that there was nothing in that question that was a personal attack.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order - it is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I would rule that in this particular case there is no point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. L. Stirling) has taken an opportunity, as well as the Premier, to clarify their positions and would rule that it is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I refer the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I do not know how far through the Five Year Plan he is yet -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - but if he would turn to the Fiscal Review and Outlook of Chapter III on page 29 and move through that, he will find that the current account revenues and the way we spend our money and our expenditure targets is clearly outlined on those pages, showing a budget rising from \$1.2 billion in 1980-81 to \$1.8 billion by 1984-85. And then if he wants to go to the back of the Five Year Plan, Appendix A, he will find the development targets of where we are going to be spending our money. The \$20,000 that I have referred to is hopefully not the first \$20,000 that we spent this year. One would like to think that since the Budget was brought down in March that there has been a lot of money spent, say half a billion dollars or more

PREMIER PECKFORD: on very valuable projects around this Province. So I would commend the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Stirling) attention to this Five Year Plan and to Chapter III, which clearly outlines that of the \$1.5 billion that we will spend this year a very miniscule part will go towards trying to ensure that we are treated equally in this Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: A supplementary question to the Leader of the Opposition, it can be addressed to the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. H. Young) or to the Premier, and that basically relates to the type of government that we have in our Province, whether it is a democratic, monarchy government or are we going towards a presidential system. And the question I have to ask is that pictures that are now being put up in various government departments by the photographer here in Newfoundland, which is the most expensive photographer in Newfoundland, Rostotski, large pictures of the Premier, is this coming out of taxpayers' money or is it coming out of the PC Party fund?

MR. S. NEARY: President Peckford.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the only response I can give to that is that in our White Paper that we produced, Towards the Twenty-First Century Together, I would commend the hon. gentleman's mind to that because we say on page 3 of that at the outset it is important, and I quote from the White Paper, to indicate the fundamental principles upon which the constitutional position of the Government of Newfoundland is based, "The government believes the following to be of fundamental importance, parliamentary democracy, balanced federalism, equality of opportunity for provinces and people and consensus. Under Parliamentary Democracy,

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'The Government of Newfoundland, reflecting the view of the people of the Province, believes that the constitutional monarchy should continue as the basis of sovereignty and parliamentary democracy with the federal and provincial governments.' So that therefore, we have gone on record in our white paper as fully supporting parliamentary democracy and the role of the monarchy in ongoing political frameworks in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: I ended up asking a question whether they were being paid by the PC Party or the Newfoundland Government; it was not answered.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is not a point of order. A minister has the right to refuse to answer a question or answer it in whichever way he is pleased to. But in no way is it a point of order.

The hon. Minister of Public Works.
Do you want to address the question to the Minister of Public Works?

MR. E. HISCOCK: I already did to the Premier or Minister of Public Works.

MR. H. YOUNG: As the hon. member has asked me about the Premier's picture that is in my office -

MR. E. HISCOCK: Not only in your office.

MR. H. YOUNG: - well, all over the Province.

Well, the one that is in my office was framed by the people in my department, like I did some framing for the hon. member the other day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A point of order, the hon.

member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the pictures that were framed the other day were of the Queen Elizabeth visit when she came here during 1978 that I made as an official presentation to the Community Council down in Mary's Harbour on their fiftieth anniversary.

MR. SPEAKER:

I appreciate that information but it is not a point order.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance, Sir. We heard just a few moments ago the government make all kinds of commitments in spending money - yes, in committing themselves to spend money, but they are not so quick in paying their bills. The number of complaints that have been reaching my desk recently, Mr. Speaker, indicate that some of the governments bills, invoices that have been sent to the government, especially by small businesses and small contractors, are outstanding for as long as four months, certainly over three months. The complaints are increasing and I would like to ask the minister what the problem is. Is it a procedural problem? Does it take a long time to process the invoices or is the government strapped for money?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to respond to that unless one gets some specifics and if the hon. member has particular problems with a particular invoice I will be only too pleased to have that investigated and then I can give a definitive answer. But in a general way, I might

DR. J. COLLINS: state this that sometimes government ends up with bills to pay and these bills can come in a number of ways; bills can be sent, say, to a vocational school for books or whatever, and that vocational school will then have to process the invoice, that invoice will then have to go to a department - in that particular probably the Department of Education; the Department of Education will have to carry out a certain number of procedures there, it is then sent to the Department of Finance and that voucher then is processed in the Department of Finance. Now we would have no control over certain aspects of that. We would have no control over how the vocational school would handle that. The Department of Education, of course, would take over control when it reaches them and when Finance gets into the act, we have control there.

In other instances, a bill will come in to a department; there is some doubt or difficulty about the bill, there has to be a certain amount of investigation carried out before that department can validate the bill and then the department will send that to Finance where it is processed. So there are a number of instances where difficulties can arise and, as I said at the beginning, it is difficult for me to answer specifically unless I know the circumstances involved.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: I am not going to give the hon. gentleman specific instances. Anybody who comes to me I refer him to the hon. gentleman's department. It would not be fair for me to give names of businesses, but I have getting phone calls and representation from small companies and businesses that are on the brink of bankruptcy.

MR. S. NEARY: They are teetering on the brink of bankruptcy with that bills that are overdue, that have been due for the last three or four months. And in some cases when they do approach the department they get emergency payments which bail them temporarily. But the minister knows that this is the general policy of his department and what is he doing about it to save some of these companies the embarrassment of having to be forced to go to the bank for loans or even to think about declaring bankruptcy because they cannot meet their bills? I am talking about commitments directly from government departments, not from the vocational schools or the other institutions although that is a problem too.

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what I have said already that if the hon. member has some difficulties, if he directs them to the department we will take care of them. He does not have to give me the names himself, he can just say to the people who contact him, 'You have a problem, phone the Department of Finance'. And I can give the hon. member an assurance that we will

DR. COLLINS: take it from there and give it immediate attention. Now, I can, though, give the assurance to the hon. member along this line, that any vouchers, any validated vouchers that come to the Department of Finance for payment, and I make that point, any validated vouchers that come to the department for payment, it is seldom that we take more than two weeks to get the payment out.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would say it is a very poor way to do business, to have to send people down begging and pleading to the officials in the department, and sometimes appeal to the minister and his deputy, to get their bills paid after three or four months. I think that is a pretty sloppy way to do business. But I want to ask the hon. gentleman, in my final supplementary, if the government pays interest on outstanding debts? Do they pay - a bill that is overdue, say, by a couple or three, or four months, will the recipient be paid interest on the money that is owed him by the government for the length of time that they keep the money in their possession?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there are interest payments on the bills that are outstanding. This has applied in the past. It is now very seldom necessary. Because as I indicated to the hon. member, that once the invoices are validated they are processed within a very short period of time.

MR. NEARY: Yes. But how long does it take to validate them? That is the problem.

DR. COLLINS: The validation -

MR. NEARY: It could take four months.

DR. COLLINS: - will depend on the
circumstances.

MR. NEARY: I see.

DR. COLLINS: If a bill comes in and there
are inaccuracies in it, often that bill has to go back to
the firm sending in the bill -

MR. NEARY: I see. The stall.

DR. COLLINS: - and that can take as much
time as that firms take to -

MR. NEARY: The stall.

DR. COLLINS: - correct the inaccuracies.

MR. NEARY: And they do not pay them
within two weeks, by the way.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Could the minister explain
to the House, Mr. Speaker, why it is that after a voucher
has gone up from one of the departments, Recreation,
Forestry, any department, for payment; having validated
the claim, having the invoice validated and requesting
payment from Finance, that it is still taken as high as
three months for Finance to issue that cheque? And if the
minister wants me to document cases of that having happened,
I can document it. Why is it it takes Finance three months
to pay the bills after they have been validated?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as soon as the
hon. member gives me details on which I can make an
investigation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Look into - check with the

MR. FLIGHT: Minister of Recreation.

DR. COLLINS: I cannot make an investigation on vague allusions, or vague suggestions. I would not even know how to investigate something like that. I need a name, a number, I need something. I cannot investigate something that is so vague and so obscure that I would not even know where to start. So as soon as the hon. member gives me something -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - to even begin - he does not have to give me very much - give me even just a hint and I will do my very best.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is directed to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). Mr. Speaker, I understand it has been about five years since the Newfoundland Status of Women has been aspiring to have assistance from the minister's department in an effort to establish a transition home for battered wives. I am wondering if the minister at this time could tell the House of Assembly, this hon. House, that funds will be made available in the very near future.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, we have got a request from the Status of Women's Council with regard to this issue and I think the best I can say is that I have no money in my budget.

MR. STIRLING: Why did you not take the \$20,000 that has been wasted on the ad campaign.

MR. HICKEY: Can you just allow me the courtesy of allowing me to finish -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: I know the hon. gentleman is not used to the decorum of the House, he is not here that long.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: But, you know, if I will -

MR. BRETT: He is only a new leader.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, before the interruption I was about to enlarge a little bit upon my answer. The Status of Women's Council, or a spokesman for that group, just a few days ago indicated publicly that they had received encouragement from my department, that I had no money in my budget, that I was pursuing the matter with my colleagues in

MR. HICKEY:

Education, Health and Justice, and that I would get back to them as soon as I had the results of those discussions and a decision by Treasury Board.

I think I can say that it is the government's wish to take some positive action on this very critical area. We acknowledge the need and we also acknowledge the continued efforts of the Status of Women's Council over the years to bring about this Crisis Centre, or transition house, and I think it is sufficient for me to say now that government is determined to do something, but how much money we can gather together at this point in time and when it will be available I am unable to say; but the minute I get the information I will pass it on to the appropriate organization.

MR. BENNETT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

for St. Barbe.

A supplementary, the hon. member

MR. BENNETT:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, either I am a little bit hard of hearing or the hon. gentleman is not speaking very clearly, I find it very difficult -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is not very clear, boy.

MR. BENNETT:

- to hear way over on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker. But my information tells me that this has been an ongoing plea by the Status of Women for at least five years to have assistance. And I also understand, Mr. Speaker, that a house is available to the Newfoundland Status of Women and if they do not get the co-operation, not only verbally but financially, they are going to lose the opportunity, as well as a lot of courage they have, in aspiring to help your department, Sir, in providing a home for battered women. If the minister does not have at this time, Mr. Speaker, these funds available, at what time might the Status of Women Group expect to have funding made available?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, it is obviously because of the very points my hon. friend is making, the fact that there is a piece of property available, and the fact that there is some urgency to the situation right now that prompts me to discuss with my colleagues the prospect of a co-operative effort among four departments as opposed to one.

