

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today, on behalf of all hon. members, some representatives from the Third St. John's Wesley Venture Company, in the district of St. John's South, and their leader, Mr. Jim Hogan. We hope they enjoy their day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to apologize for not being able to pass along this particular Ministerial Statement to the individual opposite responsible for this matter, but I was late getting here.

Mr. Speaker, one of the more widely discussed and misunderstood environmental issues of recent times is the subject of hazardous wastes and their disposal. Internationally, there have been a number of stories of environmental contamination due to the escape of hazardous materials into the environment from abandoned and improperly sealed chemical waste dumps or landfills. These incidents have served to generate public concern and, indeed, governments everywhere are tackling the very difficult problems associated with ensuring the future safe disposal of ever-increasing quantities of hazardous wastes, as well as dealing with those problems created by poor disposal practices in the past.

Hazardous wastes are one of the by-products of our industrialized society and they will

MR. DAWE: be with us for as long as there is a chemical industry.

The various provinces of Canada, and, indeed, the Federal Government have all been cognizant of these problems for some time and considerable effort has already been expended in coming to terms with the issue and determining environmentally acceptable solutions. At its 1978 annual meeting, the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers officially recognized the need for action concerning hazardous wastes and it gave strong support for a joint Federal/Provincial programme. Initially, this programme took the form of defining the scope of the hazardous waste problem and implementing a manifest system of hazardous waste transportation. Recognition that availability of disposal sites in the United States was uncertain led to the need to identify acceptable disposal sites and facilities in Canada during the coming years and, indeed, the United States border was closed to PCB disposal from Canadian sources as of May 1, 1980. A need was also established to carry out an inventory of hazardous wastes by provinces and territories.

At a meeting of Environment Ministers in Prince Edward Island this past September,

MR. DAWE: the results of a hazardous wastes inventory of the Maritime Provinces indicated that they alone generated 138,900 metric tons. As a matter of interest, this was determined to be approximately 10 per cent of the total waste generated in these Provinces on an annual basis.

These waste materials varied from acids or alkalies, which in some cases might be readily treated at the source, to solvents which may need special treatment and disposal methods. For example, the well-known PCB's - which do need special treatment - require special storage facilities and can only be destroyed by high temperature incineration.

Although a wide range of chemical wastes may be classed as hazardous, the ones we are most familiar with in Newfoundland and Labrador are the chemicals known as polychlorinated biphenyls - PCB's - used primarily in transformers and electrical switching gear in the past, but now prohibited for new installation. These chemicals are a recognized hazard if in long term contact, or ingested. Because of their stability and resistance to break-down, these chemicals will persist for a long time in the environment if spilled and not cleaned up.

Government has acted in cleaning up waste PCB's at former USAF radar Installations at Cartwright and Hopedale in Labrador. Other wastes at these sites, and at Saglek, consist of waste oils, tar, greases, fuels and used lubricants - materials which are environmental contaminants, but by no means considered hazardous in the same sense that PCB's are. Identification of these and their quantities, etc., are part of our own local inventory study of hazardous waste materials that was carried out by my department in co-operation with the Federal Environment Protection Service this past

MR. DAWE: Summer, the results of which are presently being compiled and assessed. Upon completion of this study, I shall be making a report on the whole situation to my colleagues in Cabinet.

Clean-up of abandoned facilities is a complex, costly, and time consuming task. In addressing such problems, our first priority concern has to be, is there an immediate health or safety threat to humans? Secondly, is there an immediate threat to the environment? And thirdly, is there a long-term threat to the environment? Government decision as to what action will be taken at which sites will have to be taken within the context and based upon these criteria.

To complicate this decision even further, the matter of ownership and jurisdiction must of necessity also be an influencing factor. Responsibility for administration, management and control of certain lands at Saglek, Hopedale, Cartwright, Goose Bay, and other sites in Labrador were transferred to the Department of National Defence between 1941 and 1965. These lands were subsequently sub-leased to the United States Government so that air bases and/or communications stations could be established. The property and equipment which remained on site when the US authorities subsequently withdrew were sub-leased to a variety of communication and exploration companies. Property and equipment which was not sub-leased became the responsibility of the Crown Assets Disposal Corporation - a Federal Crown Agency. The corporation carried out its dismantling and disposal function by contracting private salvage

MR. DAWE: companies or by direct sales to public and private groups.

By 1976, responsibility for some tracts of land had been transferred back to the Province. However, records pertaining to such transfers do not indicate clearly that all land has reverted to Newfoundland. Furthermore, preliminary investigations indicate that the condition of land which has been returned to the Province, may actually constitute a violation of the original transfer to federal authorities.

I would like to inform this House that last Spring government set up a small working group, headed by the Intergovernmental Affairs Secretariat and comprising officials from the Departments of Consumer Affairs and Environment, Justice, and Forest Resources and Lands, to try and co-ordinate the resolution to this problem. The work of this committee is still ongoing as the matter is a very complex and legal issue.

The hon. members of this House and, indeed, the Newfoundland public at large can be assured that my department and government are pursuing the resolution of hazardous waste problems in this Province. This has been well illustrated by our recent action that was promptly taken to remove, containerize and safely store PCBs in the Labrador area. As with my recent statement concerning acid rain, I will be reporting to this House on a periodic basis relative to this and other environmentally topical issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of a shadow for the minister, I would like to respond to this.

MR. WARREN: I find it very unusual, Mr. Speaker, that within fifteen to eighteen hours after Mr. Toby Matthews made it public by the media yesterday that there was an enormous amount of toxic material at the radar sites in Northern Labrador and today the minister comes out and makes a Ministerial Statement. I think the thanks should go to Mr. Toby Matthews, not to the minister.

MR. BARRY: That is action (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: So that is what you call action. Yes, that is what you call action.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) action.

MR. HODDER: That is not action, it is reaction.

MR. WARREN: In 1976, I would like to read here that order said, 'The land being no longer required by the Department of National Defence, the administration and control of 746 acres of Crown land situated at Hopedale and 6,460 acres of land situated at Saglek Bay' - and this is exactly where these chemicals are - 'in the electoral district of Eagle River, which was transferred to Her Majesty in the right of Canada to Order in Council in 1965 be and are hereby assured by Her Majesty in the right of Newfoundland.' So it was transferred back to Newfoundland in 1976.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: And now, this is what you call action today in 1980. That is good action, five years.

As I said, I think the minister should be glad that he has a competent staff of Mr. Toby Matthews to bring this to the light of the Newfoundland public.

MR. G. WARREN: I wrote to Crown Lands myself in November when this came to my attention and at that time Crown Lands and the federal government said, 'Look, that is a provincial responsibility to get this cleared up'. And what do we have after Mr. Matthews makes this statement and the minister comes out with a Ministerial Statement and says, 'We are doing everything we can.' Yes, five years! 'We are doing everything we can.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further statements?

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) dealing with Come By Chance. Yesterday he tabled a letter which had one clause out of an agreement between the receiver and Petro-Canada. Can he tell us now whether or not the people who are responsible - Peat, Marwick on behalf of Kleinwort, Benson - have they also accepted the conditions set out by Petro-Canada?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in Question Period yesterday I informed the Leader of the Opposition that it was my understanding at that time that the agreement for purchase and sale entered into between Petro-Canada and the first mortgagee and the receiver on July 28th was a public document. I said that was my understanding; I was not absolutely certain but I said that it was my understanding and I said that I would undertake to find out. I have since found out and it is, indeed, a public document. As a matter of fact it was -

MR. L. STIRLING: It has not been tabled.

DR. J. COLLINS: - one of the documents that was before the court a little while ago. So, I mean, it is readily



DR. J. COLLINS: available to whomsoever wishes to peruse it. And the conditions in that public document, I am informed and to my own knowledge-although I am not a lawyer, I would like to point that out, but I did check for my own reasons -the provisions in that public document are quite consistent with the letter that we received from Petro-Canada.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I understand it, then, the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) has accepted the fact that Petro-Canada will eventually make the judgment that if they decide not to operate the plant they can take whatever steps they need to take, including scrapping of the plant; does the Minister of Finance now accept the fact that if that happens Newfoundland has no possibility whatsoever of recovering any of our \$40 million, or whatever that figure is, \$40 million investment?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure in what terms I should answer the hon. the Leader of the Opposition because he is now bringing up points that are common knowledge that have been mentioned any number of times. Just as an example,

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could just read from the Budget Speech I gave - how many months ago? - six months ago whatever it was, and I said here, 'I wish to emphasize that at this time there is no guarantee that the refinery can be rehabilitated and put back into operation. A final decision on that matter must await the outcome of the inspection process and other feasibility studies which Petro-Canada has formally undertaken to conduct.' Now, when the agreement for purchase and sale was entered into with the owners-and the owners are not the Province of Newfoundland; the Province of Newfoundland is in the second mortgage position which is far down from ownership because even in the first mortgage I think there were five participants involving, I do not know, at least four nations, I think, if not five nations, so we are far away from being owners and therefore having any right to set the terms of sale of this refinery - but the letter of agreements entered into for purchase and sale between Petro-Canada and the owners, i.e. the first mortgagee and the receiver and manager of the refinery, laid all these provisions out, and this is, as I say, a public document and those points that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is now bringing up are something that everyone should know who has paid attention to what has been going on in regard to the refinery for the past number of years.

MR. STIRLING:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I accept the fact that a minister has the right not to answer, and he has just taken five or six minutes not to answer the question.

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) tell us whether or not - and he has referred to a public document and I think he was very careful to point out that it became public because it was before the courts. It was never tabled in this House but it is public because it went before the courts. Another matter that went before the courts was an offer that involved something like ten or twenty times the offer of Petro-Canada - could the Minister of Finance tell us whether or not they have looked at that offer which was before the courts as an alternative to the Petrocan offer when Petrocan said, yesterday that in fact they were changing the agreement, has the Province looked at that alternative offer?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to an offer from Peninsula Refining Company Limited, I believe that that is the offer. I might say that it is our understanding, and I think it is as pretty general understanding, that this particular company, Peninsula Refining Company Limited, or Peninsula Refining, in short, which is a Newfoundland company, is nevertheless essentially a John Shaheen company. I think this -

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) Yes, exactly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. J. COLLINS: I might just clarify the point that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) brought up. I have before me an affidavit signed by the receiver which was one of the documents considered by the court, the Trial Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, during the recent case in regard to this. And in part it says that 'an offer dated the 30th. day of September 1980.' - and I am just seeing if I can see the date; yes, this affidavit is dated the 14th. of October so that was two weeks before this affidavit - 'an offer dated the 30th. day of September 1980 submitted by Peninsula Refining Company Limited, a Newfoundland company.' So he refers to an offer that he had received two weeks beforehand. And he goes on to say that 'the offer of Peninsula Refining has been reviewed by Kleinworth Benson', that is the first mortgagee, representing the first mortgagee, and Export Credits Guarantee Department of the Secretary of State of Her Britannic Majesty's government - ECGD - that is the guaranteeing arm of the British Government, the principle guarantors of the first mortgage, as well as Peat, Marwick, that this offer then was reviewed by the receiver, it was reviewed by the first mortgagee, it was reviewed by a division of Her Majesty's government, and it goes on to say, number four, 'That the offer of Peninsula Refining contains several conditions which are acceptable to Kleinworth Benson and ECGD.' And a little bit further on it states, 'That Peat Marwick, Kleinworth Benson and ECGD have the gravest doubts as to whether any offer to purchase the refinery by Mr. Shaheen or any company with whom he is associated can attract adequate financial support.'

Now the Province up to that time, that is the court action, had not received the proposal referred to here nor was there any particular why it should because the proposal was quite properly directed to the receiver and to the owners of the refinery, i.e. the

DR. J. COLLINS: first mortgagee and, as I wish to point out, the province is not an owner of the refinery, never has been and, I trust, it never will be.

So we had not seen this proposal; however, we were informed by people in whom we have placed the greatest of trust throughout this whole exercise, i.e., Peat Marwick, the receiver, and ECGD, a division of the British government in whom we have placed great trust throughout the whole exercise, we were informed by them that they would not accept this proposal as they did not

DR. J. COLLINS: accept a prior proposal coming essentially from the same gentleman, I think in 1978, which we ourselves at that time studied in tremendous detail and at great expense and found not to be feasible.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I take it that the answer that the Finance Minister gave was no.

DR. COLLINS: You have the word.

MR. STIRLING: He is very good at reporting court documents, The question was has the Newfoundland Government considered that proposal and he said, 'No.' And he then quoted some conditions. It seems to me - now this may be the kind of great financial wisdom that is only capable of coming from the other side - but it seems to me that if Petro-Canada has a deal in which they can buy something for \$10 million, and you have an offer from somebody, and it does not really make any difference what his future is but he is prepared to put up \$75 million, it seems that the government, on behalf of the people of Newfoundland who had \$40 million in there -

MR. WARREN: Right on. Right on.