I acknowledge that the Department of Social Services has direct responsibility for this area. I acknowledge also the necessity and the support that such a programme would be to my department. But I have to again repeat what I have said before, I do not have sufficient funds in my budget to cover this project and therefore I am unable to respond in a definitive way at this time. We are having some discussion and I will not know for a week or so just what the result of those discussions will be.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Transportation, and it is concerning the Straits Road on the Labrador Coast, as well as all roads within my district. For the past two weeks we have had severe heavy rain and as a result there have been major washouts in all of these smaller communities, particularly in the Straits area. Because of lack of maintenance by the department we have had eighteen washouts from Pinware to Red Bay. We have had bridges washed out and we have also had people leave their cars and trucks and had to take boats from one community to the other where it was under water. The question I would like to ask the minister, could he report what progress has been made and will there be any extra funds given for road maintenance, to upgrade these roads to at least a minimum standard?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot give the hon. gentleman any detailed report as to how many feet or miles of road have been repaired in the last week or so since we had the washouts. All I know is that we have been working diligently on that section of road to try to make it passable. What has happened in the last two or three weeks you would never conjure up in your wildest dreams. Who would have ever thought that you would have a flood in Labrador in November? So needless to say this caught us quite unawares, a lot of our machinery was in getting ready for the Winter maintenance, but I have no doubt at all that the road will be made passable and if the present weather conditions - there is an old cliché which says it is a bad wind that does not blow somebody good and I suppose the only good thing that came out of this was that maybe Mr. Rompkey, our federal member in Ottawa, this might help impress upon him the need for him to get off his prosterior and see if he cannot get some money out of his colleagues in Ottawa so that we can put a proper road in Southern Labrador because what is there, particularly from Pinware to Red Bay -

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: - was put there by the maintenance crowd a number of years ago when they were given something like \$5,000 or \$6,000 a mile-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BRETT: - \$5,000 or \$6,000 a mile to build a road, and that is all there is there now

MR. BRETT: really, so it is hardly fit to be called a road. And the hon. member is aware of the fact that if we are to start on that project, if we were to start on that project and to put a fair share of the provincial government's total yearly programme into it, it would still take us seven or eight, maybe nine or ten years to finish. So even though we acknowledge the fact that, you know, it is a provincial responsibility, but on the other hand the Federal Government must also recognize that we -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. BRETT: - it would take years and years for us to complete that road and the people in Southern Labrador cannot wait that long. Therefore, it is imperative that we get some money to start on that next year so that we can give them a decent road.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: I am surprised that the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) does not follow the advice of his Premier and try to raise the decorum of this House instead of going on personal attacks. The question will also go towards the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs H. Newhook) because roads within these communities are also damaged. The Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) - they were supposed to be signed in October and the DREE Agreement came down, if I am correct, it was a fifty-fifty relationship, that the Province would pay fifty per cent of the road on the Straits

MR. HISCOCK: area as well as -

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: This is the Question Period, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is making a speech conveying information, albeit it incorrect information, but it is information.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Disinformation.

MR. MARSHALL: And this is the Question Period in which he is supposed to address questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you wish to speak to the point of order?

MR. HISCOCK: No, I do not.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the point of order is a legitimate one. The rules are very clear. The hon. member, I am sure, is aware that the preamble should be brief. I would ask him to put his supplementary question because there are only a couple of minutes left.

MR. HISCOCK: A question to the Minister of Transportation (C.Brett). The Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Rompkey, has turned down a request by DREE and has made another request to the Federal Government asking for more money to be allocated for the roads than there was on the agreement that was supposed to be signed in October. Does the Minister of Transportation support Mr. Rompkey going back to Ottawa and asking for more money for the Straits road?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I got the gist of that. I believe the hon. member said do I

MR. BRETT: support Mr. Rompkey going back to the Federal Government and asking for more money for Southern Labrador roads.

MR. HISCOCK: That is it.

MR. BRETT: Well, obviously the answer is yes.

MR. HISCOCK: You got it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Is it true that the hon. gentleman's officials are meeting with the federal officials on the 25th of this month to discuss transportation priorities in the Province and funding for these priorities? Is that not true? And if so, would the hon. gentleman raise the matter then of the road to Red Bay at that meeting, if the hon. gentleman feels that it should warrant priority?

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

MR. BRETT: If next Tuesday is the 25th, and I do not have my glasses, but if -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: - next Tuesday is the 25th, and if it is not foggy and raining and if the flights can get into St. John's, and if they do not cancel out again for about the 500th time, then there is a possibility that the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: - officials from Ottawa may be here on the 25th to discuss transportation with my officials.

MR. S. NEARY: And funding.

MR. BRETT: And funding, exactly.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had a supplementary to the Minister of Transportation (C.Brett). The minister does look like Santa Claus but he sure does not act like one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I consider that to be unparliamentary. I ask the hon. member to withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

I will withdraw my remarks, -

MR. SPEAKER:

I understand - Order, please!- I understand the hon. member has withdrawn.

MR. WARREN:

I wonder if the Minister of Transportation could advise the House what his department has done within the past twelve hours to make sure that roads on the Avalon Peninsula will be plowed immediately?

MR. HANCOCK:

What about the rest of Newfoundland? Do you want to repeat the question?

MR. WARREN:

Yes, I wonder what the minister has done within the past twelve hours since we had this raging snowstorm on the Avalon Peninsula and the Burin Peninsula, what his department has done to make sure that the plows, his employees are ready to accomodate this snowstorm that we have had? I understand there is all kinds of havoc all over this Province.

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

MR. BRETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is -
I - that is a stupid question, Mr. Speaker, because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: - no, actually it is because the hon. member is aware of the fact that every Fall we get our equipment off the roads as quickly as we can to get them ready for Winter maintenance. We have arranged it now so that we have shifts coming on at five o'clock in the morning and that has been going on for the last two weeks so that we can -

MR. WARREN: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering if the word 'stupid' when referring to another member is unparliamentary?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, there are certain references to unparliamentary language in Beauchesne's parliamentary reference book. I do not have an opportunity to go through it all and remember every word, but perhaps to rid ourselves of that concern, maybe I would ask the hon. the Minister to withdraw the word 'stupid' if that is what he used, and that will settle the situation, and then he can continue his answer.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that remark and just say that it is a lack of knowledge on the part of the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: But the obvious answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is that we are doing everything that we possibly can to make sure that the roads are cleared so that people can get over them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, Section 18 of the Statutes and Subordinate Legislation Act requires that subordinate legislation be tabled from time to time. The time has come and I would like to table it.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Section 28 of the Financial Administration Act, I wish to table a Special Warrant. There are several copies here.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, you will recall yesterday the hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) asked a question and I took it as notice and will give the answer now. It is quite complex because it deals with electricity rates and the method in which they are awarded and that. But if I were to rephrase the question which was asked in an unparliamentary manner, rephrase it in a parliamentary manner, it would be, I suppose, to ask a minister to comment upon or explain apparent overcharges by Newfoundland Light and Power to its customers. I think that would probably be the parliamentary way of putting it.

Now, in the late Summer of 1979, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro applied to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities for an increase in rates that it charges customers, and its customers include Newfoundland Light and Power. During the course of the hearings, Hydro asked for and received an interim rate increase on October 18, 1979. At the conclusion of the hearing a further increase was granted to Hydro to become effective April 1, 1980.

Now, while this issue was being heard by Hydro, Newfoundland Light and Power applied to the board for permission to increase their rates immediately Hydro was granted an increase so that they could recover the increased charges, because Newfoundland Light and Power buys its electricity from Hydro.

Interim authority was granted by the board to Newfoundland Light and Power, and orders issued so that Newfoundland Light and Power's increased rates could become effective the same date that the increases became effective for Hydro. As I say, it is fairly complex, but what that boils down to is, Hydro applied for an increase; Newfoundland Light and

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Power, which buys its electricity from Hydro, made an application to have an increase effective as soon as Hydro's increase was effective to cover their own charges.

Now, in early August, 1980, Newfoundland Light and Power applied to the Board of Public Utilities for an increase in rates to be charged to their customers, and a hearing into the matter followed in September and October. That is apart from Hydro's, the increase consequent upon Hydro's increase, but a separate increase because of their own increased costs for other factors.

During the course of hearing, evidence was adduced showing that from the period October to March, 1980, Newfoundland Light and Power earned insufficient revenue to offset the increased expenses by Hydro. Evidence was also shown that Newfoundland Light and Power would have earned more additional revenue than they were charged extra expense by Hydro as a result of their interim increase of April 1st if the rates were unchanged until the end of the year. In other words, the increase applied to Newfoundland Light and Power's rates charged to their customers on April 1st was in excess of that required to recover the extra expense charged by Hydro if they were allowed to charge for a full year.

I will endeavour to repeat that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Right.

For a certain period of time,

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Newfoundland Light and Power's increases were insufficient to meet the increased costs to them accruing from Hydro's increase. But if one went through a whole year there would have been more than was necessary to meet Hydro's increase so Newfoundland Light and Power came to the board requesting a rate increase before the end of a full year so that the amount of additional earnings over the amount of expense charged by Hydro became hypothetical. They came looking for an increase not just related to Hydro but related to their own increased costs for labour, for capital, whatever. Now a control of Public Utilities that was -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. minister, but the Standing Orders are quite clear and you have about fifteen seconds if you would like to conclude because the routine business must end by four o'clock on Private Member's Day.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think the answer has been so clear to now that I -

MR. STIRLING: I would suggest that you pass out your written copy and then my colleague, when he gets a chance to see it -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, it will be in Hansard tomorrow anyway.

MR. STIRLING: Okay, well I -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Actually -

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave to -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I can give it to you in ten seconds without going through it all.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

MR. STIRLING: I think it is sufficient if you

MR. STIRLING: just give us a copy of your written answer and we will look at it. We do not need any additional explanation.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If I do not have leave to answer the question, I will not answer it any further.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I take it there is no leave.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Under the Standing Orders then, Standing Order 53, we will not be able to move into petitions today. We will move right into the regular Orders of the Day, which is a private member's motion.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-
White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the motion that stands on the Order Paper in my name today has been one that has been very close to me for the last number of years. In fact members of this House will realize, if they look back at previous Order Papers, that this is the second session that I have had this same motion on the Order Paper.

MR. STIRLING: We cannot seem to pass this one.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right. The last session the motion was a bit too far down on the Order Paper and even with the new rules governing the procedure of activity here on Private Member's Day we were not able to get down to the motion so it died on the Order Paper at the end of the session. I thought that I may not be able to introduce it today because of a previous commitment, but fortunately Mother Nature was at our side and I am here and I am very happy to be able to present this motion to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, the motion is not very complicated. The motion says that;

WHEREAS the economic well-being of many people of our Province is dependent on the utilization of non-renewable resources; AND WHEREAS companies and corporations can and do reap possible benefits from the exploitation of those resources; AND WHEREAS when those resources have been exhausted, such companies and corporations can and do pull out of this Province leaving behind economically depressed areas; NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House cause to be established a Select Committee on Resource Management and that this Committee be empowered to advise the House on the advisability and feasibility of:

- (1) The Province becoming a partner in the development of all non-renewable resources;
- (2) The establishment of a Non-renewable Resource Fund to be funded by the industrial exploiter. One of the chief purposes of such a fund would be to provide financial relief to areas where non-renewable resources have been exhausted and to help in attracting alternate industry.

Now there are a few other BE IT RESOLVED but it relates to the power of the Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I think really that our past experience has shown us in this Province that we have been too lenient to say the least on companies and corporations that have been exploiting non-renewable resources in this Province. We have not in many cases, particularly as it relates to the mining industry, we

MR. RIDEOUT: have not been getting a fair return on those non-renewable resources. And the government, this government, through the Mineral Impost Bill, I believe it was, a couple of years ago, made some efforts to rectify that situation and I believe that the time has now come for us to move, again, further in that particular direction.

The principle of this motion, really, Mr. Speaker, is embodied, I believe, in, "NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED", number one and two, and that is asking that the possibility be explored that the feasibility be investigated of this Province becoming a partner of some sort in the development of non-renewable resources in the Province.

Of course, if you stop for a minute and consider our offshore petroleum regulations, that is exactly what is proposed, and that is exactly, under the offshore petroleum regulations, what can happen. Over a period of time this Province can become a full-fledged partner to the degree, I believe, of 40 per cent equity participation in the development of any oil field that might be out there. And what I am suggesting is that something along those lines, something along this principle be worked out for other sectors of the economy that are based on the exploitation of non-renewable resources, and I think, of course, specifically as it relates to my district, of the mining industry and, of course, there are others.

The other principle that is embodied in this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, is that some sort of non-renewable resource fund be established. We have seen in this Province example after example where companies and corporations have exploited for year, and years on end the resources of the Province. And we have seen example after example where, having exploited and

MR. RIDEOUT: reaped the benefits from those resources, having made, in many cases I am sure, hundred of millions of dollars of profits, the resource suddenly gone or the grade so low it was no longer feasible to work the resource, we have seen case after case, Mr. Speaker, in this Province where companies have, having exploited the resource, having made hundreds of millions of dollars of profits, have just left the town, left the community and left the people of that particular area high and dry. And the principle that I see in this particular resolution and the non-renewable resource fund, would be to make an effort to try to ensure that that particular kind of exploitation, and that particular way of leaving communities high and dry when the resource is no longer feasible to exploit, that that will never happen again in this Province of ours.

I do not intend to get into a raking down of companies or corporations that have operated in this Province over the last number of years. Of course they have done great things, many beneficial things in the particular communities in which they have operated. They have contributed to some degree to the economy of the Province. Not as much as I think they should have, in most cases, but they did contribute to some degree to the economy of the Province, and they did, no doubt, contribute to a large degree to the stability and economy of the particular areas of the Province where they have been operating. They build the infrastructure and they have helped out the town councils, giving them grants in lieu of taxation and all that kind of thing. Many of them have been very good corporate citizens and have been supportive, Mr. Speaker, of the towns where they have been operating. So it is not my intention to get into a situation of raking down all those companies or corporations that have operated in this Province. But I do believe that once it was gone, once the resource was no

MR. RIDEOUT: longer feasible to exploit for one reason or another, then many of those companies did not exercise, in my opinion, the degree of corporate responsibility that they should have.

In this Province you have to look no further than Bell Island, for example, St. Lawrence, Tilt Cove, communities around Springdale like Gull Pond and other areas where there was mining activity over the past number of years,

MR. RIDEOUT: Buchans, which hopefully has some new lease on life, but which has been in a very precarious position over the last four or five year period.

You know, you get communities like Bell Island, I suppose, where there was a great deal of mining activity, intensive mining activity for probably forty or fifty years, hundreds of people employed, the company was certainly making profits - I have never been able to read anything that they were not making profits. But the real question is, what is left to the people of those communities when those companies decide that the time has come to pack it in and leave Newfoundland and Labrador altogether, in most cases? Most of them are certainly corporate entities that are from outside this Province. What is left to the people of those areas, Mr. Speaker, to draw on in that particular time of need? What is left to the people of those areas to promote themselves, to promote their advantages, to promote their assets, to promote the infrastructure that may have been left behind in that particular part of the Province as a result of the activity that was there? What is left by the people who reap the greatest benefits, the money benefits, the profits from that particular area to those people to help them in the transition period, from then a very prosperous area to an area that suddenly looks like it might turn into a ghost town? I think that is the real question that we have to address and that is the real question hopefully that this resolution and a committee would address.

We have to face those problems yet in this particular Province. We have to face them in Buchans. We have to face them in Baie Verte. We have to face them in Labrador West. We have to face them in Daniel's Harbour. We have to face them in any particular part of the Province where the economy is built on a non-renewable resource. And I believe, Sir, that it is time that we develop a very comprehensive and detailed policy to deal with the kind of situation that a

MR. RIDEOUT: lot of areas of this Province are going to face a few years down the road.

All those companies and corporations, Mr. Speaker, are in our Province and exploiting the resources to make a profit and I have no quarrel with that, that is fair game, that is how our free enterprise system is supposed to operate. But I ask is it unrealistic to compel those companies and corporations to set aside some of those profits, specifically earmarked, Mr. Speaker, to help areas to readjust when they are gone? Is it unrealistic that we compel those people to do that? I would venture to say that ASARCO, for example, in the Buchans situation, have probably made hundreds of millions of dollars of profit in the many years that they have operated down there. I have never seen their balance sheets but I have not heard too many complaints about them having a lot of lean years, unprofitable years. And should not some percentage of that profit be set aside to help the people of the Buchans area after they have gone? It could be used to promote the area in some way or other, to attract other industry, to study other alternatives. What I am saying is a little kitty, drawn from the resources of that area left aside for the people who have to hang around and want to hang around because it is their home, after the major industry is gone, and that, Mr. Speaker, this concept that I am proposing, it does not have to be an onerous burden on the company, I am not suggesting that they break their backs financially, I am not suggesting that at all; I believe a contribution schedule, based on yearly profits could be worked out. You take the example of Advocate Mines, for example, which over the last two or three years have had very lean years and have not made any profits, as a matter of fact have lost - last year I believe it was \$9 million or \$10 million. Well, you obviously have that kind of situation

MR. RIDEOUT: worked into your schedule. But in the good years they contribute something to the fund to be left behind when they are gone.

The point is there would be a fund, and I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that properly managed, properly invested, properly looked after, properly controlled, a fund of several millions of dollars, eventually, could be

MR. T. RIDEOUT: established to assist affected areas of this Province once the non-renewable resources have been exploited.

I have already hinted that we on the Baie Verte Peninsula, in my own district, will have to face this reality sooner or later just as other areas have faced it before and, of course, there are still other areas of the Province that will have to face it in addition to us. The best advice, the best expert advice we have is that Advocate Mines is good for another fourteen years. It has already operated for about twenty or so but it is good for about another fourteen years 'if'. Of course, there are a lot of ifs in that. The asbestos market those days, Mr. Speaker, is precarious to say the least, There are an awful lot of European countries insisting on very stringent environmental conditions, placing very stringent environmental regulations on the importation of asbestos. It has now got to be wrapped up in plastic, and all that kind of thing, and marked 'hazardous to health' before it can get into most European ports. So there are a lot of 'ifs' as to whether or not the asbestos industry is going to remain profitable. As a matter of fact, the parent company to Advocate Mines Limited, Johns Mandville, the great Canadian Johns Mandville Corporation, has been experiencing lay-offs and downtime in their Quebec mining operations, but we have been fortunate in Baie Verte in that Advocate Mines has a contract with Internet of Europe to take everything they can produce and they must take it under the terms of the contract. So we are fortunate. But if we were, right now, depending on the world market conditions and world market situations, we could very easily be facing a downswing in that particular industry right now.

So the point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that it could be five years time, ten years time but sometime within the next ten or fifteen years, we are going to have to face the reality that a major industry on the Baie

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Verte Peninsula, employing about 600 or 700 people, is not going to be there anymore. And the same thing goes, of course, with the Consolidated Rambler operations also at Baie Verte. You ask the Directors and President of that company how long they have left to operate and they will never tell you any more than eighteen months. You can ask them that every year or year and a half and they will tell you eighteen months. The local wisdom is that it may be closer to five or ten years but, again, there are a lot of ifs, you know, what happens to the price of copper if the price of copper goes down? If they run into bad grade, then they could be in serious trouble.

So again the point is that there are two mining operations in that area employing directly close to 1,000 people that could leave a very big hole in the economy of that part of our Province were they to close down. And what I am proposing here, Mr. Speaker, is that for those kinds of situations in Baie Verte and in other parts of the Province - Buchans, Labrador City and so on - that the great corporations that are in there, in there for the sole purpose, of course, of making profit, that we as a people attach a little bit more of that profit than we are doing now when times are good and set it aside in a special fund, a special account, to enable those areas to better be able to cope with the lean years that are going to come, inevitably going to come, when those operations have to face the final day of judgment, as they will. Because as we know, in a non-renewable resource situation, that the first day you open it and the first day you start producing from it, it is one day closer to the death, it eventually has to spin out, none of it goes on forever.

I think, also, equity participation of some sort by the government of this Province, so that we can have some say in what those great corporations and those giant

MR. T. RIDEOUT: corporations do, would be an excellent idea and one that we should look at. We are doing it in our offshore petroleum regulations and I think we ought to be able to extend that principle to other areas of resource ownership within the Province itself, in the ground not under the sea, as it is in the offshore case.

So there are two principles involved here, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope that members on all sides of this House could support. I think it would be beneficial for all of us to hear what

MR. RIDEOUT: the expert opinion is in this matter. It is an idea, it is a dream that I have had for some time and finally there is an opportunity to get it before the House. But I believe it would be beneficial to us all to be able to go out and listen to what the mining companies have to say, listen to what the local town councils have to say in the Baie Verte and the Buchans areas and in Labrador City and so on, listen to what the unions have to say and see if this thought, this concept, makes any sense, see if it is workable, and if it is workable then to bring back some recommendations to this House that can be acted on. I believe the principle is one that we all could support and, Mr. Speaker, it is in that spirit that for the last couple of sessions I have been attempting to put this motion before the House. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me say from the start, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side intend to support this motion.

This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a great Liberal concept -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: - a great Liberal Resolution. You should have been there, Mr. Speaker, in our caucus and seen how proud the hon. member was when he had the assurance and the total co-operation of our caucus that his resolution that this resolution would get priority in the Private Members' Resolutions. He was so convincing, Mr. Speaker, he was very, very convincing in defending his resolution that the only way that the great principles that he talks about would get exposed to the floor of this House was by a Private Members' bill from the Opposition, from the Liberal Party, the Liberal

MR. FLIGHT: Opposition. Because, of course, he was totally convinced that the principles encompassed in this bill were foreign to any beliefs of anyone on the other side. The Tories do not believe, Mr. Speaker - and the hon. member knew, probably still knows, that the Tories do not believe in the kind of principles and concepts encompassed in this particular resolution. And as a result, Mr. Speaker, this side of the House will support, as the member knows it will support, this Resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: I understand, Mr. Speaker, how the member feels. If anyone in this hon. House should understand how he feels, I understand, having come from Buchans that he referred to so often, a town that went for fifty years, made untold millions of dollars profit. They are on the way out now, Mr. Speaker. There is indeed some hope. Developments in the mining industry in Buchans indicates that there may indeed be a few years left in that mine - there may be twenty. But for all intents and purposes, compared to the kind of operation we were used to for fifty years, the mining industry in Buchans may well be on its last legs. The company took millions and millions and millions of dollars and left nothing by way of the kind of fund that the hon. member is talking about. Except for the severance pay, I suppose, that came as a result of a union effort, resolved in negotiation, none of the employees would have anything by way of anything that ASARCO left. Now it is Abitibi Price.