MR. STIRLING: - could consider buying something for \$17 million and selling it to somebody else for \$75 million, because it is my understanding that the cash was put up. So are we saying now that the Province really has not been involved in this at all and that they have accepted the word of the receivers, and that they have washed their hands of it, and that they are now saying that they are not the least bit concerned? Maybe I can ask another specific question so the Minister of Finance

MR. STIRLING: (Dr. Collins) can again quote some public document. Is the Minister of Finance now accepting in this deal that the unsecured Newfoundland creditors are just washed out of the matter completely, the unsecured or Newfoundland creditors, under the changed agreement that you said you agreed to yesterday, the Newfoundland creditors now will not get a nickel and you have accepted that?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a double-barreled question. The first one relates to the payment for the purchase of the refinery. I suppose the quickest response to this is that if the receiver and certainly the first mortgagee felt that they had a better deal with someone else, they had no reason to take a lesser deal. I cannot conceive, although I am struggling now to try to put this in my mind -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: - I cannot conceive why the receiver and the first mortgagee would want to take a lesser price if they felt a greater price was well within their grasp. There may be a subtlety here that the hon. Leader of the Opposition may explain to me, but I have difficulty in getting my mind around that.

Now the first mortgagee is owed a lot of money; he has two offers, one is for a bigger amount and one is for a smaller amount, so he says, "I am going to elect to take the smaller amount." Now I am having difficulty in dealing with that concept.

MR. WARREN: We know you have difficulty dealing with a concept.

DR. COLLINS: But I am going to try again.

Now, the second point, in regard to the unsecured creditors, I, this government, this side of the House, and I am sure that side of the House, would

DR. COLLINS: wish that every single unsecured creditor was paid in full and that not only that, that perhaps some extra retribution was made to each unsecured creditor for all the trouble they have been through and all the anguish and all the rest of it.

This administration in its dealings and in its negotiations, not only with Petro-Canda, not only with First Arabian Corporation, and prior to that not only with the unsuccessful and invalid and unfeasible proposal put forward by Mr. Shaheen, we endeavoured to put in place just payment for the



DR. COLLINS:

unsecured creditors, we made great efforts. We are in a very limited position though in that regard; we can only put forward as strongly as possible the case we can make for the unsecured creditors. We are not in a position to insist. We do not own the refinery. We are not purchasing the refinery, and we would be out of our minds to purchase the refinery. So we are not in a position to supply unsecured creditors with monies, we can only make our very best efforts. And I would like to ensure this hon. House, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) in particular, that we made the greatest efforts that we possibly could.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING:

You see, on this side of the House we can understand the mental exercise that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) went through a few minutes ago and said, 'Why would any first mortgagee accept \$15 million instead of \$75 million?' But we have even greater difficulty in seeing the Minister of Finance ask that question but be satisfied on behalf of the people of Newfoundland saying, 'That sounds crazy but we better not investigate it any more -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

- we had better not check it any further.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order has been raised. The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The point of order is that this is Question Period and the purpose of the exercise is to ask questions and not to debate answers that have been given.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point or order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: As the Speaker has pointed out many times; when people answering questions drift all over the place they are encouraging the people asking questions to make some preliminary comment. And it was a provocative suggestion by the Minister of Finance and I am really only responding to his invitation to make those opening comments before getting to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I think once again the Standing Orders are very clear for everybody to read and I will just quote one section, Standing Order 31(c): "In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same; and in answering such question, the Minister is not to debate the matter to which it refers."

I bring that to the attention of all hon. members and ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to proceed with his supplementary question.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is an easy technique that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) uses. Any time a minister gets in trouble, he will try to take the heat off him with a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

November 26, 1980, Tape 2427, Page 3 -- apb

MR. STIRLING: I will continue with my  
question. Would the Minister of Finance

MR. STIRLING:

tell us what he did to satisfy himself about that problem? Why would a first mortgagee, and Newfoundland following their great lead, why would a first mortgagee accept \$15 million instead of \$75 million? Can he do anything to assure us that they did any checking in that other than to accept the fact that, well, the first mortgagee must have had a good reason? Can he tell us what the good reasons are?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Give us a good reason.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I can certainly try

to do that. I do not know but I should take notice. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition has brought up a point that should be answered and perhaps I should. So perhaps I can give an answer now that I have readily with me, and if the Leader of the Opposition indicates that he wishes a fuller answer I will certainly try to get it for him. But perhaps I could answer it best this way, continuing on from another part of the affidavit which was given to the court by the receiver in the recent court action. It says here, as I say, 'this offer from Peninsula Refining was unacceptable for the following reasons, (1) A new lender to Peninsula Refining having a first charge on the refinery to secure \$45 million in Canadian currency ranking in priority of the first mortgage.' So in other words one of the points in the Peninsula Refining proposal was that they should raise another \$45 million for which the security would be the refinery and that security would rank ahead of the present outstanding mortgage. And that seems to me a rather obvious reason why a first mortgagee would not accept that proposition.

Secondly, 'Kleinworth, Benson

DR. COLLINS: agreeing to freeze the present first mortgage debt as of the date of bankruptcy in February 1976 with interest only to accrue as of the start of the refinery thereby resulting in a loss of approximately \$44 million in Canadian currency.' In other words, quite rightly the first mortgagee had interest accruing to his account as the first mortgage remained unpaid. Another provision of the Peninsula proposal was that all that accrued interest should be wiped out and, as the first mortgagee points out, that would mean wiping out \$44 million. So that in effect it would mean asking the present first mortgagee, who now has his mortgage compromised, would make a contribution of \$44 million to the Shaheen proposal. '(C) The alteration of priorities provided by the first mortgage so as to allow payment to be made to other creditors prior to the repayment to the first mortgage, including payments to a new lender including a first charge on the refinery and to the Government of Newfoundland, the second mortgagee.' So there would be payments made to people in advance.

MR. STIRLING: The unsecured creditors.

DR. COLLINS: Not only to the first mortgage -

MR. STIRLING: Newfoundland unsecured creditors.

DR. J. COLLINS: - but also in advance of the Province itself.

MR. L. STIRLING: Putting the Newfoundland creditors in a preferred position.

DR. J. COLLINS: Perhaps I could read that again; 'to other creditors'-unspecified. We do not know who these other creditors might be.

MR. BARRY: Wake up! wake up!

DR. J. COLLINS: It seems to me that there are laid out, you know, certainly a few good reasons why the first mortgagee-who owns the refinery after all, he is the owner of the refinery- could not possibly agree to a proposal such as Mr. Shaheen put forward, and it would seem, from his point of view, it is clearly, you know, an invalid proposal. That is all I can say at this moment.

MR. L. STIRLING: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Do I take it, then, that the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) now accepts the position that they have agreed with that? Was this discussed by Cabinet, agreed to accept that position, agreed not to protect the Newfoundland creditors and agreed to turn down that? Are you now in agreement with that? Are you saying that this was considered and is it now in agreement? And the final question is because of all this confusion and some of the questions that the minister himself is puzzling with, do you not think that this whole question should be examined, this whole question and all of the information dealing with the Newfoundland Refining in a more formal manner?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Shaheen, I can only reiterate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

DR. J. COLLINS: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. My apologies, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STIRLING: Are you calling the Speaker Shaheen's spokesman?

DR. J. COLLINS: I note, Mr. Speaker, that even my friends opposite had the good grace to laugh over that one.

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing personal, I hope.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate what I have said before, that we do not own the refinery. We cannot insist on payments of this, that or the other one; we cannot insist on an acceptance of one thing or another because we are not in that position. And possibly I might be able to find, but I will not hold up the business of the House, but I might just point out that the judge in his judgment, in his decision, he said it would be unreasonable to expect the first mortgagee to put himself into a position on accepting such a proposal; it would be unreasonable to do so, it would be outside the bounds of reason and we are not in any greater position, surely, than the courts in this regard. We cannot insist on this, that or the other thing; it is not in our power. We would like to, but we just cannot do it; we are not in such a powerful position.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the Minister of Finance a question. Having approved the sale of the refinery to Petrocan for \$15 million as opposed to offers of \$71 million and that kind of thing, does the minister accept that Petrocan six months down the road can decide to scrap that refinery? The scrap value of the refinery, as we are told, has been reported at around \$100 million, we can get \$100 million for it as a junk yard sale, scrap, Now is the minister prepared to confirm to the House that having approved the Petrocan position that Petrocan might indeed be able to do that, decide to scrap that refinery and sell it for any amount in excess of \$15 million?

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

DR. COLLINS: Firstly, Mr. Speaker, it is not our prerogative or otherwise to approve this. We do not own the refinery. We approve nothing. You cannot approve the sale of something that you do not own.

MR. FLIGHT: You do:

DR. COLLINS: But I think that is just a slip of the tongue. I suppose what the hon. member is asking is do we support such an action?

Now, if you take his information that the scrap value is \$100 million, there might be some validity to that question. The information we have is that the scrap value is considerably less than that.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes.

DR. COLLINS: It may in actual fact be zero.

MR. WARREN: Put a figure on it.

DR. COLLINS: It may be zero.

MR. FLIGHT: It may be.

DR. COLLINS: It may well be zero, and the



DR. COLLINS: highest I personally have heard is of the order of \$15 million to \$20 million, but I think that even that was a ballpark figure.

The point about it, Mr. Speaker, is that much of the equipment is, of itself, not very valuable. It is the putting together and putting in place and so on and so forth. So the actual tubes and pipes and pumps, and so on and so forth, intrinsically do not have that much value.

The other point is that once you dismantle, you run into tremendous costs; once you transport, you run into tremendous costs; and thirdly, there is a very limited market for this type of equipment, because each refinery is really a custom-built operation, and it is difficult to find another custom-built operation with which this will integrate readily.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this Province witnessed a \$600 million bankruptcy. There have been offers to the government in excess - we have read offer after offer in excess of \$100 million. There was an intervention by Peninsula Refining worth \$71 million, Mr. Speaker. The minister might talk around it all he likes, there was a portion of that \$71 million -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member is debating now. I believe he should put a supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the Peninsula Refinery put on up front \$45 million that would have been available, up front, and the minister is saying that they would accept the Petrocan offer of \$15 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: My question is, Mr. Speaker, in view of this government's having no problem with nationalizing - they have been known to nationalize something when they thought it was in the better interests of this Province before - would the minister consider nationalizing Petro-Canada and if it comes to a junk sale let the Province, let us have what profit can be made on it? So, Mr. Speaker, would the minister consider nationalizing as opposed to approving the Petro-Canada sale for \$15 million, nationalizing and getting the resale value?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: It is alright, we will get back to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, our prime concern in this whole matter has been to, if we possibly could do so, rehabilitate and to lease that refinery. That has been our prime approach. Now, there were some other things in our approach too. First of all, we wanted environmental protection and we are not neglecting that by any means. We wanted to see if the Province could recoup some of its expenditures, but these were other things, and, as I mentioned to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, one of our objectives was, if we could possibly do it in any shape or form, we wanted to get some return for the unsecured creditors. But these, in many respects, were secondary. Our prime objective was to rehabilitate and restart, and in going towards that objective we think we have made the best move. We have got the most credible organization on side now. That organization is on side to the extent that they have now undertaken to purchase the refinery. And they

DR. COLLINS:                    have also given us firm, sincere  
undertakings that we have absolutely no reason to doubt-

                  I mean, I cannot conceive doubting the word of  
Petro-Canada, quite honestly - So we have no reason to  
doubt that they will use their

DR. J. COLLINS:

sincerest efforts to re-start this refinery. And I venture to guess that if Petro-Canada cannot re-start this refinery, no one can.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): We have time for one final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the minister knows, and we all know as a result of his statement yesterday that Petro-Canada has made no commitments to this government - they are going to buy it for \$15 million. Would the minister confirm that it may be possible, if we want to go from the ridiculous to the sublime, that it would be possible for Petro-Canada to sell that refinery to Shaheen for \$16 million six months from now? And the Shaheen proposal through Peninsula Refinery and the rest would have been - he could have saved himself an awful lot of money. Petro-Canada has no commitment to the Province. Can Petro-Canada - can the minister concede that is a possibility, that Petro-Canada will decide to offload it for \$20 million or for anything in excess of what they paid for it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is incorrect to say that Petro-Canada has made no commitment to the Province. Petro-Canada has made a commitment to the Province, (a) to the province as well as to others that it will purchase the refinery. That is the first commitment. It has made the second commitment to the Province that it will use its very best efforts to rehabilitate and will only undertake other actions if they are driven off that particular objective. And the third commitment to the Province is that if they are driven off that objective by circumstances that they

DR. J. COLLINS: cannot control, that they will consult with the Province before taking any other action and we will have full and complete consultation.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that in the past our consultations with Petro-Canada have been absolutely forthright, have been satisfactory to us. Both sides realize that we are dealing with an extremely difficult situation but there has been an incredible amount of good will and co-operation and forthrightness on both sides.

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

I would like to welcome to the galleries today on behalf of all hon. members Mr. Reg. Hussey from Corner Brook, the the district of Humber East, who is the Provincial President of the Association of School Tax Authorities. I am sure all hon. members would like to join me.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) poor people in the  
(inaudible) 000

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: While Your Honour was on your feet extending the greeting that Your Honour just did, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) repeatedly was making interjections and Your Honour's voice could hardly be heard. I just point out to the Chair, Your Honour, that when Your Honour rises and Your Honour speaks everybody in the Chamber remains completely silent, because it is a discourtesy to the Chair to act in that particular manner.

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

MR. J. HODDER: To that point of order, there was no point of order whatsoever. What the hon. House Leader was telling the Speaker was that he was not maintaining order. I heard no disorder here in the House whatsoever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, the rules are very, very clear. When the Speaker stands, the members are to be quiet and retain their seats. I suspect there was a legitimate point of order in that particular matter and I rule that there was.