So I understand, Mr. Speaker, how the member feels, and I support the principle in the Resolution. As he said, there are going to be a lot of Buchans, Baie Verte, Flat Bay, Labrador City - Wabush, all the mines in the Province. And, Mr. Speaker, maybe the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) should have paid attention to this Resolution, because although our forestry is a renewable resource in most people's minds,

MR. FLIGHT: forestry is not considered a non-renewable resource, but because of things that are happening in forestry, Mr. Speaker, because of the mismanagement that our forestry has been subjected to these past fifty years, total complete mismanagement, because of the waste we have allowed in the exploitation of our forestry, because of the damage that the spruce budworm has done, it is frightening to see directors of Abitibi Price on a programme with the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) saying that unless certain things are done and done quickly, the forest industry in Newfoundland may not be able to sustain the pulp and paper operation indefinitely. I think they put ten years on the life - on the possibility that ten years from now, unless certain things are not done, those mills might close. In that sense, Mr. Speaker, the forest industry is a non-renewable resource. And I would remind this House that the whole of Central Newfoundland and a lot of the West Coast depends totally on the forest industry - the towns of Badger, Grand Falls, Bishop's Falls, Millertown, Deer Lake to a great extent, Corner Brook to a great extent.

So, Mr. Speaker, from the member's point of view, he says that the company should be asked to set aside some of their profits. Well, they do not like to hear it, Mr. Speaker, they do not like the profits they are making today to be called windfall profits, but the paper companies

MR. G. FLIGHT: in this Province are making the biggest windfall profits. They never dreamed they could make so much money.

MR. T. HICKEY: How did the paper companies get it?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member - where is he member for?

MR. G. WARREN: St. John's East Extern.

AN HON. MEMBER: Minister of Social Services.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Minister of Social Services.

He went the circle, he went the full route and he is back

to Social Services. I would advise him to keep quiet.

MR. WARREN: Heave him in the doghouse.

Mr. Speaker, paper companies today are making - if the member who presented this resolution is concerned about where the funds will come from those paper companies-and I am going to dwell on it for a second-are making windfall profits as a result of the difference in the Canadian dollar. Most of the paper is sold in the States - sixteen or seventeen cents difference -

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty cents.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Twenty cents. Well, whatever the

difference is. In normal times when there was parity in this country, when the American dollar was par with the Canadian dollar, the paper companies were making a very nice comfortable profit then. There were no problems with their profit then. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are making untold millions in a windfall situation and we do not know how long this is going to continue. If ever there was a time that a company was in a position to put some funds into a non-disturbance fund or a non-renewable resource fund now is the time. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the hon. member something. I am sure that none of these companies are going to want to share their profits. None of those companies are going to want to share their profits. They have shown no desire up to this point in time and will show no desire in the future to set aside any monies that we could use after

MR. G. FLIGHT: they are gone. And this party, Mr. Speaker, this Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition and the federal government gave the government of this Province a tool a few days ago, a tool that they could use to make sure that there is a fund after Price is gone, after Bowater is gone, after Abitibi-Price, the mining companies are gone, and that tool is indirect taxation on resources. That is the tool, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HOLLETT: It was the federal Liberals who did it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: It was the federal Liberal Party that suggested that indirect taxation.

Mr. Speaker, if they are not prepared to put some money aside for the fund that the hon. member talked about, the indirect taxation would do it. But I have a concern and I am sure the hon. member has a concern. He could see it as the tool, he could say, 'Look, let us apply an indirect taxation situation on Abitibi-Price or on the Buchans mines or on any other mining company and let us - we know that one day the ore will be gone, now let us earmark those dollars that we will collect as a result of the indirect taxation being imposed, let us earmark it to take care of the infrastructure he talks about, to make sure that after that mine closes up that the people can develop ways of making a living, maintaining a viable community and a viable economy. Let us do that.

But I am sure that he has a great concern, Mr. Speaker. He knows he is sitting with a Tory government that up to this point in time have had no desire to use their revenues, any kind of revenues to improve the way of life of the people of Buchans or Baie Verte or anywhere else. They would want to see that money

MR. G. FLIGHT: go into - their policy, Mr. Speaker, is to see that money go into the general account, pay off the deficit, balance the budget. And that is what he might - he may not want to see the indirect taxation applied for that purpose because he knows very well that this government, the architect of what we are hearing in the past six or seven months, the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) manipulating the Premier who, left on his own, would probably want to do exactly what the member is talking about. But being in the hands of the people, particularly those in the front bench, his ministers, in the clutches of the right-wing Tories who have never shown a desire and never will show a desire to share the revenue of this Province with the people who need it most, Mr. Speaker. They want to balance their Budget. 'I do not care if ASARCO closes up and 3,000 people have to re-locate, it is more important that we balance the Budget. I do not care about providing an infrastructure wherever the source of funds comes from, let us balance the Budget, pay off the deficit!'

But, Mr. Speaker, this Opposition put in the hands of that member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) a means of providing the funds to take care of the kind of thing that he is talking about,

MR. FLIGHT: an indirect taxation on their exports. But make sure, Mr. Speaker, make sure in the case of Buchans, or in the case of Baie Verte, or Labrador City, or the paper companies, because of the danger they are in, that the money collected, as a result of the imposition of that direct taxation, is earmarked to take care of the Buchans' of this Province when they close.

MR. TULK: Something to use for a ring roads.

MR. FLIGHT: But I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) would have no confidence in this government being prepared to accept that concept.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the Liberal concept?

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the best - you see this is a great Liberal concept, a great Liberal philosophy we have here. Let us do the first clause: "NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House cause to be established a Select Committee on Resource Management and this Select Committee be empowered to advise the House on the advisability and feasibility of: 1. The Province becoming a partner in the development of all non-renewable resources." Mr. Speaker, that is the Liberal concept regarding the great offshore, the great offshore.

DR. COLLINS: Alberta's concept. Alberta does (inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: The resolution presented: 'The Province becoming a partner in the development of all our non-renewable resources.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, having established a long time ago that the Liberal Party is clearly on record as being in favour of ownership, the first resolution passed in this House of Assembly relating to ownership was moved by a member on this side of the House. So there is no question of the

MR. FLIGHT: ownership concept - Right? But I know, the member knows, and every Newfoundlander in this Province knows, that if ever that offshore is going to be developed it will have to be developed jointly. As the member says in his clause, 'The Province becoming a partner in the development of all non-renewable resources'. It will have to be done jointly. It will have to be done as a result of a negotiated agreement with Ottawa. Every Newfoundlander in this Province knows that, every one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they also know something else, because they have been brainwashed by being told that Hibernia can be producing in 1985, and with the level of unemployment we have in this Province, with the need for dollars we have in this Province, they are wondering if this government is going to move in a way that will make it possible to develop the offshore, to develop Hibernia by 1985. And they also know that in order to do that it will take the next five years to get the infrastructure needed in place. The oil companies or nobody else will move to put in the infrastructure that will be necessary to put Hibernia into production, until the agreement is there - Right?

So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HICKEY: So we should sell it.

MR. FLIGHT: No, the question, Mr. Speaker, now is, the question -

MR. WARREN: Change your doghouse.

MR. FLIGHT: The question now, Mr. Speaker - the Newfoundland people know that. They know it will be the result of an agreement. The position, Mr. Speaker, on this side -

MR. TULK: I am looking at kitchen cabinets.

MR. FLIGHT: The cornerstone of any agreement, obviously, would be that all revenues accrued in Newfoundland, all

MR. FLIGHT: revenues from the offshore accrued to Newfoundland, all benefits from the offshore accrued to Newfoundland, that we have the control over the rate of development. That would be the cornerstone of any agreement - right? If the hon. House Leader has got to wait - he has indicated he is not prepared to test our case in the courts and we accept that if that is his choice - if he has got to wait until the ownership issue is settled then he should get up and tell the people when he would see Hibernia coming under development, producing, making dollars for the Newfoundland people, if he is not going to be prepared to negotiate a settlement, not joint to be prepared for joint development, when he sees a situation in this province that will permit the oil companies to start putting in the infrastructure that will make it possible to actually get into development. Because, Mr. Speaker, we are being blindfolded here, you know. We hear about DAC, we hear about these various companies, the companies, Mr. Speaker, that made the millions, the same names. Are the names familiar?

MR. WARREN: No, no.

MR. FLIGHT: The names that are emerging now as companies to make the millions off the offshore are they not the same names, Mr. Speaker, that made the millions off the fisheries in the 1920's and the 1930's and the 1940's?

MR. WARREN: Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Are they not the same dollars that were made off the backs of Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WHITE: Right on!

MR. FLIGHT: - in the fishery when Newfoundlanders were starving to death? The only ones that were not starving to death were the merchants in this Province and people living in St. John's. Are not now the same names, are not the same monies

MR. FLIGHT: being put together into the DAC's
and the various other organizations that are getting together
to make the fortunes off the offshore?

MR. TULK: And the Premier loves history.

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, remember DAC
establishing in Mortier Bay, the DAC group and all the rest,
have nothing to

MR. FLIGHT:

do with the development of Hibernia, they are talking about building submersibles that can be used in the North Sea. There is no indication that any of the activity up to this point in this Province is a concrete indication that the Hibernia is going to be developed. Maybe the things they will do in Mortier Bay will be done for the North Sea or Venezuela or the offshore of the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if anyone in this hon. House believes that the people of Newfoundland really care about ownership they got another thing coming. The people - apart, Mr. Speaker, maybe apart from the principles of the various companies that I just referred to, they may be concerned because they know what is in it for them. They knew what was in it for them under the fisheries, under the seal fishery and under every other thing that happened in this Province when they were being protected by a right wing Tory government.

So, Mr. Speaker, if anyone thinks ownership of the Province - let me ask this question, Mr. Speaker, do you think there is a Newfoundlander in this Province - they know now that when Hibernia comes into production, at the given estimates of reserves there, at the given rate of production per year, it will last for twenty years and Hibernia will be gone, the one we know now - now, is there a Newfoundlander alive that would care whether we own that piece of real estate, two hundred miles out in the North Atlantic under about four or five thousand feet of water? Is there a Newfoundlander, with that oil gone who would care whether we own it?

MR. WARREN: Yes, thirty-four of them.

MR. FLIGHT: No, they do not care. There is a possibility, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WARREN: Thirty-four of them.

MR. FLIGHT: There is a possibility, Mr. Speaker, that this government may be reading things wrong. There may be a possibility that the young man in Windsor today who has not worked for two years, who is twenty-one years old and who sees no hope of the Hibernia or anything else being developed because of the confrontation situation this government wants.

They are more concerned about, Mr. Speaker, what are you doing? When are you going to develop? When are the jobs going to flow? They are more concerned that the dollars come into this Province. They are more concerned that the dollars used, made off our offshore, will provide jobs in Windsor or Buchans or the West Coast, something the other side of this city.

So, Mr. Speaker, this government, and their chief spokesmen, the ministers and the Premier, riding high, believes he has got an issue that is dear to the hearts of all the people in this Province. He has got an issue that is dear to the hearts of the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, but they are wondering about the way it is being managed right now. They are wondering how many young men, Mr. Speaker, twenty-one years old in this Province today that want a job, will be in this Province ten years from now. How many? Is that important to this administration, Mr. Speaker?

MR. LUSH: Not at all, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. DINN: The future leaders of Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT: Is it important, Mr. Speaker, to this administration -

MR. PATTERSON: They will all move to Toronto and work in the assembly lines up there.

MR. FLIGHT: Is it important, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. LUSH: Hibernia will never stop them -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) out on the West Coast (Inaudible) out there.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Hibernia will never stop them.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Burn your boats.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are all gone now, boy,so (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we develop the offshore. If my son, Mr. Speaker, who may be ten years old cannot take advantage of offshore then what is in it for me? We have now problems in this Province, Mr. Speaker. Where is this rag that we read today? Look, bread and butter issues, Mr. Speaker. It says, 'Do not talk about the constitution, talk about bread and butter issues!'. Well, I will tell you what the bread and butter issues are that were left out of this.

MR. MARSHALL: It is The Daily News you are referring to as a rag!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: This junk. Look, I will tell you the bread and butter issues, Mr. Speaker. The bread and butter issue, Mr. Speaker, is a five year plan that accepts as a fact of life fourteen per cent unemployment in this Province, a five year plan that accepts as a fact of life a fourteen per cent unemployment insurance.

AN HON. MEMBER: A good plan.

MR. FLIGHT: A bread and butter issue, Mr. Speaker, is the state, the deplorable state that the trunk roads in this Province are in. It is the fact that the town councils in this Province cannot maintain the basic services. That is a bread and butter issue that concern a lot of them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH: And a lot of (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: The spiraling costs of electric rates in this Province, Mr. Speaker, making it impossible for people on fixed incomes to survive in decency. That is a bread and butter issue they should have printed here, Mr. Speaker. They should have told us why here, Mr. Speaker, since LCDC have recommended the development of Muskrat Falls back in July, why they are not interested in creating those five thousand jobs,

MR. G. FLIGHT: and securing a standard, stable supply of electricity for this Province. That is the kind of bread and butter issues, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. G. FLIGHT: - bread and butter issues, Mr. Speaker, where half the people living in this Province are living in next to poverty-line housing. Every member knows how many people have come to him to have the housing upgraded - no, not important. All that is important, Mr. Speaker, is that we get on the radio day after day, we push this stuff out, a smoke screen for the real problems of this Province -

MR. T. LUSH: A red herring.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - a red herring, a smoke screen covering up this government's inability to address itself to the real problems -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: - covering up its unconcern, its inability -

MR. T. LUSH: Diversionary tactics.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - to worry about the problems that are facing the people of this Province, the real problems that are facing them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. T. LUSH: Diversionary tactics.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Can anybody in this House, Mr. Speaker, in the ministry -

MR. G. WARREN: They have no intestinal fortitude.

MR. T. LUSH: Any what?

MR. G. FLIGHT: - tell me the last time the Premier of this Province addressed himself to the 45,000 jobs that he was going to create a year and a half ago?

MR. T. LUSH: He has forgotten about that now.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Is there anybody in this House, Mr. Speaker, who can stand up and remind me or remind this House the last time the Premier made a comment about the state of our essential services in this Province? Is anybody -

MR. G. WARREN: He has got television (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please!

MR. G. FLIGHT: - able to remind me, in this House, the last time the Premier commented on the level of unemployment in this Province - the 14 per cent unemployment in this Province?

MR. G. WARREN: He will do it tomorrow.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The only thing, Mr. Speaker -

MR. T. LUSH: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird): Order!

MR. G. FLIGHT: - that this Premier has commented on publicly and it is getting to a point, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Newfoundland, you know, they are starting to wonder about this man, they are starting to wonder about the Premier of this Province. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is a silly -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. G. FLIGHT: - childish way -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Am I to understand we are discussing a Private Member's motion?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Is Mr. Speaker asking me?

MR. SPEAKER: If so, I think the member is starting to stray.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether I am starting to stray or not. The motion - I do not know if His Honour has totally familiarized himself with the motion, but we are talking about non-renewable resources, Mr. Speaker, and it is the subject of the motion. But, Mr. Speaker, I have to wind up, my time is over, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province has done nothing for fourteen months, I think it is - fourteen or fifteen months - except to attempt to brainwash the people and draw on what has got to be considered their patriotism, on their desires to control their own destiny,

MR. G. FLIGHT: using the issues, the Constitution, the politics of fear, the possibility that somehow or other the Constitution will not work in the better interest of Newfoundland, avoiding like the plague, Mr. Speaker, the real problems of this Province, the problems that the hon. member talks about in his resolution, avoiding like the plague the fact that we have four or five industries about to shut-down, avoiding like the plague, Mr. Speaker - abdicating the responsibilities for the forestry by shuffling it off to a Royal Commission. That Premier, Mr. Speaker, that Minister of Forestry approved a full spray programme, took the chance on poisoning half the people in Newfoundland by their own admission.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! The hon. member's time is up.

MR. G. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we are going to - with leave -

MR. LUSH: Whole-heartedly.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - whole-heartedly support the resolution. I want to commend the member for bringing it forward and I want to encourage him to continue bringing forward great Liberal concepts in the sense that this particular resolution is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as supporting this motion brought in by my hon. friend from Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. BUTT: And I must say it is very difficult to address myself to the motion without -

AN HON. MEMBER:

And you a Liberal.

MR. G. WARREN:

And you a Liberal.

MR. J. BUTT:

- first of all addressing myself to a few remarks made by my hon. friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight).

AN HON. MEMBER:

A good man.

MR. J. BUTT:

Now, I thought I would approach this today in a very impartial way, being an impartial fellow -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. BUTT:

- but I think it is worthy to note that when my hon. friend was looking across the floor and saw the kind of policies and the philosophy of this government, it was certainly compatible with what he was thinking himself -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on, boy.

MR. J. BUTT:

- and finally he did take the plunge and come across.

MR. BUTT: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a progressive motion put forward by my hon. friend and it shows that he has some foresight. It is something that could, if it were brought in thirty or forty years ago, certainly help a place like Bell Island or Buchans and they would not be in the situation that they are in today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT: It is the kind of fund that the hon. member mentions that would be set up, would be of great benefit to a town that had its non-renewable energy resources exploited. I think the key to this is the long-range planning, and we are looking at non-renewable energy resources, so that somewhere at some given time down the road, whether it is an ore deposit or an oil reservoir, it would be pumped out or the ore mined and we are left with basically nothing.

Also, the idea is compatible with this government's philosophy and policy. Just let me say that in exploiting an unrenovable resource such as offshore oil, the benefits accrued from that would not only be used to upgrade our public service, but also to further develop our renewable resources such as our fishery and our forestry and so on so it could provide the necessary employment and monies for future generations.

The idea of a committee system for the House, I think, is a good one. I think it is a good way of government, one that I certainly believe in; Select Committees of the House, getting elected members involved and going out and gathering information in various parts of the Province, reporting back to the House. Certainly, I do not know at this particular point in time what kind of terms of reference this committee would have, but no doubt, besides funding, it would probably look at the aspects of other industries that could be brought in after an oil well or a mine is exploited to its fullest. The kind of funding that would be set up is

MR. BUTT: he is looking at long-term effects down the road.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BUTT: If we look at offshore oil, which basically is what my friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) talked about for his twenty minutes and really did not address himself to the Select Committee on Natural Resources, if we look at offshore oil, well, the benefits from offshore oil can certainly be of great benefit in utilizing our renewable resource to the fullest.

AN HON. MEMBER: Taking it step by step.

MR. BUTT: Yes, step by step. Of course.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. BUTT: Right.

We on this side, I am sure, will support this resolution, and I certainly hope that in the not too distant future this House will appoint a select committee to address itself to this resolution brought in by my hon. friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. the member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to apologize to my colleague for not being here during his remarks. I am sure that his pearls of wisdom that flowed out on the floor of this House were persuasive and were in his usual good fashion.

And I want to congratulate the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), by the way. I came in on the tail end of the hon. gentleman's remarks in support of this resolution and I want to congratulate the hon. gentleman for subscribing to such a wonderful Liberal principle. Because, Mr. Speaker, I am sure my colleague

MR. NEARY: And so we have the resolution in front of us, a Liberal resolution; a good resolution, a resolution that I personally take great pride in supporting, not because I supported it in caucus, not because I encouraged the hon. gentleman - I believe the hon. gentleman had this same resolution on the Order Paper once before, this is the second time.

It is not an original idea, Mr. Speaker. I may point out to the hon. gentleman it is not an original idea, it is something that came up many times in this House, something that came up not only on Private Members' Day but came up in other debates in this House. It was raised many times back in the mid '60s and in

MR. S. NEARY:

the early '70's. It was raised by members on that side of the House who were then the government, who are now on this side of the House. And how do I know, Mr. Speaker? How do I know that? Because I was one of the members who raised this matter. Now, the hon. gentlemen may say, 'Well, why was something not done about it?' Well, I could ask the same question of hon. members now. They have been over there since 1972, January 18th., 1972 - it was a black day for Newfoundland, that was when the government changed - that was eight years ago and the government has not seen fit to do anything about this matter that is referred to in this resolution yet. Eight years have gone by. I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that we will not see another eight years go by before something is done about this matter. The reason I raised it when I was sitting on the government side of the House supporting the government, and as a minister in the government, was because of the way that Bell Island had been torn up, holes left in the ground, piles of rock left on the surface over there.

MR. CARTER: Where is the (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: I answered that one time for the gentleman who ran against me when I asked him where the trip to the world's fair was.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if anybody has had occasion to visit Bell Island either when the mine was working or since the mine closed but if they did they would not be impressed. As a matter of fact, they would be very unimpressed. And they would be pretty sore and pretty mad about the holes that had been left in the ground over on Bell Island and the pile of rock that was picked out of the iron ore that has been left behind.