NOTICES OF MOTION

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.  
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.  
DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to revert to Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. I apologize, I must have missed that announcement. Could we revert to Presenting Reports?  
MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to revert?  
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.  
DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 28 of the Financial Administration Act, I have pleasure in tabling copies of seven special warrants.  
MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?

000

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I have to table a response to a question asked only two days ago by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), an oral question.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further Answers to Questions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members Day, we were debating the Private Members motion put forward by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). The debate was adjourned, I believe, by the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe).

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not here.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution presented by my friend and colleague for Baie Verte - White Bay basically because it

MR. DINN:

contained within that resolution all of the things that we believe in on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, without going through all of the detail of the resolution, it gets down to the main nuts and bolts of the resolution which says that the Province become a partner in the development of all of our non-renewable resources, which means mining which would have a very great impact on the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (T. Rideout) and many other hon. members in this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we can recognize that during Question Period we got several questions with respect to a resource that we have here in the Province, that resource being the Come By Chance Refinery. It is one where the Province at one time had 100 per cent - was a 100 per cent partner in that resource in that it guaranteed all of the funds. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that if that contract had not been changed we would have been in debt to the tune of well over \$600 million on that one refinery alone. I do not think that is what the hon. the member for Baie Verte-White Bay means for this resolution, that we should get somebody to come in here to develop a resource, renewable or non-renewable, and be on the backs guaranteeing all of the monies for that development. But he means that we should be involved in that development so that we should have some protections.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many things were - questions were raised today in this House that relate



MR. DINN: to this resolution. The question such as why do we not prefer onebidder on the refinery to another bidder on the refinery. Mr. Speaker, we have all been around for three or four or five years in this legislature and in this Province dealing with the very unfortunate occurrence of the close-down of that refinery due to a bankruptcy. That fact of the matter is that that refinery could not be operated, it had to be closed down. It was closed down and a receiver was moved in there by the courts to look after the assets that refinery has. Why do we not accept Mr. Shaheen's proposal? Well, Mr. Speaker, I was around in 1978 when the receiver, Peat, Marwick, requested that anyone interested in buying that refinery or taking over that refinery put in a bid. The bids were to be closed on the 14th day, I believe, of October, 1978. Well, Mr. Speaker, at that point in time there was only one proposal received. It was a letter of intent from another firm or conglomerate called the First Arabian Corporation. That was the only thing received by anybody, by the receiver at that closing date. And at the 11th hour - not the 11th hour, not the 12th hour but at the 13th hour, ten or fifteen days later, Mr. Shaheen walked in with his proposal that appeared on the surface to be better than the one presented by First Arabian.

Now, Mr. Speaker, very knowledgeable people looked at this. Kleinwort, Benson looked at it, ECGD looked at it, Peat, Marwick looked at it. All of

MR. DINN: these people are very, very competent people and they said that the proposal was just absolutely no good, not feasible, not viable and it just would not work.

Now we as a government at that time, Mr. Speaker, having put our faith in Mr. Shaheen once to the tune of guaranteeing everything that happened on that refinery - now not this government but a former government, and we do not need to get into who that government was or what that government was, but they guaranteed all of it. Now comes along Mr. Shaheen at the 13th or 14th hour with his proposal that appeared to be better than the proposal put in at that time by First Arabian.

So, Mr. Speaker, a great uproar came in the Province and hon. members opposite made a great to-do about why do we not accept poor old Mr. Shaheen's offer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Discriminated against him.

MR. DINN: Discriminating against Mr. Shaheen is what we were doing. The dirty old Tory government was discriminating against poor old Mr. Shaheen, who after all put the refinery there with our money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at what happened there. The Newfoundland government, not convinced, not knowing all of the details at the time, the Newfoundland government said, well, maybe there is something in what Mr. Shaheen is saying. After all, he did try to do something, it did not work out but he did try. Is what he is proposing better than what First Arabian is proposing?

MR. DINN: If it is is it in the best interest of the people of this Province to accept Mr. Shaheen's offer rather than the one proposed by the First Arabian Corporation? So we suggested to Mr. Shaheen, after this big uproar, that maybe we will have a look at this and we will recommended a firm that was very competent that should go in and have a look at it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Shaheen was not happy with the firm that we chose, so we said to Mr. Shaheen, "Well, Mr. Shaheen, if you are not happy with that firm could you recommend a reputable firm to come in here and have a look at your proposal? And if that firm proves to be reputable, if we can investigate and find out that that firm is reputable, then we will have that firm investigate your proposal and recommend to us." So, Mr. Shaheen recommended -

MR. RIDEOUT: How could you be so reasonable?

MR. DINN: Mr. Shaheen recommended a firm, it was called Thorne Riddell, and we investigated and found out that Thorne Riddell was indeed a very reputable firm. Mr. Shaheen recommended Thorne Riddell. The unreasonable Tory Government at the time said, "Okay, Mr. Shaheen, since it is a reputable firm we will have Thorne Riddell investigate your proposal and see if there is anything in your proposal."

Well, Mr. Speaker, they investigated for several months. As a matter of fact, I believe it went on for some six months or more, and before they submitted their report they went back to New York and they met with Mr. Shaheen and they said, "Mr. Shaheen, do you have any other additions you would like to make to your proposal?" And Mr. Shaheen said, "No, that is my final offer. That is it. Nothing else. That is better than First Arabian and I am confident."

So Thorne Riddell went through the whole thing and finally wrote their report to government. That report said, Mr. Speaker, and I have not got

MR. DINN: the complete Thorne Riddell report, but basically what it said was that it was not feasible for a prudent investor to invest.

Now by 'prudent investor' everybody in the Province got into a big uproar about, "Well, you do not have to be a prudent investor, Mr. Shaheen is one of those guys who takes a chance and we can get it working," you see. But why should not the Newfoundland Government get involved in, or why should not the Newfoundland Government recommend what Mr. Shaheen was proposing? And I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Basically because in the proposal that Mr. Shaheen had in to Peat Marwick and into the Newfoundland Government at the time was that, 'If you give us a contract for the supply of fuel to Hydro for three or five years, which will come out to a total contract of about \$75 million Canadian, or \$65 million American, then we take that and finance the refinery. But what we want now, Newfoundland Government, is we want that \$75 million up front and when we get the refinery working then we will supply you with the oil to keep Holyrood going and whatever Hydro uses that fuel for.'

MR. RIDEOUT: Sink another \$75 million.

MR. DINN: So what he wanted us to do, Mr. Speaker, was to throw another \$75 million into the bottomless pit that we had got involved with before, and we as a government, and Thorne Riddell, a firm recommended by Mr. Shaheen, we as a government - who had now come back with their fine report and said, "It is not feasible and it will not work," the dirty old Tory Government did not throw the \$75 million away. Now is that not a shame? Is that not a terrible, terrible thing for the dirty old Tory Government to do, not to accept Mr. Shaheen's proposal which meant that we would have to throw another \$75 million into that bottomless bit. We have \$35 million

MR. DINN: in there now, plus interest, And hon. members opposite got up and they waxed eloquently at the time about why the Newfoundland Government was treating poor, old Mr. Shaheen so badly. Well, Thorne Riddell investigated that report - now we did not listen at the time, by the way, to Kleinwort, Benson, or Peat Marwick, or the ECGD, the Export Credit Guarantee Department of Great Britian, we did not listen to them, we said, "Let us give Mr. Shaheen an unbiased investigation." And we got a firm recommended by Mr. Shaheen and they went about our investigation and they came back and said the proposal was full of baloney, that it could not work, that it was not feasible and that if you did put your \$75 million in it would be another \$75 million down the drain.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the eleventh hour Mr. Shaheen said, "I did not need the Hydro contract. I got \$75 million." And I have not seen a sou since, nor has anybody else by the way. Now what he wants is,

MR. J. DINN: 'Let us forget about the refinery, let us put that off to the side for a second, let us put all the deals that went before and all the people who went bankrupt, let us put that aside and give me the refinery. And based on the asset I can raise \$40 or \$45 million and I can go through the same old rigmarole again.' Well, Mr. Speaker, they must think we are some gullible down here. We were on the backs- based on the original deal - we would have been on the backs of the people of Newfoundland for \$600 million. And the former Premier of this Province re-negotiated that deal to a point where he saved this Province \$550 or \$600 million, saved this Province \$600 million. And we are on the backs now of the Newfoundland people for \$35 million and Mr. Shaheen wanted us to go into, 'Invest again in me!' And everybody says he cannot do it; Peat Marwick says he cannot do it, ECGD says he cannot do it, the Export Credit Guarantee Department of Great Britian says he cannot do it, he has not got a sou to invest in this. And we have hon. members opposite standing up and making a big to-do about poor old Mr. Shaheen. Well, if Mr. Shaheen or anybody else comes in with a viable, financial proposal he will get the ears of this government. But until he does, and he has not yet - and, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you another thing, the Thorne Riddell Report cost this government \$240,000 or thereabouts to have that independent view done. Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. L. Stirling) gets up today, 'Are we going to throw away Mr. Shaheen's proposal without a glance, without looking at it, without investigating?' Is he recommending that we do another investigation of Mr. Shaheen's proposal and spend another \$250,000? Is that what we have to do every time Mr. Shaheen turns over in his bed and gets another idea- spend another \$250,000 to find out whether Mr. Shaheen's proposal is good or bad? Or should we listen to these reputable financial people, Peat Marwick, ECGD, Kleinwort, Benson, people who have a little more capability to investigate

MR. J. DINN: these things than we do. I think it is nearly time we started listening to these financial people.

This government has nothing against Mr. Shaheen or anyone else as long as he comes in with something that is viable. But the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) read today into the record of this House an affidavit, and on that affidavit Kleinwort, Benson, ECGD, the Export Credit Guarantee Department of Great Britain and Peat, Marwick, all very reputable people, he read into the record today a affidavit that said that what Mr. Shaheen was proposing was not viable, it could not work. Now I do not know how long it is going to take for that to sink into hon. members opposite, but this government is not going to throw any more dollars down that bottomless pit for Mr. Shaheen or anyone else. If he comes in with a viable proposal we will have a look at it, but we are not going to throw it away, we are not going to sell it out. We were lucky to get out from underneath the \$600 million, lucky. Mr. Shaheen on a whim on day said, 'Look, this is going to be so successful,' he said, 'that I do not need the guarantee of the Newfoundland government.' And we said, 'Well, if you do not need the guarantee, sign on the dotted line.' We got his signature and, thanks be to God, we saved \$600 million in one fell swoop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN: We are still on the backs for \$35 million. If we could have gotten off the backs for that we would have, but he was not as free as we thought he could be. So we got all the money back and the Newfoundland people do not owe the \$600 million; we are on the backs for \$35 million, and the answer to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and anyone else who asks is that if Mr. Shaheen comes in with a proposal that people in the financial circles think is viable, Kleinwort Benson, ECGD, Peat Marwick -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! A point of order.

MR. HODDER: They do not want to hear the truth, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: The particular resolution, Mr. Speaker, deals with non-renewable resources. I feel that the minister is not speaking on the resolution and therefore he is being irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that there is a rule of relevancy in this House.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, one of these days some hon. members opposite are going to wake up. The hon. member should read the resolution which says, 'the Province should become involved in the development of all non-renewable resources'. We have Hibernia out there, it is oil, our refinery develops that and refines that and, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a non-renewable resource I do not know what is. The hon. member does not want to hear the truth is what is going on.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, during debate on Private Members' motions the realm of debated is rather broad and, secondly, relevancy is very difficult to define. And the hon. member speaking should be given the benefit of the doubt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Thirdly, we are speaking about, in this motion, a non-renewable resource and indeed the Come By Chance refinery, with the implications of oil as a non-renewable resource certainly fits into that category. However, I would ask the minister if he, in making his observations, would confine his remarks to the motion and come back to it as quickly as possible.



MR. DINN:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. members opposite do not like to hear what I am saying, that is what the problem is. Mr. Speaker, this resolution deals with the Province becoming involved as a partner in the development of all non-renewable resources, as we have done, which is why I said the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is toe-to-toe, cheek-to-jowl on everything that we are doing over here. Mr. Speaker, we have done exactly that thing with respect to offshore resources, a non-renewable resource whereby we are going to get involved in anything that is developed out there with forty per cent equity. I mean, that is the way we operate over here, Mr. Speaker. This is why this meets in unison with everything - it beats with our hearts over here, Mr. Speaker, and the Come By Chance refinery is just an example of how we should not develop resources, we should not develop things, we should not guarantee all the funding for the Come By Chance refinery-and we got out of it, we saved \$550 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. DINN:

Hon. members opposite may not know that we have saved \$550 to \$600 million by our great - approaching these business people who come in here to develop at arm's length, just keep them at arm's length and make sure you listen to every word. You watch before you sign on the dotted line. And before the Ts are crossed and everything like that, you better make sure what you are doing is correct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not too many more words to add on this. I just wanted to get up today to clarify so many misconceptions that are going on in this Province today and some of them being perpetrated by hon. members opposite that we are giving poor old Mr. Shaheen a rotten deal here in this Province. Well nothing, Mr. Speaker, could be further from the truth. We are waiting for anyone who wishes

MR. DINN: to develop to come in and present their proposal, but we are not going to be blindfolded and we are not going to put the old blinkers on and we are not going to just develop or perish: What we are going to do is look at these proposals, or have people with the expertise in these areas to look at these proposals, we are going to make sure that everything is right and then we may get involved in some of these developments.

Now just to make it very clear in the minute or so that I have to wind up; number one, in 1978 we got a proposal before the deadline by First Arabian and after the deadline in comes Mr. Shaheen with his proposal, at not the twelfth but the thirteenth or fourteenth hour, ten days after the proposals were closed. And he came in with what was proposed to be a better offer than the First Arabian proposal. Mr. Speaker, we had it checked out. Kleinwort, Benson, ECGD and Peat, Marwick said that it was no good. We got an independent review of that proposal done by a person recommended or a firm recommended by Mr. Shaheen and that firm, Thorne Riddell, told us in no uncertain terms that it was not viable. And not only that, but in order to make the proposal even start, what he wanted was \$75 million of this government's money.

AN HON. MEMBER: Even First Arabian was not that hot.

MR. DINN: Now First Arabian may not have been that hot but, I mean, it was a little bit hotter than what Mr. Shaheen proposed: 'Give me \$75 million and I will do some work for you, boys.' And that is what it came down to, and Thorne Riddell said it and Mr. Shaheen appointed Thorne Riddell through us and we paid \$240,000 to get that thing looked at. The proposal was found to be not viable and we did not go ahead with it. And if Mr. Shaheen wants to propose

MR. DINN: something that is viable we will have a look at it, but we are not going to throw good money after bad.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to draw the attention of this House and to the galleries that the motion itself by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) as pointing out that, BE IT RESOLVED that this House cause to be established a Select Committee on Resource Management and that this Select Committee be empower 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." If this government and the minister who has just spoken previously before me had taken this resolution that is before this House serious and not given the debate on a speech of what is happening with Petro-Canada and what is happening with Shaheen, but had given this - and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) of all people, the Minister of Labour getting up and not supporting, and not only not supporting but not explaining this in greater detail, saying look there is a great Tory who introduced it and supporting it and then not coming in and in bringing this in as far as I am concerned it is an insult and a mockery to the rules of this House.

November 26, 1980

Tape No. 2435

AH-4

MR. HISCOCK:

Sure, Mr. Speaker, you are allowed to have great latitude in debate, but I did not hear once about this fund of having

MR. HISCOCK:

a tax on the Iron Ore Company of Canada or on Buchans, or on Alcan, when they were in St. Lawrence, or any other one, not once - but went through a great resume of explaining what happened with Mr. Shaheen and Petro-Canada.

I would like to point out that while he was saying about Mr. Shaheen, and I have to get into this realm of debate now just to point out a few things that the minister forgot to say, Come By Chance was opened by the former Premier, Mr. Frank Moores, and when it was opened by Mr. Frank Moores, not long after that, he promised that a second refinery was going to be opened near Come By Chance, a second one, that the first one was great. 'Not only that, we are going to have a second one'. I would also point out that all the ministers who are now criticizing this government - this Opposition here for saying, 'Let us look at Mr. Shaheen's proposal and let us look at any other proposal. Surely after all the money we are after investing in it \$17 million is not enough, we can turn around and scrap it ourselves and get a better deal'. Now, whether Mr. Shaheen gets that is not my question. I think we are the Opposition and we have to point out that the government is neglecting its responsibility.

It is true what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said, it is not up to the government to decide what should be done with Come By Chance, it is the receiver; the government is only a spectator and can only make its views known. But I believe very strongly that I would like to see Petro-Canada take it over and I would like to see Petro-Canada develop and expand into a great corporation in Canada and take over more oil and gas - and refineries - and other products and have more Canadianization of

MR. HISCOCK: the petroleum industry.  
I would like to have that, but I have no intention, nor anybody on this side, even if it is a federal Crown corporation that was made and brought into creation by a Liberal government, we have no hesitation on this side saying that we are not going to give it down the drain, we are not going to sell it down the drain. We are not going to have the creditors who are wanting to be paid off having to go into bankruptcy because Mr. Shaheen and his refinery went into bankruptcy, we are not going to turn around and turn our backs on them.

We do not mind, and being a new member of this House, I do not particularly mind being identified with Mr. Shaheen if Mr. Shaheen can come up front and give a half decent proposal to this Province.

I think just because you take up the cage and rattle Mr. Shaheen's name, or rattle John C. Doyle's name, or rattle whatever, this party, as far as I am concerned, and this government is doing an injustice to our people of this Province by bringing out all these bogeymen and these skeletons from the past.

MR. BARRY: A lot of skeletons too.

MR. HISCOCK: No problem! No problem!  
But what I ask the Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry) is, why was it that the former Premier made the great acclaim at Come By Chance and then said that he was going to have a second one? That is all I ask.

Let us be fair and let us be reasonable. Also, the federal Prime Minister at that time was going to do away with Petro-Canada, do away with Petro-Canada, and if he had his way in doing away with Petro-Canada the only person who would be coming forward with Petro-Canada now - not with Petro-Canada,

MR. HISCOCK: with Come By Chance would be the Shaheen proposal. So we are very lucky, and this government is very lucky, that Mr. Trudeau and the Liberals got back into Ottawa, because according to their proposal we would have nobody - even the \$17 million, we would not have that for Come By Chance. So I am saying here again the federal government, the Liberals have created Petro-Canada and even if they have, I still very strongly that we do not have to accept that.

And this is a point I also want to make, just because Liberals in Ottawa or Liberals in Newfoundland come up with a proposal, we do not have to support each other all the time. And the government in Newfoundland and Labrador likes to point out that just because the Liberals in Ottawa bring something in we support it. Well, this is one point that we do not support. We feel that the government in its wisdom, yesterday, should have rejected this report, should have rejected it! It had six months to study it and they did not come up with anything. They also do not have a supplier of the resource, of oil, and they do not have a market for it even if they get it, yet, here is Petro-Canada blocking the way of anybody else.

So I just want to finish with that, seeing the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) brought it up. I want to get back to what the Minister of Labour said, and I find it a mockery and hypocrisy of what politics are. I find it very interesting in this House of Assembly, in this Parliament of Newfoundland and Labrador, when the people of the Province basically say that there is no difference between Liberals and Conservatives, no difference. And

MR. HISCOCK: when we have a member of  
this House cross the floor and decide to sit as a  
member on the government side, and does not give the  
people who elected him the



MR. HISCOCK: opportunity to have their decision on that and basically all of a sudden the side embraces them and you are a great Tory, you are a great Progressive Conservative - I do not like the word Tory; I do not like the word Tory and I am one who believes very strongly that we as Liberals use that word too much - but embraces him as he is a great Progressive Conservative.

I would like to say that when this member for Bay de Verde brought in the resolution -

AN HON. MEMBER: Baie Verte- White Bay.

MR. HISCOCK: Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), being in the caucus for the first time, one of the things that he ended up saying was that 'I am after bringing in this resolution ever since I have been in the House.' It is basically a Liberal resolution and it is at the roots of Liberalism. And I will say to the member now, who went across this floor, he was a Liberal then when he brought that resolution in and he is a Liberal now and he will be a Liberal till he is dead, ideologically and philosophically. Whether he went over on the other side for opportunism or for the fact that he figured that he would be in opposition because of having Mr. Peckford as the leader, for whatever reasons, were they motives or whatever, I do not think that it is up to me to assign them. But I am saying that this resolution was brought in as a Liberal and a Liberalism resolution. And why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? Why do I say that this resolution of setting up a fund to tax industrial exploiters - one would even go as far as to say how can this Progressive Conservative use the word industrial exploiter?

Sure, my dear, if Mr. Crosbie heard that or Mr. Clark or anybody else in the Progressive Conservative Party on the mainland, they basically would say the person

MR. HISCOCK: was a Socialist - an exploiter! - or an NDP, but definitely not a Conservative.

And as I said, to set up a fund for industrial exploiters so that when the industry is down and closed down then we can come up with some alternate employment in that town. And why do I say that? because in the spirit of Liberalism, of Liberalism, of the party of Gladstone and the party of the great Prime Ministers of Canada, of St. Laurant, of Laurier, or Pearson, of Trudeau, and of Smallwood and of Jamieson and hopefully now of the present leader and hopefully of this party.

It is in the line that we brought in Medicare, that everybody should have universal health, not because you are rich or poor but because you need it. It is in the philosophy of unemployment insurance that basically the state should help those when they are out of work because of a lack of employment. It is also in the spirit of Canada Pension Plan. After working and striving, an old - I was going to say heartbreak story, a headache story, back pains and building up this country from a pioneer land to bringing it in to a great industrialized state, that the state realize that you should also be rewarded, those who for various reasons do not have education to get pensions.

It is also in the spirit of the Old Age Pension Plan or the Senior Citizens Plan and I would like to point out that when Mr. Crosbie, the Minister of Finance under the former Progressive Party in Canada, would not give the thirty-five dollars -

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: - to the senior citizens of Canada because he said it would add another \$600 million

MR. HISCOCK: to the debt of this nation.

But it did not take long for the Minister of Social Services Of Newfoundland and Labrador (T.Hickey) that when the Liberal Government of Mr. Trudeau, the Prime Minister, brought in an extra increase of \$35.00, it did not take him long to say to people in the Hoyles Home or Escasoni or any other senior citizens' home, would not get the \$35.00, would only get \$35.00. It did not take them long for that.

MR. TULK: They only got \$5.

MR. HISCOCK: And also it is in the spirit of DREE, another great Liberal philosophy of helping the equalization or helping regional disparities in other parts of the country. And also this resolution comes and follows in the great line of equalization, of helping the poorer regions of Canada. It also follows in the line of oil subsidy for the Atlantic provinces, that the Atlantic provinces have to import oil for electricity of Holyrood

MR. HISCOCK: and other areas of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It follows in that line that this resolution is brought in, and also that Canada has two prices of oil, one for export and one for the Canadian market. That is where this resolution comes in, and this is where it follows.

I believe it is a great resolution and I believe also, very strongly, it is in the philosophical root of Liberalism and I find it hypocrisy and every other word that I could possibly bring up, as soon as the member - if the member had stayed over on this side, then the government would get up and tear it to shreds and say it was useless -

MR. WARREN: Right on. Right on.

MR. HISCOCK: - and X number of other things and go on, but as soon as he crosses over he is a great Tory, a great Progressive Conservative, and then all of a sudden it is a great Progressive Conservative philosophy.

Now I mean let us get facts and let us get hypocrisy out of it. Just turn around and say, "Look, the member brought it in as a Liberal resolution. It is a half decent resolution. It is a good resolution. We will support it." Leave it at that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. HISCOCK: But to turn around and say it is a great Progressive Conservative resolution, I mean, you know, who are we kidding? And I believe very strongly we should be true to our values.

One thing that I want to point out is that I have to ask a question now - it is a pity the Premier is not here - where this is brought in by a member on the government side, where all the ministers in particular are getting up and embracing it and saying "It is a great Progressive Conservative resolution, and we support it," I cannot wait to see and read the introduction of the legislation. My only question now is

MR. HISCOCK: that everybody is supporting it, I am wondering when this bond is going to be set up and when this tax is going to be put on the Iron Ore Company of Canada and also on Buchans and also all the other companies, and when this committee of the House is going to be set up. So obviously we are not going to have another step of hypocrisy where, "Oh, yes, it is great," and then after it is over let it die again. Surely we have not got a government as shallow as that, that turns around and says it is a great Progressive Conservative resolution just because the person happens to sit on that side? Surely we have a government that is a lot more credible.

MR. BARRY: Certainly.

MR. HISCOCK: I hope so. So I look forward to the day when I read the legislation.

Now the other thing I want to point out, let us say it does not happen and let us say the government in its wisdom does not want to tax these companies that are making fivefold, sixfold profit. I would like to point out that under the new resolution that the Prime Minister of Canada has said with the constitution of giving control of ownership of resources to the province and allowing them to have an indirect tax, an indirect tax for the first time in Canadian history, and letting them have that tax and tax non-renewable resources - timber, forest products, mining products, hydro. - If the government does not feel that they want to set up this fund and call it taxation for the chief purpose for a fund to provide financial relief to areas where non-renewable resources have been exhausted and help in attracting alternate industry, if they are going to get flak from the Iron Ore Company of Canada or from other large multi-nationals, and international corporations, if they do not want to offend them by coming up with such a resolution as this - because this is a very, very liberal, progressive step that is being suggested - if they do not want to do that then the Prime Minister is allowing them the opportunity to impose upon these

MR. HISCOCK: multi-nationals, international multi-nationals, that basically they can put a tax on non-renewable resources. But no! The Premier is over in London giving a speech and having business to do with this Province, basically saying, "No, we cannot repatriate the constitution because we do not get this, we do not get this, we do not get this, we do not get this."

We have a government here that operates on the politics of negativism, negativism, 'We do not get this, we do not get that,' but there is nothing pointed out of what we do get. We do get a Charter of Rights. I would like to ask this House, where is our Charter of Rights for the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for the people? I would also like to ask them that when it comes to the Premier in basically going and saying, "No, we cannot support this constitution," then why

MR. HISCOCK:

is it that we do not find out and the Premier does not mention that we can tax the Iron Ore Company of Canada now for the first time?

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I support the resolution not because it was brought in by a member on this side. I support this resolution because it is at the root; the philosophical root of Liberalism and I think it hypocrisy for the government over on the other side to embrace this and say this is a great Conservative resolution, a great Tory resolution, as most of the members have referred to it, and then do not turn around and bring in the legislation. So I say put up the legislation and put the words into action; do not just get up and say this is a great resolution and not necessarily support it. And by - I mean by supporting it, is allowing us in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to have control over our resources and do not see another Alcan happening, another DOSCO happening over on Bell Island, the same thing happening to those places as having those things happen to Buchans or Wabush or Labrador City.