MR. CARTER: Those were Liberal times.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, I do not care what times they were. This company that came in here and picked the

pockets of the people of Bell Island for so long -

MR. CARTER: Well, who let them get away with it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you know, the

irony of all this is - I heard the hon. gentleman referring to Bell Island a few moments ago - when I was the member for Bell Island I could not turn on my radio or television or pick up a newspaper without hearing somebody in the Tory Party or in the Opposition, who happened to be Tory at that time, wanting to know what we were going to do about the depressed situation on Bell Island. They would not leave me alone five minutes; night and day they were on to me. And they have been over there eight years and I have not once in eight years heard one single member on that side of the House refer to the economic condition of Bell Island, the economic plight of the people of Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: And when they were over here and I was over there, they were at me all the time, continuously, and putting up there little pipsqueaks over on Bell Island to try to sabotage me. And I was elected four times over there and represented Bell Island fourteen years in this House. Unfortunately, and I am sad to say, since I left the district it has been grossly neglected. All they have tried to do over there is build on the foundation that I created for them. And I had to laugh - I was over this Summer and the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) trying to suck his way in with the people of Bell Island, paved the road down to a gun installation and they paved the airstrip over there, an airstrip that I was partly responsible for building, this is what they did, and they have extended the water and sewerage, projects that I started

MR. S. NEARY: All they have been doing is expanding on projects that I started. But just imagine the number priority on Bell Island is paving, paving a road down to a gun installation that was there in the Second World War something that I had restored into a historic site, by the way. I have no objection to paving the road. I am glad to see it paved, but, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there are more priorities on Bell Island. If the hon. gentleman would only use his noodle, there are more priorities on Bell Island than paving the landing strip or paving a road down to the site of the two old cannons that have been left there from the Second World War.

MR. N. DOYLE: Trying to promote Tourism.

MR. S. NEARY: Trying to promote Tourism, the hon. gentleman says. The hon. gentleman, if he wants to use his initiative and his imagination and if he does not have any of his own if he would

MR. NEARY: Your Honour could, I am sure he would. There are some of these quarries not too far from Your Honour's district.

MR. CARTER: We are wasting the time of the House.

MR. NEARY: Yes, we are wasting the time of the House, Sir.

MR. CARTER: There is one going on outside now.

MR. NEARY: It is raining out today and the snow is on the ground.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is impossible to grow a little savory these days. The hon. gentleman - his attendance will be perfect, Mr. Speaker, 100 per cent attendance. The savory is now hung on the shelf, put on the cardboard, hanging in the supermarkets and the hon. gentleman is back in the House where he can occupy himself with his favourite sport and that is needling me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend and myself work excellently, perfectly, as a team on the Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So I say, Mr. Speaker, that we should be thankful for small blessings in this world.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very serious matter indeed about these - especially about these rock quarries.

I suppose the previous government, if we want to be fair about it, passed out permits. This hon. crowd are passing out permits - the hon. crowd -

AN HON. MEMBER: Except one.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. POWER:

The same with the next administration too.

MR. NEARY:

- passing out permits to their friends and their buddies to quarry rock and stone. And you know, Mr. Speaker, as I drive around this Province I never cease to be amazed at the desecration of the countryside. The tourists coming in here must say that we are awfully stunned, that we run a sloppy operation in this Province when we are passing out permits

MR. NEARY:

right, left and center to contractors to go and quarry stone wherever the site is that they pick, not the site the government picks or the Department of Mines and Energy. They go and pick it out themselves. I have had occasion when contractors have come up to me moaning and weeping because they could not get a permit to quarry in this particular area. They have even gone near communities in my own district, right in there, practically in the heart of a community to quarry rock so they can become millionaires, and a lot of them are millionaires. It is not right, Mr. Speaker, and I do not know if anything, ever, will be done about it. My hon. friend mentioned here in his resolution that the Province should become a partner in the development of all non-renewable resources. I did not hear the hon. gentleman's speech but I presume he explained how the government could become a partner. It is a very complex and difficult thing, I would say. But I certainly agree with funding. I certainly agree that a fund should be set up not only to fill in the holes and the dams and to set trees and flowers over the areas that are mined and where the rock quarries are. And, Mr. Speaker, you and I by the way - I just thought of this when I thought of setting flowers - you and I and a number of other of our colleagues had occasion this past Summer to visit one of the most famous flower gardens in the whole world in British Columbia, in Victoria, British Columbia. What was the name of the garden? Could Your Honour refresh me, the -

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Bouchard.

MR. NEARY:

The Bouchard Gardens in Victoria, absolutely beautiful. It is unbelievable. I am telling you if that programme on the television, That's Incredible, ever heard of it, they would be up with the television cameras taking pictures of it. Millions and millions and millions of flowers, and where are these flowers and these trees and these little rivers

MR. NEARY: and streams, Mr. Speaker? Where are they? They are in a rock quarry, one of the biggest rock quarries I have ever seen outside of the Glory Hole in Buchans. And you go in there now and it is just one massive flower garden. Your Honour and I travelled together down these little lover's lanes in the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Were you holding hands?

MR. NEARY: No, we were not holding hands but -

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - I could see the gleam in Your Honour's eye. I think Your Honour will have to agree, and the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) who was with us and the -

AN HON. MEMBER: He was chaperon.

MR. NEARY: And I do not know if the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) was with us or not, but it was absolutely, absolutely beautiful. No reason why - I know we do not have the climate here, Mr. Speaker, but there is no reason why we cannot dress up these eyesores that we have along the Trans-Canada Highway and that we have in other parts of Newfoundland, some of them near communities. In my own district one rock quarry and one crusher and one dump almost in the heart of a community. And the people have no control over it because they do not have a municipal government, they have to rely and depend on the provincial government, the Department of Mines and Energy, to save them, to protect them from these vultures, these parasites moving in with their crushers and bulldozers and almost bulldozing people out of their homes so they can get out and make a buck. Millionaires!

So as far as the funding is concerned I am all for it. And I, as I said when I started, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I was late for the debate. This sort of thing I enjoy, I understand it, I know the feelings of the hon. gentlemen who represent the mining communities and my colleague the member for

MR. NEARY: Buchans (Mr. Flight), all qualified, and the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) who also has a problem up in his own area with the talc mines. There are other problems up there but this one; one of these days they will pull out and they will leave nothing behind them but a mess and an eyesore and walk away scot-free. So I think the sooner that we can establish a fund to take care of this kind of situation, Mr. Speaker, the better. Having made these few remarks, Sir, I whole-heartedly support the resolution which I said in the beginning is a Liberal resolution. Now I would hope that all the Tory members and all the members on the other side of the House will support this great Liberal concept.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, certainly I also wish to rise and support the resolution as presented by a great Tory from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who is going to be a Tory and indeed the member for Baie Verte-White Bay

MR. C. POWER: for some time to come. I would also like to speak, just for a moment, on the comment made by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who apologized in a very direct way to the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) when he said that it must be a disappointment and possibly an embarrassment because he is not in Cabinet. And I think that is an apology on behalf of the Liberal party because certainly it proves that when the member did cross the floor he crossed on a matter of principle -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. C. POWER: - not because there were deals made or because there were trade offs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. C. POWER: On behalf of the members on this side I certainly accept that apology with the intent that it was given because we know certainly the members opposite made a judgement in prejudging some of the reasoning why the member for Baie Verte - White Bay may have changed his political affiliation. But I also say -

AN HON. MEMBER: The ought to tell you about Tom Doyle.

MR. C. POWER: I have an excellent memory. I understand the things that took place and I appreciate them now for making me a much more diligent member for the hon. district of Ferryland. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in supporting the resolution, certainly one which is a very progressive idea and which says many things that are going to, I suppose, make this Province a better place in which to live, I have to also at the same time take to task the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). It is just not rational, Mr. Speaker, for persons to say some of the things that that member said in his opening remarks. It is

MR. C. POWER: just neither fair nor sensible, nor is it correct, when the member says that certain things are changing in Newfoundland and that this government has done nothing in the last fourteen months in resource development, has done nothing to actually change and alleviate the economic conditions of Newfoundland, that this government is simply trying to camouflage in many ways the real issues of Newfoundland.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is true.

MR. C. POWER: True. True. The ERCO agreement of the other day that only got back to this government about \$146 million that was given away by some other people. The fact that - I must also say, Mr. Speaker, that besides being somewhat disappointed with the comments from the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), I am also somewhat disappointed that although we have a new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), and I take this opportunity, which is my first time speaking in the House since he was elected, to congratulate him and to wish him good luck, but I also say that maybe to wish him good luck is going to be an understatement and he is going to need a lot more than good luck, because although he may be a new Leader of the Opposition it certainly appears that the Liberal ideas, as expounded by the member for Windsor - Buchans, have not changed any.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. L. STIRLING: Or as expounded by the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout)

MR. C. POWER: The philosophy expounded quite simply by the member for Windsor - Buchans, Mr. Speaker, which takes into account the fact that we, for instance, first of all as a government, should have a lot more money to do different things

MR. C. POWER: with. On one hand we are supposed to set up a fund, possibly combined between government and industry from the people who are involved in the non-renewable production of our resources, and at the same time we are supposed to have more money to all the other social programmes. And at the same time yesterday we get this anemic looking amendment to a constitutional thing that mentions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please.

MR. C. POWER: -that mentions

AN HON. MEMBER: Denominational education.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. C. POWER: - that mentions only denominational education.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Point of order.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding that Beauchesne on page 153, section 424 - a motion dealing with the same subject-matter as a bill, standing on the Order Paper for second reading, cannot be considered. It seems that the hon. member -

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, what is the reference again?

MR. J. HODDER: Page 153, section 424, item 7.

It seems that the member is dealing with a motion which is directly before the House. The reference, to my understanding, says that when there are two motions on the order paper before the House you cannot deal with one while dealing with another.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):
Minister of Finance.

Point of Order. The Hon.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, that reference in Beauchesne clearly means dealing in detail and substantially. It does not refer to dealing in a brief and insubstantial manner and that was all the hon. minister was doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the point of order, I believe it is fair to say that there has been a great degree of flexibility allowed in the degree of debate during the course of our Private Members' motion. In fact, I believe other references to the same issue were made by other members in the debate and I believe that was allowed to continue; as long as it is just a passing reference and not something in detail.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Passing reference.

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, similar to what I believe one of the other members to my right referred to earlier.

The hon. minister.

MR. C. POWER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Although it may be in reference to this amendment, it is certainly also in reference to comments made by, as you mentioned, previous speakers on the opposite side who say such things as we must have

MR. POWER:

more money to develop our resources; we must have more money to develop our social systems and, at the same time, they will support resolutions, either yesterday's one, today's or others, that tend to give away much of the bargaining power, to give away much of the earning power of this Province that we have, and this money that we are supposed to use to make the non-renewable and renewable resources that much more functioning and productive for all residents of Newfoundland. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that on one hand you cannot have your cake and eat it too, that you either have to be willing to support resource development and resource control and resource ownership or you have to be able to support, on the other hand, resolutions that, as yesterday's for instance, say that we should have less control over these things and, therefore, less money to do the things that Newfoundland needs to have done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. POWER:

And all I say is that unfortunately we have a new Liberal leader but we do not have necessarily new Liberal ideas in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, in relationship to the comments made on forestry in particular and comments - and, of course, copied from statements that I have been making and other members, the government have been making relating to the renewable resource industries that we have and why we have to have more money from the non-renewable resource section so that we can have more money to develop our renewable ones, certainly in forestry. And forestry, as I have said and as other persons have said, is only a renewable resource, It is one that can only be developed and, I suppose, can prosper and grow over the next forty or fifty or a hundred years if it is managed properly. To say that this government since 1974, in particular, when a new land management taxation act was brought in, to say that new

MR. POWER: silviculture policies that were announced last week, to say that new cutting regulations which are being put in place are not ways of managing the forest, either says that the member either has a reading problem or an understanding problem caused by his inability to understand the things that are taking place. There are things going to be taking place, Mr. Speaker, in the woods, in the forest, in the tree industry in Newfoundland in the next twenty years that are going to make it an extremely viable operation, one which will make it a renewable resource forever and a day, only because we, as a government, are willing to manage the resource as it should be, not in a similar way as the great giveaways were in many years past where the land companies, where the forest companies - one of the arguments the member continuously brings up is the fact that we in the forest industry, the renewable industries, have given away control of it for long periods of time on ninety-nine year leases and extended. That was not done by this administration. It was not done by this government and it is only this government's efforts that are now beginning to take the companies to task and get them to do the things that are absolutely necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: What happened to Linerboard?