If we are going to have this - and the government is going to support it and say it is a great resolution - then bring in the legislation. And if they do not bring in the legislation, as far as I am concerned it is only a political farce - so that they do not embarrass their new member who is sitting with them.

I, as I said, for one, support this and I give full credit to the member who brought it in. He brought it in out of Liberalism, he is speaking on it out of Liberalism and if anything will be admitted, it will be Liberalism.

MR. HISCOCK: He is not doing it from the point of view that it is on the government side.

He happens to be on the government side.

There is one thing I just want to touch on before I finish, Mr. Speaker, and that is, when this House was elected under the last Premier, the former Premier of this House - and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I can have leave because the House has given leave to many speakers before -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired. Does the hon. member have leave? Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank this hon. House again also for extending courtesy to one of its members that when he is not necessarily finished in cluing up his thoughts that he is given the time to finish it.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to have a few minutes. What I was about to say is that going back to Come By Chance when the former Premier, Mr. Moores, ended up getting elected and the Conservative Party got elected, it was in this Province not a reaction to a pro-Conservative philisophy, but it was a reaction to a negative reaction to a former leader of the Liberal Party who felt he was there too long. So the party itself brings out the point that, number one, the country is going bankrupt. We cannot afford the linerboards and the Shaheens and the Come By Chance and X number of other things.

But now, only eight years after, the debt is quadrupled. We also find out that when that government was made up that the majority of members under



MR. HISCOCK: the former Premier of this Province, Mr. Moores, the majority of them were ex-affiliated with the Liberal Party. And I do not think I am disclosing any secrets from the point of view of what one of the ministers over on the government side said, that when the member from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) ended up deciding to cross the House and it went before the Conservative caucus and it was decided, I was told that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) got up and said - a lot of people objected to him coming over and the Minister of Social Services got up and said no - he did not say no, several people said no, and the Minister of Social Services got up and said, 'Stand up,' - those that never had affiliation with this party, with the Liberal Party, before. And only six people out of the thirty-three members over on that side even to this day can say that they never had any association with the Liberal Party.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: So the point I am trying to find out is this: a Liberal resolution - in many ways we have a Liberal Government over on the other side, but because they have the true, true, true Tories over on that side, they are on the backs of the true Liberals, who are, I would say Baie Verte - White Bay, for one, and I could point out half a dozen others, that basically they are

MR. HISCOCK:                   hauling them back and they will not allow them to come in. Why was it that it took eight years to come with the subsidization on senior citizens drugs? And even now it is a farce of it.

AN HON. MEMBER:               Relevancy!

MR. HISCOCK:                   Relevant, Mr. Speaker, I will bring it back to relevancy quite easily. And the relevancy I will bring back in the non-renewable resources of this Province and the fund that should be set up, that the great spirit of Liberalism in this Province and the great spirit of Liberalism that we see over on the government side - Liberalism like Conservatism is always searching for new avenues to exploit the mind. I can say that over here we have pure Liberalism in at least that we claim to try to represent it. We do not, at least, go across the floor and say - or we do not say that we try to represent Conservatism. I mean, you know, we do try to remain true to our policies. What I was saying was what is happening with our government now is that you have a lot of people believing in Liberalism over on the government side but because they have the true Conservatism, it is holding them back, so therefore you are not getting anything. I would like to refer to them as the quasi-Liberals.

So I would like to say hopefully that this House of Assembly and this government basically will point out to them that if you want the real thing, you do not have to turn around and support a government whose former Premier worked on a Liberal leadership campaign and that the former Minister of Mines and Energy, who believes very strongly in non-renewable resources, was president of a Liberal association, and I can go on down the line.

MR. E. HISCOCK: So with this resolution, no problems in supporting it because of the root of what I believe in. And hopefully, as I said, within the next session of this House we can expect to see legislation in setting up this fund so that we do not have the same thing happen as happened in Bell Island and the same thing as happened in St. Lawrence.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution whole-heartedly as well as this side over here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for St. John's Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Another great Liberal!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. P. McNICHOLAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to support the resolution of the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

I would like, first of all, to deal with the second part of the resolution, that is the establishment of a non-renewable resource fund. We always have, or always seemed to have foreign owners of our resources here and I suppose the reason is fairly obvious, that it costs millions of dollars and that we just do not have these millions, we do not have the expertise that is necessary to run and exploit these resources. I also think that these people are very good corporate citizens in most cases when they are here, but they just pack their bags and fade away when the resource is no longer profitable.

DR. P. McNICHOLAS: I think for that reason this resolution is a very good one, a very important one.

I well remember myself going over to Bell Island many years ago when Bell Island was thriving and I remember after that going over when Bell Island was really a ghost town. I think I am right in saying that Bell Island has never really recovered from the closure of the Dosco mines. I think if we had a fund that is proposed in this resolution for Bell Island and for other places it would have helped to a great extent if it was developed and thought out properly before the mine was closed, that this would have alleviated the distress and suffering of these people. This is what we have in mind or what this resolution has in mind at the present time.

Another place that I have some knowledge of is

DR. MCNICHOLAS: St. Lawrence. I think the fisheries, to some extent, have taken up the slack there. There is one particular aspect of that, and I do not think this is the appropriate time to deal with it, but being a medical doctor it is one that has interested me very much over the years and that is the poor deal that miners in St. Lawrence have gotten over the years. They were forgotten about for a long time. It was known medically what their medical condition was, that they were getting cancer of the lung. The means to prevent it, or certainly to lessen it, were known but it took a long time before anything was done to come to their aid.

There are other places, Baie Verte, the hon. member from there mentioned (T. Rideout). I think now is the time - Buchans, Labrador - now is the time to build up a fund so that we as a government can look after and try and develop alternate employment for these people when the time comes, as undoubtedly it will, when these places are no longer viable as a mining entity, as they are known today.

Mr. Speaker, the first part of this resolution, 'That the Province become a partner in the development of all non-renewable resources', I think we owe a great debt to the hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) in what they have brought in in our newest non-renewable resource, the offshore oil. I think this is the line we should be thinking along in any new areas that we exploit, and I think we should also look into the present non-renewable resources we have to see if now we could build up a fund so that it will be there when it is necessary in the future.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet learned the secret of being able to say in thirty minutes what I can say in five, but before I do sit down I would like to make one more suggestion and that is that in getting a share in mines and various resources in the future, we should leave the details of these various businesses to businessmen and women and that we should confine our activities as politicians, and government or opposition members, too, if you like, directing the overall picture as far as we and the people are concerned.

I think we have our lawyers and our accountants and I think we should confine ourselves in that instead of dabbling as non-experts in any business.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in supporting this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will start where the hon. member from St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) finished. I have great pleasure also in supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, about seven or eight months ago the hon. member from Trinity - Bay de Verde brought a resolution into this House and in that resolution, if I can refer back to it, because it was in connection with this resolution, and he said, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to meet throughout the Province to hear and seek advice and recommendations concerning the fishery.'

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in this resolution the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout) is also saying, 'BE IT RESOLVED that this House cause to be established a Select Committee'. Now, we know what happened to the resolution by my hon. friend from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) who brought up, I would say, the most important resolution in this hon. House, and that was away back last Spring. We voted on that resolution because he asked for a Select Committee; the government of this Province, the government members voted down the resolution. Now, what happened afterwards? We had the biggest strike in Newfoundland, the fishery dispute. We could have avoided that dispute by setting up that Select Committee but the government of this Province at that time, the members on the government side, said, 'No'. And we know what happened, we had one of the biggest strikes in this Province. And only the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) and this government can really get the answers as to why we had the fisherman's strike.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will bet because the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay is now sitting on the government side, the government members will rise up and support this motion.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Right on.

MR. G. WARREN: We are going to support - Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker of this House and I abide by your rules but it sounds unusual for the Speaker of the House to say, 'Right on' in response to a member speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member casting aspersions on the Chair?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. G. WARREN: By no means but it is unusual, Mr. Speaker, it is most unusual.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is most unusual for the Speaker of the House to interrupt.

Mr. Speaker, I do say, again, that I am sure that the members on the government side will get up and support this resolution for a Select Committee. The members on this side will, yes, We will support a Select Committee the same as we supported a Select Committee for the fishery, because it is important. There are too many things going on in this Province and we, as members of this House, do not know what it is all about. So this is why a Select Committee is important, to make sure that the proper machinery is put in motion to see that what has happened in the past will not happen in the future. We can talk about the mine in Tilt Cove, we can talk about the Buchans mine, we can talk about the mine on Bell Island, we can talk about the mines in Labrador City, Wabush, today and we can see that there is much profit; the companies are reaping profits and leaving ruins behind.

Mr. Speaker, I was surprised that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) got up and started shooting about Come By Chance, about Shaheen but he never opened his mouth today about Elmer McKay, he never said one word about Elmer McKay today.

MR. MORGAN: Who is Elmer McKay?

MR. G. WARREN: Who was he? He was a member in the PC administration in Ottawa, a former minister, and he was the same minister who, today, made a statement - 'The government's position on hiring practices is absolutely crazy.'

MR. MORGAN: He was misquoted.

MR. WARREN: He supported it?

MR. MORGAN: ; No, he was misquoted.

MR. WARREN: He was misquoted? Oh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. G. WARREN: The same as the minister from the Nova Scotia Legislature was misquoted.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. WARREN: That is two, two from Nova Scotia. So, Mr. Speaker, there, you see, we have our friends up along who -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Rompkey is a good friend of yours.

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes. 'Yes, Sir'. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) Mr. Rompkey and (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: I will tell you this much, Mr. Speaker, they will do more for the fishery than the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) has done in the past.

MR. MORGAN: It is political suicide, what Rompkey is doing right now.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, is it

MR. G. WARREN: possible for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to keep his lips a little bit closer together. It would be appreciated.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell him he will not get hooked.

MR. G. WARREN: He might not get hooked like that.

Mr. Speaker, the first part of the hon. member's resolution is saying the Province becomes a partner in the development of all its non-renewable resources. A partner by confrontation - is that what he means, a partner by confrontation? Well, that is what is happening with this government, confrontation. Who is going to be the partner? Who is going to be the partner in the non-renewable resources, the DAC group?

Mr. Speaker, we all know that in order for our non-renewable resources to yield their potential both governments have to work together. And when the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who was sitting in this position, in fact, who stood in this same position I am standing in now and read this resolution, the partner he was referring to was the federal government. I venture to say that the hon. member - as my colleague for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) said, it was a bright Liberal idea. It will go down in history as a bright Liberal idea but it will also be supported by the Progressive Conservatives of this House. And I am hoping that you do not say that it was brought in by a PC member'. It was not brought in by a PC member, it was brought in by a former Liberal member, this same resolution we are debating now. I am sure that members, and the constituents from Baie Verte-White Bay, will be quite pleased to know when the time comes

MR. G. WARREN: around and the next election is called - when the next election is called they will know that that member was in the Liberal caucus and it was decided in the Liberal caucus that this was going to be a resolution by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland. So we can see that that member's days are going to be numbered in this House. I would venture to say that -

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Dream on.

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, well, we will dream on! We will dream on but dreams do come true sometimes.

Mr. Speaker, to become a partner - the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has become a partner, yes, a partner with the PC Association of this Province. And I would say the day is coming when he will regret it and it may be not too far away.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will never regret it.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would say the hon. member regretted it the day he walked across.

MR. PATTERSON: That is what he did not.

MR. G. WARREN: The establishment of a non-renewable resource fund. I am interested to know more about this non-renewable resource fund; how it is going to be set up and exactly for what purpose and to know exactly what is going to come out of this non-renewable resource fund? What are the companies mining in this Province going to have to say about it?

Mr. Speaker, "AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Committee have power to sit in and out of Session, to send for papers and other documents, and to generally exercise the powers which may be conferred upon Commissioners under the Public Inquiries Act".

MR. G. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am just anxiously waiting for the hon. House to pass this resolution this evening and to see the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) probably coming in tomorrow with a bill setting up this select committee. Let us not wait! Do not wait five years like we waited for the PCB's and other toxic materials in the radar sites in Labrador. Do not wait five years before we bring in this bill. Do not wait, set up a select committee. I am hoping that the President of the Privy Council will tomorrow announce that a select committee is going to be struck. And then we can start the ball rolling. Let us not wait until the day before an election is called or next year or the year after, start tomorrow.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatsoever in supporting this resolution. It is a good resolution and no one on this side will object to it. But I would like to remind members to reflect back to when the hon. member for Bay de Verde (Mr. F.B.Rowe) brought in a more important resolution, he brought in a resolution which said, 'Have a Select Committee into the fishery'. And he brought it in four months before we had the fishery strike which could have been averted by that Select Committee, but the government said no. Now, all of a sudden, they are going to vote for a Select Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the member for Baie Verte - White Bay. I think he used intestinal fortitude by coming into the House last Wednesday and seeing that this resolution was discussed. I think the member showed that - not because he is sitting on the other side of the fence, as we call it - he does have a concern about this Province and I have no hesitation at all, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, first of all it is very shameful the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) went into my district and just mentioned one of the mining companies. He should have given the second one the same coverage but, of course, that is the limit of his knowledge about my district. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) at least remembers there are two companies up there.

Mr. Speaker, this time I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Baie Verte - White

MR. WALSH: Bay (Mr. Rideout), and my friend, on two occasions, one, for moving this resolution and, secondly, for having the God-given good sense to walk across this House before he became too old.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: Now, my own district, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak about because I have in my district a non-renewable resource. There is no shortage of an inventory, I might add, it is reported there are over 10 billion tons of it and there are approximately 15 million tons produced each year, over and above.

Now, last year we had a shut-down, 1979, due to unstable markets, steel markets, in the world. And, of course, no one knows when this steel market will come back to where it was or even succeed to that. Now, just to give you an idea, most of the product is produced in pellets in my district at the present time, which most of the smelters have to use rather than the concentrated form. Now, speaking of pellets, there are several million pellets lying on the ground on the North American Continent, and it is up to - I think my figures are correct - 50 million tons of it in Europe that they cannot sell, they cannot give away because of the steel market being down.

Now, there is another plus to this, negative to this. If the country of Australia ever gets their labour problems straightened out in their mining industry, we are in dear trouble again in Newfoundland, and in Canada as a whole, as a matter of fact. Because at their production rate, and the labour reduction costs, and the temperatures, the climatic conditions, they can produce and sell, especially to the Japanese market, a lot cheaper than we can anywhere in

MR. WALSH:

North America.

Thirdly, South America is due to come on stream in approximately 1983 - I think it is the year of '83 - and here, again, they have equally - the same quality of pellets to produce for the steel market, but because of climatic conditions and the low labour costs, they can produce at roughly 50 per cent cheaper than we can in my district or, as a matter of fact, anywhere else in North America.

MR. WALSH: so you see, Mr. Speaker, it is not a case that the good corporate citizens in my district are going to run off and leave us. If the steel market continues to drop and does not come up, then the companies may have to move out. And that would be a sad day for some 20,000 people, a very sad day.

Now, we are talking about the member for Eagle River (E.Hiscock) and this taxation to the mining companies in this Province. He should check his figures a little more. I will not get into any details but one of the things I will get into, Mr. Speaker, is the royalties alone paid out to two companies that are not even operating in this Province. One gets \$5,000,000 in royalties, the other gets \$12,000,000 in royalties; a total of \$17,000,000 that do not come into this Province, Mr. Speaker.

Now, over a period of seventeen years, fifteen to seventeen years, that means some \$289,000,000 paid out in royalties that did not come into this treasury. Now, who set that up, this administration, Mr. Speaker? No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WALSH: Now, we will not take great Liberalism and great Toryism. Now you take that-another big giveaway. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go on. I think I have made my point. I have no qualms whatsoever and the people in my district, I am sure will have no qualms in supporting this motion. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Carbonear.



MR. R. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you back in the House.

MR. R. MOORES: Yes, today. It gives me great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Opposition party in this hon. House to stand today and declare my support for this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: I think it is one of the finest resolutions ever placed on the Order Paper actually and I think that the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who was a seat partner of mine for, oh, I guess the better part of two years, we sat back here the better part of two years and we got to know each other quite well.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true.

MR. R. MOORES: And I believe, unlike certain other gentlemen on the government side of the House, that he is one of the finest gentlemen in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: There are some on this side of the House I am sure, because of the very nature of the political situation, the two party system in provincial politics, in our democracy, there are some who certainly cannot find it within themselves to be any less than negative or any less than hostile towards someone who desires or decides for one reason or another to cross the floor of the House. But I have not changed my opinion of the hon. member for Baie Verte-white Bay. Party politics have never meant a great deal to me as an individual. I represent a constituency in this Province and that is my primary concern. I was not elected as a Liberal to this House. I was re-elected as a Liberal and I am glad to say by one of the largest majorities, the largest majority ever in the district of Carbonear. But I was not elected as a Liberal to this House, I was elected as a member of the Liberal Reform

MR. R. MOORES: Party that was led by a man who had very diametrically opposed views with the then Leader of the Liberal Opposition in this Province. I do not change my attitude towards the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and he has done nothing, to my knowledge, since crossing the House, to cause me to change my attitude. I think he is a fine, honourable young man who is a loss to this party, has been a loss to the Liberal party and has been a gain, God forbid, to the P.C. Party in this Province.

MR. MORGAN: He is not going back. Do not worry, he is not going back.

MR. R. MOORES: I hope the -

AN HON. MEMBER: He is not sure what to do about that.

MR. R. MOORES: That is a personal opinion. And I will say one thing about this party here and its leader, that is one thing I can do, I do not have to be a trained seal, I can get up and I can give my opinion even if it may not concur -

MR. MORGAN: We saw that yesterday.

MR. R. MOORES: - with some of the members of my party. And that is very important to me at least, as an individual. Yes, we did see it yesterday. I will not go on to comment but that was an individual action that I stood up for and I paid the price for. That is more than I can say for the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) standing against the party.

MR. R. MOORES: I was not here, I am sorry.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the party.

MR. R. MOORES:

I was not here I am sorry.

Mr. Speaker, to be more germane to the resolution, having said the few words that I have said, this resolution, I might add, is not wholly a product of the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), the hon. member who is now introducing it and speaking to it in this House. If I am going to be fair then I might as well be fair all the way down the line. As a member of the caucus, at the time that this resolution was construed or created or written, I know that the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) my colleague now representing Bellevue district, was very much a party, Mr. Jamieson, very much a party to the wording and to the composition of this resolution.

MR. RIDEOUT:

The resolution came in the first time before he came in.

MR. WARREN:

Not the same one, Not the same one.

MR. HOLLETT:

It is not the same one.

MR. R. MOORES:

No, it was reworded if I recall correctly.

MR. RIDEOUT:

(Inaudible).

MR. R. MOORES:

Sure. Okay, we will not quarrel with semantics. I believe the hon. gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay - God, that is a hard one to say, is it not? - does agree that Mr. Jamieson, my colleague from Bellevue, did help him and did aid in the composition of it, but more importantly, he agreed with it.

MR. WARREN:

Right on!

MR. R. MOORES:

More importantly, as the Leader of this party he saw the very great need for the establishment of a fund. Regardless of the nature of that fund, of the composition of that fund, just the creation of it so that it could provide the monies, the financial wherewithal to help, to assist, to aid those people in this Province who may from

MR. R. MOORES: time to time receive the worst end of the stick from the industrial exploiters of our non-renewable resources. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not come from or represent a district with a non-renewable resource. The district of Carbonear has no mining, no petro chemicals, no hydro-carbons, nothing that can be construed as non-renewable. But there are many dozens and dozens of retired persons in my district right now who have worked either in the DOSCO iron mines, the ASARCO mines in Buchans, the Sydney Coal mines, dozens and dozens of them who are even today calling my office and asking for assistance from me to take up the plight that they have experienced with government in action, whether it be a Liberal government or whether it be the present administration in power.

You know, I do not see where politicians, regardless of their stripe, can get up in this House and say, you know, "The former administration did this or did not do that". In 1949 I was not even born. In 1975 I came into this House, I had no previous association with a Liberal Party or a Liberal administration. In fact, in 1971 I voted P.C. I voted P.C. and I worked hard for a P.C. candidate. And now I stand in this House day in and day out, some biased, partisan, narrow-minded individual gets up in the House and makes me, or tries to make me accountable for something that happened before, almost literally before I was born. From whence cometh my independence, the right of me as an individual to formulate a view on the future and the development of this Province whether it be in the establishment of a non-renewable fund for workers in this Province or if it is the Come By Chance oil refinery? From whence cometh my independent right to formulate my own view, or to formulate a view that I think should be my party's? I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that it is fair, I do not think that it is right for a member on either side of this House to

MR. R. MOORES:                    try to make me accountable for  
an action or a non-action of something that is totally, almost  
totally alien to me as a way of life, certainly alien to me  
as a philosophy both political and socio-economic.

MR. MOORES: I want to see this fund established. I want to see workers like the dozens of them, some of them good friends of mine and my family's, men who strove in the mines - God help us, Mr. Speaker, they gave the best years of their lives, young men in the prime of their health, their vigour, and those of their families, and they sacrificed almost everything that they had. They came out of it, in the case of a number of them that I know, with a lousy \$19 a month pension from DOSCO, having what they called in their simple vernacular a black lung, and they cough bits - almost literally they now cough up bits of their lung into a handkerchief when they take these fits, these spurts of exaggerated coughing, bronchitis. You know, it is time for some of us to get a grip on ourselves around here. This is the first real sensible resolution that I have seen brought before this House on a Private Members' Day. A lot of it over the past five years that I have been here has been trash and rubbish designed only to provoke debate and anger and malice and spite - nothing positive about it at all, just some narrow-minded individual concocting and contriving something to waste our time. Now that a member who, unfortunately or fortunately, has crossed the House has decided to stick with a resolution that he placed on this Order Paper as a Liberal, stick with it, much, perhaps, to his chagrin as a member of the PC Party, the government side of this House, well, let us not take away from the substance of the resolution to get back to what is a shallow party stand that we too often take in this House. Sometimes it is necessary for an individual to take exception to what another individual says. Sometimes it is necessary for a party to take exception to what another party stands for, and one might even argue that it is always the responsibility of the Opposition to oppose the government on what it is trying to promote or bring about in a Province, but this resolution has nothing that I can see that is partisan, nothing that can be construed or misconstrued as being selfish

MR. MOORES: or individualistic. It is a good resolution, Mr. Speaker, and one that I predict will never, ever be implemented as a policy of the government of this country, of this Province. Never as long as I live, or as long as this present government stays in power, whichever comes first, will this non-renewable fund be established to help the miners or the workers of this Province. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in closing I might say that that is the real calamity that the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has to contend with. You know, it has always been said that man does not fear what is known but really fears what is unknown. Lord Nelson, when he used to go into battle with his chief strategist, would say, "Never beware of what is in front of you, that which you can see and confront. Beware of your broadside and somebody taking you from the rear." The resolution is a good one. Your problem now is not to sell it to me, your problem is not to sell favour or disfavour to the Liberal Party, from whence you cometh, but your problem now is to watch your broadside and your rear, those with whom you sit. Make them put up or shut up. Make them implement this fund or perhaps you had better reassess some decisions you have already made.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. AYLWARD:

MR. Speaker, I would like to rise today to give a few brief comments, and they will be certainly brief, because, as you are all aware, my district is lucky enough, and I say lucky enough, not to be depending on a non-renewable resource industry. But seeing that this is the first time I have had the opportunity - I notice the hon. Leader of the Opposition is walking out there now - I would like to congratulate him on his election as Leader of the Opposition and I wish him luck in his job. But to get back to the resolution, there has been much comment made from the other side that, because the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has crossed the floor, this side, the government is supporting the resolution. And I can assure the hon. members opposite that no matter where the hon. member, or who presents a resolution, if I am sitting in this House and it is a good resolution, such as this is, an excellent resolution, I will support it. Out of my personal opinion, that this is a very good resolution, I would have supported it if the hon. member had not come across the floor.

One part of the resolution which has not got a lot of comment -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) amendment?

MR. AYLWARD:

I would support your amendment too if it was a complete amendment but it is not complete. One part of this amendment which has not yet gotten much discussion, Mr. Speaker, is the last part of it, 'AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Committee be authorized to sit from place to place throughout Newfoundland and Labrador'. And I think this is an extremely important part of the resolution because we can set up Select Committees which could be sitting in the Confederation Building or in some building here in St. John's and miss most of the information that would be necessary



MR. R. AYLWARD: to be gathered for this resolution.

I believe that there should not be any restrictions on the travel of this Committee, they should be allowed to go and visit with any people who want to present cases to them. And no matter how many communities they have to visit, they should be authorized to go wherever people are interested in presenting briefs to them and giving them their side of the story.

As I said before, my district does not depend on a non-renewable resource, but I have a lot of constituents in my district now who probably would not be there except for the DOSCO shutdown on Bell Island. These people who live in my district now are leaders of the community, councillors and mayor, in one case, and they tell me the stories of Bell Island and what a place it used to be and they tell me that now it is impossible for them to live there, it is just too expensive for them to get back and forth, and they had to move out away from their own homes. I also have friends and relatives, as a matter of fact, from the St. Lawrence area. Now, I cannot say that I am sad to see the mine in St. Lawrence closed down because a lot of my relatives are widowed ladies, young ladies, whose husbands died with lung disease because of the mine in St. Lawrence. But I still would have liked to have seen a fund being prepared at that time so that these widows and the people who were affected by the close down of St. Lawrence would have something to fall back on now.

There are other places around the Island, Tilt Cove, mentioned by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout), Gull Pond, and there could be many other places in the future. I do not know - not the near future for Labrador, but Buchans is a very precarious place to live right now, I would say, because people do not know from day to day, in some cases, what is going to happen to them. If the mining company wants to take off, that is what is going to happen

MR. R. AYLWARD: and there is not very much left there for the people when they leave.

There is one thing that the Opposition members in their debate have convinced me of: They have talked so much about Liberalism in their debate and how this is a Liberal idea and the like, that they have convinced me that Liberalism is also a non-renewable resource.

MR. STIRLING: But it has to be preserved.