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, what happened to the Linerboard is quite simple: it was an industry that was not based upon a renewable aspect of forest industry. It was not viable or economic and it was not managed properly. That does not mean that the new mill in Stephenville - you know, Mr. Speaker, if anyone sat and looked at -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: - if anyone sat and looked at the resource base that Newfoundland has in forestry alone, if it is managed properly, if the things that this government is doing

MR. POWER: today, has done yesterday or last week with a new silviculture policy, the management plans that we are putting in place fifty and eighty and a hundred years down the road there can be as many as ten mills in Newfoundland all functioning well and properly, all based upon a renewable aspect of the forest industry, but it can only be done if we have money. It is nonsense and absolutely pointless for the members opposite, on the one hand, to say, "Let us increase the forest industry; let us get more persons employed in Grand Falls, Corner Brook, and all the harvesting parts of Newfoundland, Let us do that; let us put lots of money in forestry. Let us make forestry a better business, but let us not do it with oil and gas money; let us not do it with hydro money; let us not do it with fishery money; let us do it with some kind of a welfare system or a rearrangement -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. POWER: - of the financing systems that we now have with Ottawa."

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. POWER: That is what the members are actually saying, Mr. Speaker, and it is those types of things which, in many cases - and I really believe that the Liberal party and the Opposition in many cases have given up in a real way its opposition role in the Newfoundland Government and in many cases have become puppets of a few federalists in Ottawa who want to make Canada into a different way than we now wish to make it for the good of all Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, on the resolution as it is stated in this document, it says, "BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Province become a partner in the development of all non-renewable resources".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: There is no argument from either side. Certainly the member, when he made up the resolution, made it up

MR. POWER: as a member of the House of Assembly, not particularly as one member of either political party but certainly as an individual, as a person who has an interest in the types of non-renewable development that have taken place in the Province over the last fifty or sixty years. Certainly that type of, I suppose, co-operation from a government and company level has to be done. It is the type of thing that we are certainly doing in forestry. It is the type of thing we would like to do in the oil and gas industry. It is the type of thing we would like to do with our hydro development. However, we do need a certain amount of co-operation and support which does not always come forward on other resolutions which, although may be worded differently than this, the end result is exactly the same.

The second aspect of this resolution says that, "Be it established, a non-renewable resource fund", so that places like St. Lawrence and Bell Island, that the member was mentioning earlier, or things such as that which have happened in the past should not be allowed to happen again, are things which certainly this government and every member on this side fully support. It is a progressive idea. It is an idea to make sure that Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: - it is an idea to make sure that Newfoundland is a better place to live in twenty or thirty years, that you do not go through the great traumatic social changes that occurred in places like Buchans, Bell Island and other parts of Newfoundland where non-renewable resources have been used up. Mr. Speaker, it is only with those same policies, same principles and

MR. C. POWER: exactly the same philosophy that we are now trying to develop the other resources in Newfoundland, particularly the forest industry, which I have a fair amount to do with on a day to day basis, so that we can take the monies from our non-renewable resources, which happen to be oil and gas, mining and others - to take the money from non-renewable resources to make Newfoundland into a more safe and secure place in twenty or thirty years down the road. Maybe some hon. members are not aware of what happens in places like Venezuela which up to twenty years ago thought they had an unlimited, unending supply of oil so that they could have money forever. And now those countries like Venezuela are now encouraging renewable based companies to come in, particularly the forest industry in Venezuela, which is coming up in a very, I suppose, rapid, accelerated manner, because they know that if Venezuela is going to exist in 100 years time it has got to exist based upon renewable industries, not the non-renewable which you may get some money from.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Alberta?

MR. C. POWER: So has Alberta, but Alberta has control of its resources. And that is why I am saying that if you support this resolution you have, on the other hand to also support the other resolutions being put forth by this government to give us control of our resources.

And, those are cases where, Mr. Speaker, as I say members opposite cannot necessarily -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. C. POWER: - have their cake and be able to eat it too. You have got to, on one hand, be able to say that Newfoundland wants more money, not only to put in a non-renewable resource fund but also one that does your renewable industries all the good that it should, but, on

MR. C. POWER: the other hand, you have to be willing to support Newfoundland in its efforts and fights to make sure that we have control of all of our resources.

Mr. Speaker, I gladly and wholeheartedly support the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who put forth this resolution that apparently the hon. House is going to support wholeheartedly, and in doing so, just a few comments.

When we look at company profits, and when we look at employee profits, we must also reflect on provincial treasury profits. Because, Mr. Speaker, I understand that already companies have to pay a certain tax dollar. If they are geared up in such a way that they do not have to pay direct tax, they most certainly have to pay tax to the treasury in the operations of a company that harvests mineral or pulp or anything else that they might go into, and taxation on equipment, most certainly.

There are an awful lot of questions that need to be answered by this government when it comes to having collected down through the years all the tax revenues from all the industries in the Province on top of all the cash flow from Ottawa, on top of all the revenue, income tax, S.S.A. tax and every other type of tax that has gone into this treasury. We continually go back - I just heard the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) again go back and say, 'the great giveaway.'

MR. T. BENNETT: Now, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, while I do not agree with giving away resources of the Province, when the so-called great giveaway was in place, at least our people were working and they were eating decently—

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. T. BENNETT: Which is more than I can say today. That is more than I can certainly say for this day. And while I certainly support this here, I support this, I most certainly cannot support some of the methods that are being used by government and government officials, ministerial officials in place, in hurting people in the Province. I can emphasize a little bit when I suggest if we continue to procrastinate and fight with Ottawa over Hibernia -

MR. HOLLETT: The fisheries and everything else.

MR. T. BENNETT: - and the fisheries and all the various avenues of resource development - if we continue to fight instead of rolling up our sleeves and letting our people go to work at it, we are going to be into a greater dilemma than we have ever known before. My information is, Mr. Speaker, that by today's cost of production we need

MR. T. BENNETT: \$60 a barrel to bring Hibernia oil to land. Now, if we continue the flogging of Ottawa, the procrastination and the lack of co-operation and the hostilities that I myself experience and is so evident, if we keep this up for a few years it is going to be \$200 a barrel we are going to need for Hibernia. It is about time that we started to deal in a co-operative, compatible manner.

I am happy with this resolution here in the sense that it certainly would have bearing on the district I represent. We have a mine in the district that I represent and there is an indication that it might close out very, very shortly, like in three or four years, most certainly not longer than five. There is no evidence at this time, there is no evidence on the part of government to zero in on that mine to alleviate the hardship that will come about on the shut-down of that mine and it is right on the doorstep.

Now, I would like to see governments, regardless of the level of government - provincial and/or federal - this happens to be a provincial jurisdiction, mind you, I would most certainly - then again I would say that they would certainly have the co-operation of Ottawa to help out, which they will have with the unemployment and all the rest of it that will come about, the unemployment insurance benefits these people will have to live on once the mine closes out. If you keep on flogging the federal government as you are doing at the moment, I will be surprised if they do not get so sick and tired of being flogged that some of the other benefits coming down from Ottawa might be cut off. So when the mines close out in the Province like out in Daniel's Harbour will do, I am afraid you people are going to be so hostile and upset with the federal boys up there that we are going to be in trouble in that direction.

Now I wish, Mr. Speaker, I really wish that this government would take a look at the things that

MR. T. BENNETT: they themselves can do, the things that they can nurture, the things that they can develop and have explored and developed that will give cash dollars on our tables, bread on our tables, in the communities. I wish they would - like last year, when we were in session last time, we had a real problem trying to get a fish plant activated in Cow Head and I pleaded with the minister responsible, several of the ministers responsible, I pleaded with them to look at possibly finding as small a dollar as \$30,000 that would activate a \$4 million cash flow into that community and they could not see fit. Where was the management, where was the management then?

We have had eight years of this government, Mr. Speaker, we have had eight years and we have seen our provincial debt tripled. Now if you tried to run anything but a government, if you tried to run anything but a government in that state, in that sad, sick state, you would be tossed out on your ear so fast you would not know what hit you. There is no industry, there is no business, there is nothing in this world that could or would even try to operate in the manner that this government has been able to operate and the deficit position they have been in. They have tripled, practically quadrupled the provincial debt on top of having increased all the taxation of the Province, and we are still going deeper and deeper and deeper and the only forecast that I can see that makes any significant sense or nonsense is the fact that we are satisfied to live with 14 per cent unemployment after we have introduced a Five Year Plan into the Province.

Surely goodness this government can make a better forecast than that. Have we got to continue to let people leave this Province and go out to the mainland, go out to the mainland, Mr. Speaker, and meet hostilities that they are presently meeting when they go to the mainland looking

MR. BENNETT: for employment? They need hostility because the mainland people are not able to come back into Newfoundland. Now, I certainly have compassion for

MR. BENNETT:

my fellow man. If anybody does have it, I have compassion for my fellow man, especially when it comes to employment. But I also have compassion for Canadian unity. And when our people go to the mainland looking - they have to go to the mainland looking for work because the government has got the whole show so mismanaged that they cannot find employment here and it looks like the unemployment figures are going to increase instead of decreasing - the hostilities that our people are meeting when they go to the mainland, it is certainly not fair, it is not fair to the people who have to go out and it is certainly not fair to the people who are out there who have to greet them with the hostilities that they presently receive.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that this government would meet the challenge of the day with less hostility. I wish they would meet the challenge of the day with a more mature capability. Surely goodness we have somebody in the government - they are not children - surely goodness we have men in government today with the maturity to sit down and talk in a sane and sensible, rational manner. You might think that we do not need Ottawa when we hear so much flogging of Ottawa, anti-federal approach to our way of life here and our development. But in my opinion if Ottawa dropped us this evening like a hot potato, while it might please a lot of you honourable gentlemen in government it would be a sad and a sick day for this Province. I feel that you have to be - and I think I have said this before - you have to be a certain age group to appreciate some of the benefits that have been derived from Confederation that I have had the privilege to experience myself, like a lot of the gentlemen on the other side of the House, but there are a lot of you hon. men who have not -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Blue bloods.