MR. R. AYLWARD: We might need to set up a fund for them.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution which deals with non-renewable resources is one method of protecting and helping people. There are really two methods of protecting non-renewable resources and it is too bad that these ideas were not brought forward some twenty or thirty years ago because the administration of this Province now has shown one way to help in non-renewable resources in their oil and gas regulations. They are to become and will become partners in the development which is what this resolution says. If we had to become partners in Bell Island or St. Lawrence or any of these operations, if we were partners now in the operations in Labrador, Labrador City/Wabush there would be funds and we would have more of a say in what is going to happen when these places close down, if they close down. There is not only the worry that, as the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) pointed out, there is not only the worry of the resource running out, there is also the worry about the fact that the resource is not in high demand anymore or in demand at all. The steel industries of North America, and somewhat the same in Japan, there is not as much a demand for iron ore

MR. R. AYLWARD: so there could be a drastic effect on places like Labrador City and Wabush if the demand is not increased or at least somewhat stabilized.

There was one comment that I would like to make note of that the hon. member for Winsor -Buchans (Mr. Flight) made in his speech and it gives a reason why members of the Opposition - and I do not say that it is all of them - are supporting this resolution. Just taking a part of it he says, 'The Tories do not believe, Mr. Speaker and the hon. member knew and probably still knows - and the hon. member referred to the hon. member who moved this resolution - and probably still knows that the Tories do not believe in the kind of principles and concepts encompassed in this particular resolution. As a result, Mr. Speaker, this side of the House will support, as the member knows, will support this resolution'. So the hon. member for Winsor -Buchans, at least, is only supporting it, as he stated here, because he did not think we believed in it. But I do not think that is a very good idea.

MR. G. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. R. AYLWARD: That is what you said in your debate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to say that I fully support this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that my speech does not bother the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) too much. I welcome him back, the Chamber is much more lively with him in it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all that I support the resolution put forward by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). I had the good fortune for my first few months in this House, I suppose, of serving as a colleague of the member for Baie Verte - White Bay. It is, beyond the shadow of a doubt, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) said, a Liberal resolution. Whether that word be used with a small 'l' or a big 'L' is somewhat beside the point but it is Liberal. As the member for Eagle River so ably pointed out, it is a resolution that is in the true tradition of Liberalism. So we can believe in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: We on this side, Mr. Speaker, can believe in that resolution and we can support it because basically it talks about what happens after human beings have been subjected to large companies that are neither human nor, in many cases, care for human beings. That is, of course, being truly Liberal. Therefore, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay, as I am sure he has gathered by now, will get no disagreement on this side of the House and everybody here will agree.

MR. STIRLING: Or anything else they do well.

MR. B. TULK: Yes.

MR. TULK: Or anything else, for that matter, that they do well. We see little enough of it but for anything that they do well we will support them.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. TULK: I said we see little enough of it, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) just now, in reply to something that I think was said by the member from Carbonear, (Mr. Moores) referred to Mr. Jamieson as not being the - I have to take exception to that point that he made. I think he said no, or he waved him off or something, and going through the door he said, well, he did agree with him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can clearly remember, as a young member of this House, trying to figure out why the government, why the Premier of this Province could not support the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) when last year he stood in this House day after day after day and said, "All right, give us the information and give it to us through a Select Committee". I saw Mr. Jamieson, the member for Bellevue, stand in this House almost week after week and say, "Let us set up a Select Committee on resource development in this Province". There is no doubt, as the member from Baie Verte-White Bay said on his way out of the Chamber a short time ago, there is no doubt that the former Leader of the Opposition, as do all members on this side, supports this resolution, so let there be no doubt in the records of this House of that.

Mr. Speaker, I have to support, as I said, the resolution because it deals with many of the problems that this Province has experienced.

Unlike the member from Menihek (Mr. Walsh) I live in a district that either fortunately or unfortunately has never had, has never had any non-renewable

MR. TULK: resource developed in that district with the exception of one that is almost becoming non-renewable. I refer, of course, to the forests, the forests of this Province, and when you say that they are not non-renewable, I realize full well that that is not exactly true. But, it seems to me, as the member from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) pointed out the other day, that we are fast coming to a situation in this Province where the forests might, indeed, not be renewed, so in that sense it is non-renewable. The member from Windsor-Buchans in his speech referred to the total mismanagement of our forest industry with regard, I think - what he was basically talking about was the newsprint industry and he adds the Department of Lands and Forests. The waste of the paper companies in this Province has been well known as the member, again from Windsor-Buchans, has always attempted to point out to this House. We have seen instances where the exploitation has been such that the whole landscape has been left barren.

Mr. Speaker, I live in an area, and the minister knows this, the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) knows this, I live in an area where the timber companies have rights to trees or forest areas that they have never harvested, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they never intend to.

MR. POWER: Another giveaway.

MR. TULK: Some of the giveaway was done by the minister's department last year.

I refer, of course, to the Gander Bay-Carmanville area, the Lewisporte area, where you have an over-maturation of timber that is dead, falling down, and yet residents in the area, loggers in the area, are not allowed to touch it because it belongs to either Abitibi-Price or Bowaters.

MR. HOLLETT: They cannot even get firewood.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister cannot do anything about that.

MR. HOLLETT: They cannot even get firewood.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister in his capacity, as the member from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) again says, and not only this minister, but, I suggest to him, ministers before, they have been unable to do anything about it. I believe one of them is now the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. FLIGHT: Unable and unwilling and incapable -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: - to do anything about it.

MR. TULK: Yes, he was a Minister of Lands and Forests at one time.

Mr. Speaker, if you add to this -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. TULK: Pardon?

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, if you add to this the ravages of the spruce budworm you can, indeed, find a resource that has, perhaps, been destroyed in this Province, and that resource may very well be non-renewable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: We may be looking at a resource that in fifteen to twenty years may not even be here.

MR. HOLLETT: Make an amendment and include it in the resolution (inaudible).

MR. TULK: It should probably be included in this resolution as an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this Summer, with the compliments of the minister's department, after I spent a great deal of time with people with problems in the lumbering industry and forestry in my area, with the compliments of the minister's department I was given the opportunity to fly over some of the forests in the area of Fogo and Bonavista North.

MR. TULK: industry and forestry in my area, with the compliments of the minister's department I was given the opportunity to fly over some of the forests in the area of Fogo and Bonavista North.

MR. HOLLETT: That is your last trip now.



MR. TULK: Well, it probably will be my last trip.

MR. FLIGHT: He is not listening.

MR. TULK: He is not listening.

MR. POWER: How about (inaudible).

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like for the minister to stay in here. Because as I flew over that forest I saw something that was even worse than the forest fire of 1961, in Bonavista North.

AN HON. MEMBER: No Liberals?

MR. TULK: No, I did not see any P.C.s either, I saw trees. I saw what once were trees and are no longer trees. I saw a forest that has been destroyed chiefly because of two reasons; because of over maturation and because of the budworm.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we also have the strange policy in government that they are protecting that forest. They will not allow - no way can the logging outfits in Fogo district cut anything under seven inches for logs. You have to take everything over seven inches in Fogo for logs, you cannot touch it for pulpwood. And yet we have seen in this Province this Summer where loggers, sawmill operators are unable to sell lumber. We have seen dumping from mainland firms, dumping of lumber on our local markets, and this government has done nothing, absolutely nothing to correct that situation. Yet our people had markets for exporting pulpwood but were not allowed to touch it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is shameful.

MR. TULK: I saw logging industries close down. I saw men laid off. Now, Mr. Speaker, the forest, as I said, is gone and, therefore, has reached a point where it is a renewable resource but it may very well be the case that for the next thirty years we may be facing a case where

MR. TULK: not only will the pulp and paper industry in this Province not be able to operate but, indeed, where our own people may not be able to get timber for their own use.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and I would ask that the government not only support the resolution here in this House but that it bring in a bill to see that the resolution is, in fact, made law in this Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): The hon. Minister of Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak briefly. I only have a few moments as the hon. member who moved the motion, of course, has the right to speak from twenty minutes to the hour onwards. So it just gives me twelve or thirteen minutes. I want to rise to speak to it because I think it is an extremely good motion and I support it not because the hon. member sits on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. He made that motion, obviously, because when he sat on the other side of the House, he made it because he is the type of person who believes very deeply in our Province, I am sure, and in our natural resources.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRETT: He is a man of conviction.

MR. WINDSOR: I am very happy that he is now sitting very close to me and behind me here on the government side of the House. We are very happy to have people of his caliber as part of our party. I want to, first of all, take this opportunity, my first opportunity, to publicly welcome him to this side of the House and say how happy I am to work with him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Having said all that, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WINDSOR: let me say that what I have said is totally irrelevant to this resolution in that resource development is not a political issue, at least it should not be and it will not be as long as this party is in power. Unfortunately, that has not been the case in the past. And if given the opportunity I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite would like to repeat history. Just a few days ago the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) asked me a question as it relates to a company who is proposing a large development, a project based on oil and gas development. The question was, "Is government holding it up?". There, obviously, Mr. Speaker, indicates that if hon. gentlemen opposite had the opportunity to deal with the issues that are being faced by this Province, to deal with the resource potential that we have available to us, that they would do so in the same manner as their predecessors of the same party did in the past. In other words, they would be giveaways again. Without due regard for the environment, without due regard for social implications, the hon. gentlemen would have us move ahead and say to a company, any company, any one company who happened to come in the door first, "Go to it. Heave it out of you. Build whatever you want. Never mind what happens to the environment. Never mind what happens to the working force in the Province. Never mind what happens to the fishery in the Province. Never mind what happens to any other industry that might be adversely affected, go ahead and build that major industry down there and we will worry about it afterwards." Well, Mr. Speaker, that is totally against the concept of this government as it relates to development, and totally against what is being shown here by the hon. member in his motion.

He says, "WHEREAS the economic well-being of many of our people is dependent on the utilization of non-renewable resources", and that is what we are talking about when we talk about oil and gas, a non-renewable resource.

MR. N. WINDSOR: It is probably our last opportunity to make something of this Province, to develop our renewable resources.

Oil and gas, Mr. Speaker, is not the be all and end all. In fact, it is a very short-term development for opportunity, a very short-term industry at best. And so the approach that is being taken is that we will indeed ensure that this Province receives maximum benefit from the development of oil and gas, that we not only exploit the resource but that we ensure that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are given every opportunity to take advantage of it, every opportunity to take the jobs that are available, as my hon. colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) so often talks about, taking advantage of opportunities offshore, taking advantage because of Newfoundland's local preference policy, and only because of that, Mr. Speaker. Because two years ago there were no Canadians offshore and now there are 900, my friend tells me, 900 working offshore, Canadians who happen to be Newfoundlanders, just about all of them. And we do not apologize for being Canadians either, Mr. Speaker.

Now, we could very well proceed in haste without due regard, we could allow this last natural resource that we have available to us, a non-renewable resource, to be exploited and all the benefits will go to those who come in to take advantage of it. Or we can take a very solid, reasonable, logical approach and ensure that the development takes place in accordance with our requirements and in the best interests of Newfoundland, in accordance with the regulations that my friend the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the hon. the Premier spent so

MR. N. WINDSOR: many years working on and putting in place, took such a strong stand on and it is now already being shown that Newfoundland is going to be the great beneficiary of those regulations because of the positions that they have taken. But we do have an opportunity, we do have a resource to work with, and so we will regulate development, we will ensure that Newfoundlanders have the opportunity for training because those regulations call for research and development and education and training -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Thank you.

- so that we can take advantage of the opportunities, Mr. Speaker, so that we can ensure that Newfoundland based companies can enter into joint ventures with companies from offshore, so that these opportunities are available again to Newfoundlanders, so that secondary and tertiary industries related to oil and gas are part and partial of any development, of any major development, such as the one proposed by the DAC group my hon. friend refers to, so that it is not done in haste. And it is very important. And that relates not only in oil and gas; oil and gas is only one very major opportunity that is available to us now. It is very exciting, it is very glamorous, but we hope that it will provide to this Province, properly managed, an opportunity to have the revenues necessary to invest into our long-term resources, our renewable resources such as our forestry, such as the fisheries, such as tourism, Mr. Speaker, such as hydro developments where we such a great potential.

We can talk about hydro developments, Mr. Speaker, and what happened before. We just saw last week how my friend, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) had to spearhead a great development in bringing back to this Province benefits

MR. N. WINDSOR: from the hydro development which were given away by a former administration and this government has taken back. A few days later we heard the Premier introduce a great piece of legislation here which will take back another one so that millions of dollars per year, more than \$2 billion to date in the project, benefits which have gone to another province, another part of Canada, will now, hopefully, benefit this Province, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, so that we can again undertake development of other renewable resources.

This is the sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, that we are looking at and it is for that reason that we have to have the kind of sensible, logical approach that the hon. member has here in this resolution. And he states very clearly here that when those resources have been exhausted such companies and corporations can and do pull out of this Province leaving behind them economically depressed areas.

And, again, Mr. Speaker, I have to go back to oil and gas, the phased in approach that is being taken by this government, so that that development is not exploited overnight so that the resource is not gone before we know we even had it, so that we phase it in so that, again, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can take opportunity, but so that the social impact of when it is finally gone will be lessened as much as possible. And that is very, very important, Mr. Speaker, And we have to look at where these developments are going to take place and that is why we have announced already, publicly, a policy which states the time frame we are looking at in analyzing these proposals, the criteria that we will be applying to these proposals, and the whole process of going through the environmental and social impact studies.

MR. N. WINDSOR: to ensure that when this development does take place, that it takes place not only in a technically feasible manner, but socially as well so that we know that the effect on that particular area, we know what it will be and we can predict what it will be and we can plan for it and thereby lessen any negative impact that it will have. Because any major development, no matter if it

MR. N. WINDSOR:

is oil and gas or fisheries and forestry, whatever it is, can have some negative impact if it is not controlled properly. Controlled properly we think that we can indeed receive tremendous benefits from oil and gas and that we can, in the long-term, have many, many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians receiving great benefit and establishing industries because of the opportunity of oil and gas, establishing industries that will be here long after oil and gas is gone; that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will have gained experience and education and training and the ability to do jobs and to run industries that will be here long after oil and gas is gone. So we receive, hopefully, some revenues provided the federal government will recognize Newfoundland's basic right of our resources, the same right, Mr. Speaker, as all other provinces have to oil and gas beneath their land. And we have heard this so many times but how many times must you say it before it finally sinks in in Ottawa that it is absolutely imperative that this Province be given an equal chance. And that is all we are saying, give us the same revenues, the same percentage as Alberta gets or Manitoba gets or Ontario gets, nothing more, nothing less, just to be equal partners and given the opportunity to develop and to play a part in this Confederation of Canada.

MR. STIRLING: Is that why you are scrapping Come By Chance (inaudible)?

MR. FLIGHT: You want ownership, you do not want an equal chance.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Hon. gentlemen would like to get across the fact that we are scrapping Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen do not have the intelligence to look into the announcement that was made yesterday by my colleague, a very positive announcement -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.



MR. N. WINDSOR: that Petro-Canada could have backed out and gone home yesterday and said, 'Thank you very much but we are not interested'. They did not do that, they are still here very active and have now made a further commitment and we are optimistic that all things have to be -

MR. STIRLING: What is the new deadline?

MR. FLIGHT: Any obligation (inaudible)?

MR. N. WINDSOR: So they would like to turn that around, Mr. Speaker, into something negative because again they see that this government is turning around something that was put in place by a former administration - an ill-conceived project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: A giveaway.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a great wealth of resource in this Province, a great wealth of minerals yet unexploited, many of them, perhaps, yet even undiscovered and we will be applying the same kind of policy to those natural resources as I have talked about on oil and gas, as I have talked about on hydro power as, again, there is another tremendous potential in Labrador, potential to develop a tremendous hydro resource there and to attract industries based on it. And, again, we will approach it with the same clear, logical, sound, rational thinking, Mr. Speaker, of maximizing the benefits from it and making sure that we are not going to sell it out again. We will not give it away in a sixty-five year fixed term contract, you will never see that again, Mr. Speaker. Not as long as this government is in power will you see a resource such as that given away for almost no return. We will ensure that it will be developed and in so doing we will ensure that other industries that can be established, based on that, will be based, that we will create from that hydro resource as many jobs as possible.

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought we were talking about non-renewable resources?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: We are talking about non-renewable resources. The hon. gentlemen do not even understand what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. It is all above their heads. They do not want to hear it, that is the problem, because it is too positive. They talk about us being negative, this is too positive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. N. WINDSOR: We are talking about, Mr. Speaker, the future of this Province, the heritage of generations yet unborn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to continue.

MR. L. STIRLING: (Inaudible) carry it for two minutes (inaudible).

MR. T. RIDEOUT: It is very unusual to see the Leader of the Opposition acting like that.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Could you carry it for two minutes? I appreciate that very much, I really do.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that they do not want to hear about the future of our Province, the potential that we have and all the great developments that this government is hoping to put in place and, indeed, will put in place and, indeed, over the next number of years you will see many, many major projects dealt with in the manner as described here and as suggested by my hon. friend when he very, very sensibly and logically suggests that we should look at all natural resources and ensure that benefits are kept here in the Province and that we do not exploit them overnight, that we do establish a fund or, similarly, invest funds that are raised from those resources into our renewable resources, because therein lies, in our fisheries and our

November 26, 1980

Tape 2453

SD - 4

MR. N. WINDSOR: forestry, therein lies both  
the future, the past and the present of our Province.  
Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! It is twenty to six. The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay. If the hon. member speaks now, he will close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank members from both sides of the House who participated in the debate on this resolution, supported the resolution through their debate that started a week past. It started last Wednesday. The debate, I think, for the most part, especially by members who have gone through the sorrow and the litany that I referred to in introducing this motion last week, I think the debate for the most part in those cases was certainly from the heart, and a lot of us have to face those kinds of problems in our constituencies from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies whatsoever for introducing this particular motion from the other side of the House -

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - not do I, I hasten to add, make any apologies for the support that it has overwhelmingly received from this side of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - because this resolution, as I stated last week was first put on the Order Paper by me at the opening of the first session in 1979, and a copy of the Order Paper of that time is here to show it. It was put on with the support, and the enthusiastic support, of those people still sitting on the opposite side of the House, but more than that, now it has received the enthusiastic support and, hopefully, when the time for the vote comes, the enthusiastic support of everybody in this House sitting on both sides of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, I believe it is a social issue based on non-renewable resources that we have to address in this Province and that the time has now come to address it, and that is exactly -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) vote for it?

MR. RIDEOUT: - just exactly what this motion -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I never saw a Leader of the Opposition, and I have seen quite a few because there have been quite a few in this House, I have never seen a Leader of the Opposition who breaks the rules so often by heckling when somebody else is speaking. You know, he really creates (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: You know, I certainly never saw the former Leader of the Opposition do it or the former, former Leader of the Opposition or the former, former Leader of the Opposition do it, but this particular Leader of the Opposition is doing it almost every evening.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Almost every day he is breaking the rules of the House and he is supposed to be the shadow Prime Minister who one day wants to get over here, so what a great example the gentleman is setting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose in clewing up the debate it would be proper for me to make some reference to some of the statements that were made by people during the debate as it went on over the last couple of days. The lead-off speaker for the Opposition was the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) and he gave his support to the resolution. I am happy for that because he has in his constituency the same kind of problem that I face in mine and probably a little worse in that his might be more imminent. But

MR. RIDEOUT: the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) suggests that maybe this resolution was not necessary at all in that we might be able to do what the resolution proposes, we might be able to do that by the great vehicle that was announced by Newfoundland's representative in the Cabinet only a few days ago, and the Leader of the Opposition, with the indirect taxation route. That is what the member suggested, that we might be able to do that this way. Well, I only hope, Mr. Speaker, that if we do it this way, I only hope if we do it this way that somebody makes sure they read the fine print, because what was said in the press conference a few weeks ago, when some officials in Ottawa checked the fine print, that was not exactly what was the case. So, if we are going to do it that way, I hope somebody checks the fine print for sure. The hon. gentleman also asked what will happen to the money collected. Would it go into a fund? Well, the resolution, I think, is quite clear in that a non-renewable resource fund be established and that the money that you collect from the people who utilize and use the non-renewable resource, that the money collected from that go into this special fund, not into Consolidated Revenue, not into the general revenues of the government. The hon. gentleman expressed the concern that we might milk this fund now and take it in and when the time came there would be nothing there for it. But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you, Sir, and to the House that that is the clear intent, and it is stated in plain words in the resolution, that the money go into a non-renewable resource fund, that we set up a non-renewable resource fund.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Lapoile (Mr. Neary) spoke in the debate and other than saying that the caucus on the other side supported it, he said nothing else except a few darts here and there, and I would say that the hon. gentleman from Lapoile

MR. RIDEOUT:

(Mr. Neary) has one more move to make and that is out the door, because he is next to it right now. So other than that he did not say anything that I have to refer to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), Mr. Speaker, suggested to us that companies were paying taxes now and indeed they are paying taxes. As the result of a bill that was brought in by this government only a couple of years ago they are paying a lot more taxes than they paid previously to that and they are paying royalties and they are putting money into the economy of the Province. But what I am suggesting, and what I hope that a committee of this House will eventually suggest to the House and to the government, is that they pay a little bit more into a special fund, not into the general consolidated revenue account or into the general revenue of the government but into a special fund to take care of special cases and special problems that result when those companies have made their bucks and they move on. So the gentleman is right, the companies are paying taxes now, of course they are, but I am asking that they probably dip in and pay a little bit more and that there be something left over specifically earmarked to care for those areas and to help out those areas economically once those companies have taken their get, like the old fellow said, 'Partaken their get and gone'.

The hon. gentleman for St. Barbe also suggested that he was talking about giveaways and he suggested that when we were giving away things, when those giveaways were taking place, he said, "Our people were working and eating". In other words, he is suggesting that as long as they were working and eating that was okey. Well, Mr. Speaker, there are more people working today in the Province than ever before.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Even though our unemployment rate is growing there are still more people working - our unemployment rate is too high, it is too high, we all agree with that but there are more people employed than ever before. And, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HODDER: He has actually got (inaudible) that side.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: And, Mr. Speaker, as long as they are eating and working he says it is okay. The hon. gentleman for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) should listen and learn also, Mr. Speaker. As long as they are working and eating, he says it is okay. Give it away, sell it out, do what you like with it as long as people are working and eating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: And, Mr. Speaker, that is long-term planning through a Liberal telescope.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: I am sorry, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe I should take the opportunity to bring to the attention of all hon. members the parliamentary tradition as found in any parliament; that is that there are certain words of interruption like 'order', 'order' or 'question', 'question' that are permitted. But when interruptions become loud and boisterous on a regular basis, I think that does nothing to improve the decorum of the House and I would ask hon. members to please restrain themselves when they do do their little bit of heckling which is allowed under parliamentary rules.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-  
White Bay.



MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in this debate on the first day that it came up I deliberately made no reference whatsoever to anything that could in the slightest be misconstrued as being political. Not one word did I say, not one iota but I had to sit here today and listen to the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). The hon. member for Eagle River really uttered in a few little darts which you do not mind, He was the first member in this debate today to really get into bitterness and bilge and every other thing that you can think about. You know, hypocrisy - the word is not even parliamentary as far as I know - should have been thrown out but words like hypocrisy and questioning motives and things of that nature. The real bitterness that was pouring from that hon. gentleman today, I just could not let the opportunity pass without having to say a few words about it myself.

He talked about motives and things of that nature and hypocrisy because the government would now support this kind of resolution and that the government would embrace this kind of resolution. I wonder what would the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, say to federal Liberals and federal Tories who have over the years - you know all you have to do is look at the record federally. What would he say to the federal parties, like P.C.s and NDP who over the years have traditionally robbed the old CCF and the old NDP Party and the former CCF Party of things like medicare and of things like old age pensions and stuff like that? That was not Liberal philosophy at that time, Mr. Speaker. Anybody who does a bit of political science will know the difference of that. Anybody who does a bit of political research will know the difference of that. What does he call that? Is that hypocrisy? Is that not embracing somebody else's idea just because the party in power happened to agree that it was time that this kind of thing be done. What does he say about Petro-Can?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

You know the NDP like to make you believe that. It is a great NDP philosophy. So, you know, the hon. gentleman gets up and accuses people of being hypocritical and embarrassing and embracing other ideas.

MR. HODDER:

(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) did not speak in the debate. If he did not exercise his right that is not my problem. He talks about legislation. I mean this resolution all it calls for is the setting up of a committee. The hon. gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) should have read the resolution before he got up to speak, as far as I am concerned.

MR. STAGG:

But he is not even here to

(inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

Maybe he has flushed himself.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, he cannot speak anymore

anyway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) obviously must be against jobs for Newfoundlanders because the first thing he did was get up and talk about our local preference policy.

MR. DINN:

There was no positive action

in Nova Scotia.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No? And then he asked, "What are the companies going to say about this resolution?". Well, Mr. Speaker, the companies, once the committee is set up and starts work, as will everybody else in this Province as I suggested in my speech last week, councils, local interest groups, companies, all those people will have an opportunity to make a presentation. And nobody is going to twist the arms of the great corporations. They are going to say what they are going to say anyway. They are going to make their point as they see it. And if they do not embrace the idea I say, 'So what!' There have been many companies around who did not embrace the idea of Workers' Compensation and all that kind of thing, but when the time was socially acceptable that they were forced to do it they did it and most of them, in the long run, become good corporate citizens. So, I mean, just to say, "What are the companies going to say about this thing?",

MR. RIDEOUT: personally I do not really worry what the companies are going to say about it. They will have a chance to have their say and in the final analysis they will be good corporate citizens as they have always been.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have dealt with most of the remarks that were raised by people, especially on the other side. I am very happy that this motion has finally gotten to the floor of this Legislature. As I said, in my opening remarks last Wednesday, that it was the second attempt to get it on the floor. The first time it was too far down on the Order Paper and consequently it did not get on, even under the new rules I might add. So I am very happy that the resolution has finally gotten on. I will be very delighted when the government sets up the select committee, as they will do under the terms of reference of this resolution. And I will certainly -

MR. STIRLING: When? In what year?

MR. RIDEOUT: Do not the hon. gentleman worry. It will be done, Mr. Speaker, it will be done because this government lives up to their commitments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to move the adoption of this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

You have heard the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour "Aye", contrary, "Nay". I declare the motion carried. Is it agreed to call it six o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

It being six o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three of the clock.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

NOVEMBER 26, 1980

*Minister of Energy & Power  
26 Nov.*

RESPONSE TO QUESTION (ORAL) ASKED IN THE HOUSE  
OF ASSEMBLY BY STEVE NEARY

QUESTION: How much did it cost the Province to acquire  
shares of CFLCo?

ANSWER: \$160 million (U.S.) was amount paid to Brinco.

\$130 million was amount paid for shares  
(Newfoundland Hydro)

\$30 million was amount paid for water rights  
(Newfoundland Development Corporation)