MR. BENNETT:

- and cannot understand

MR. BENNETT: the difference that has come about in the way of life in this Province as opposed to the way of life that we experienced before 1949. I do not think that either one of our leaders on either side of the House can appreciate it. I happen to have been on the work force before we entered Confederation and I was exposed to my fellow man then in the work force. A lot of these people who appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the revolution that took place are today fading out, they are getting older and they are dying off. But I hope that the younger ones coming on stream can see the wisdom and appreciate the wisdom of living in a united country, in a country that has got more to offer than oil or a country that has more to offer than just fish or a country that has got more to offer than wheat. Up until now and before Confederation we had a lot to offer, like welfare. And in the last few years it seems to me that we are reverting back to that position again

MR. BENNETT: of having an awful lot of welfare to offer to our people instead of good, sound jobs and good bread on their tables.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: I, for one, believe that a compromise can be made. We may not be looking for a compromise. I shall leave the legal ramifications for the legal opinions to sort out when it comes to jurisdiction and all the rest of the things that blend in with the constitution, I will leave that for these people. But there are an awful lot of things in this Province that I wish the government would do that would upgrade our way of life, our standard of living. Think about the fellow who does not have brains enough to get Grade XI, supposedly, or finds it very difficult, does not have the grey matter, apparently, who drops out at Grade VII; I wish there were programmes that this provincial government here could do.

MR. WARREN: There are a lot of people here who only have Grade VII, I tell you that.

MR. HODDER: Not over on the other side of the House.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR. BENNETT: Almost every day of my life I run across people who find it difficult to make their way in life, people who did not have the same opportunity as I have had and most of the hon. gentlemen, and these are the people who could not care less about this resolution or about the five year plan or about the constitution; and you people are in a position to do something about it and there is no evidence at this point that you are doing anything about it. You can stand up in this hon. House of Assembly, you can lambaste back and forth all you like, but you do not need to get up in the House of Assembly and lambaste this side or we do not need to lambaste you over there. You have the purse strings, you have the authority, you have the position and I wish

MR. BENNETT: you would use it to alleviate some of the pain and the suffering that is presently being experienced around the Island, around the Province generally, Labrador and Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: People losing their homes, victims of the system that we seem to accept - and I am saying that in a plural sense, but the onus is on the government of the day. We seem to accept it, we turn our head on it. I can find for you, Mr. Speaker, quite a number of people who through no fault of their own are losing their homes today and they are not too much worried about the resolution that we are debating. There is a lot of sick and a lot of sore, a lot of incapacitated, handicapped people around this Province, a lot of unemployed through no fault of their own, and they are being, a lot of them are just being snowed under, they are just being set aside and we have got one thing in mind to talk about and everybody knows what it is. And then you come out and spend money on a great big advertisement in the paper, in the local newspaper.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Bread and butter issues.

MR. BENNETT: Bread and butter issues! Yes, bread and butter issue! No dollars to look after some of the questions that were asked today of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey). Well, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of bread and butter issues most certainly. I think that we should talk more bread and butter issues in the House of Assembly.

MR. WARREN: They have not talked them for the last seven years.

MR. BENNETT: Well, it may be a reflection, it may be a bearing. Most certainly there is room to talk about bread and butter issues. It is the masses who elect governments,

November 19, 1980

Tape No. 2266

IB-3

MR. BENNETT: it is not the classes. And
I feel very strongly that the present government caters
only to the classes and discriminates against the masses.

MR. T. BENNETT: The classes, Mr. Speaker, do not need all the support the present government gives. They are with the classes, they are the elite, they can handle their own affairs. But the greatest problem in my district is unemployment. And I have just read in this Five Year Plan the greatest problem facing the provincial government is unemployment. After eight years in power I would be ashamed to admit it. I really would be ashamed and I would be more ashamed to accept in a Five Years Plan an equal amount of unemployment as we have to date. If we have a 14 per cent unemployment rate in five years time, that means that we have an increase in unemployment because our population is growing thanks to Uncle Ottawa being able to send down social service dollars and Unemployment Insurance so that the people can stay at home rather than go abroad looking for jobs.

Well, I just hope, Mr. Speaker, that very soon we see the day when our people can stay in Newfoundland and find jobs. And you all must agree that fifteen years ago there was a lot more jobs in Newfoundland than there are today. They might have been hard jobs with pick and shovel or bucksaw days or whatever, but there was surely a lot more employment than there is today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Prorated in relation to the population.

MR. T. BENNETT: Today I know we are mechanized and we have cut into the jobs. But, Mr. Speaker, there has been absolutely nothing done by this government when it comes to cost of living, the inflated cost of living, want the price of oil to go up. They are trying to force the price of oil up so that they we pay more for a dozen eggs and a loaf of bread. Now in my opinion that is no way to fight inflation by forcing the price of oil up, inflating the price of oil. It all comes back to that unemployed person again. The person who does not

MR. T. BENNETT: have a job still has to heat his home and he still needs to buy a dozen eggs. We are in a different position from what we were twenty-five or thirty-five or forty years ago when we grew a lot of things for ourselves. We seem to be blocked by government policy now, we are not allowed to have land anymore it seems. We are not allowed to sell eggs. There are so many things that we are not allowed to do anymore. You people are in a position to change this and you are not doing it. You are not even recognizing it.

And, Mr. Speaker, if I said anything that is not absolutely 100 per cent correct I am available to produce figures and opinions from outside the House of Assembly. So I wish, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier would take it upon himself and all the ministers of this hon. House of Assembly would zero in and do what the people of the Province want them to do, provide some bread and butter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. H. ANDREWS: In speaking to this motion, I would like to remind the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) he mentioned things that were not correct. If he had mentioned anything in his speech that was not correct, I would suggest to him that it is not the provincial government that is raising the price of oil at this time. It is the federal government exercising a policy, I will admit, that has been encouraged by this provincial government. A policy that will make it possible for the exploitation of

MR. H. ANDREWS: gas and oil resources off our coast. I get a little upset sometimes, the last week or so, hearing statements from the other side that lend themselves to express themselves that many of us on this side of the House are anti-Confederate. I am certainly not an anti-Confederate. I was seven years old, I think, at the vote for Confederation, but I think that sort of statement comes fairly close or as close as possible to accusing this side of being traitors or treasonable characters this country just because we are not and do not

MR. ANDREWS:

believe in everything that the Liberal government in Ottawa is saying at the present time. I take great exception to that, Mr. Speaker. Confederation is probably the greatest thing that ever happened to Canada, and all this present government on this side is attempting to do is to make sure that it remains a great thing and is not eroded by the transitional powers of one man who has his own thoughts and theories of how this country should be shaped. It is not only the Province of Newfoundland that stands behind this position. There are five other provinces and when you count up those five provinces and include Newfoundland, I believe you come up with a population of 52 per cent of the nation of Canada. It is quite significant when you think 52 per cent was exactly the same figure that passed the Confederation debate in this island Province at that time and Labrador. So, a very significant number of Canadians are concerned about what the Liberal government in Ottawa is attempting to do. The Liberal government will not be there, certainly, forever. Certainly, Mr. Trudeau will not be there forever.

MR. NEARY:

He will be there till he resigns.

MR. ANDREWS:

I would suspect that Mr. Trudeau might retire very soon. He may be forced to retire very soon.

Speaking to this motion by the hon. member from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), it is also very interesting and it has been said already in the House today that it is a good motion. I believe in my own mind that the hon. member who phrased the motion may have been thinking at that very moment about what he might do a few days or a few weeks down the road because this is a motion that supports the principles of this government. It supports so many things that this government is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, whereas this Province could become a partner in the development of non-renewable resources. The government's White Paper on Offshore Resources states that we will be able to buy 40 per cent interest in any offshore oil activity taking place on the Grand

MR. ANDREWS: Banks, and I hope that this 40 per cent exercise, this option is exercised as soon as possible.

I would like to go a little bit further than this motion does and suggest that the non-renewable resources fund to be funded by the industrial exploiter, one of the chief purposes of such a fund would be to provide financial relief to areas where non-renewable resources have been exhausted and to help attracting alternate industries. I think that limits the motion. It is an excellent motion, but I believe what we have to do in this Province right now is to create, as was created in the Province of Alberta, a heritage fund not only for communities affected by non-renewable resources but we have so much to do in this Province with renewable resources, with the fishery, with the forestry and so many things to do in other areas. I am thinking of public services, the area of social services, roads and rural development. I know it is the intention of the government to extract as many dollars as possible from the offshore development, but I would suggest that if a committee of the House is established, a Select Committee of the House is established, that they also be permitted to look into other possibilities besides that because there are certainly other great needs even though the disastrous things that have happened in some of our mining towns, particularly our mining towns around the Province, are so well documented. The greatest case in supporting this motion, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we will never have a fund, we will never have a fund to help any industry, renewable or non-renewable industry in this Province unless we have money,

MR. ANDREWS: and the only possible way we are going to have money is through ownership of the offshore oil and gas resource, and I would believe that the Opposition in supporting this motion also support our claim and our desire to have ownership of the offshore oil and gas resource in Newfoundland.

A heritage fund, as I referred to, as they have in the Province of Alberta, the only possible way they could have such a fund in Alberta was through ownership and from ownership flows control. And we are asking, of course, the Province is asking, and with the support of all the other nine provinces in the constitutional debate, that the offshore oil and gas resources, and the other provinces agree, should be treated as our onshore energy resources.

It is only one government out of the eleven in Canada that says no to this, one government. The federal government in Ottawa is saying that the other ten provinces, the other ten duly elected governments in Canada do not count. The people in Canada also voted for those governments. Some of them are Liberal, some of them are NDP,

AN HON. MEMBER: There are no Liberals.

MR. ANDREWS: There are no Liberal ones! What am I saying? Some of them are NDP and Social Credit, but whatever party affiliation these people have, they all agree with Newfoundland stance on the ownership of offshore oil and gas.

And, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see, unless there are some ulterior motives by the federal government which have not been explained to us yet, why they would not agree with the other ten governments. The other ten governments are duly elected. Mr. Trudeau, obviously, is attempting to shape his own Canada, and when he goes, when he resigns, when he passes away, and twenty years from now, fifty years from now I wonder what the debate will be about.

MR. ANDREWS: So, Mr. Speaker, I support this motion. It was thought up, I would say dreamed up in a moment of brilliance by a gentleman who had another moment of brilliance just a little bit later.

There is one other point that some of the members on the other side of the House might be interested in: "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Committee be authorized to sit from place to place throughout Newfoundland and Labrador".

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to have select committees all over the world, but I do believe it would be very beneficial if the Committee would be authorized to travel in other jurisdictions to see what has happened in Alberta, see what has happened in Saskatchewan, and probably some places in Europe, and I think particularly of Norway and possibly the Shetland Islands; I think the hon. member sitting across from me will agree. Some very interesting things we discovered this Summer in terms of control and ownership of the resources, and the management. So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I will say I support this motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. F.B. ROWE: In view of the hour I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has adjourned the debate. Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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