

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1981

The House met at 3p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

I have a communication here which I received from the Secretary to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. It is a communication which was addressed to His Honour and it reads, "Your Honour: Your letter of March 6th to the Governor General was forwarded to Buckingham Palace. I have now been informed by the Private Secretary to the Queen that your letter was laid before the Queen who received the message with much pleasure and greatly appreciated the congratulations and good wishes of the members of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland on the engagement of the Prince of Wales and Lady Diana Spencer!" And it is signed, I guess that is, Mr. Edmond Joly de Lotbiniere, Administrative Secretary to the Governor General.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Where is out (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: I think that would require a separate motion.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR.FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the Minister of Forests Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) growing out of his statement yesterday to the House re. the export of pulpwood, I wanted to ask the minister for a second that it seems he is not necessarily keeping with his local preference policy, Mr. Speaker, when two companies headquartered in Quebec -Montreal, Quebec and Boucherville, Quebec. What is the situation, Mr. Minister, when we find that pulpwood salvaged in Newfoundland is being salvaged and sold by companies headquartered in Quebec?

April 8, 1981

Tape No. 1035

AH-2

MR. FLIGHT: Have we not got enough people
involved in the sawmilling industry or the lumber industry
in Newfoundland to meet that requirement?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. minister of Forest
Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, certainly the process that we went through last Summer, having gone to Europe and brought many of the European purchasers of pulpwood to the Province and met with many of Newfoundland's private sawmillers and pulpwood producers -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)bankrupt.

MR. POWER:

No, only one is gone bankrupt which is not necessarily - that is Mr. Van Beek, but I think that was a problem that he had with his markets in France, or the company he was selling to in France went bankrupt and, of course, caused his subsequent bankruptcy. But certainly the process we went through, Mr. Speaker, was informing all persons in Newfoundland who had an interest in either cutting or harvesting or marketing pulpwood to make proposals to government. We put in a deadline for October 31st of last year, which was done. We received bids from many companies and there were several other companies from the mainland also, Mr. Speaker. Those two companies that we did give export permits to - one, I believe, a Mr. Otto Huck, who has been a long-time broker of international commodities, particularly pulpwood, from all parts of Eastern Canada, his export permits are for in one case in the Stephenville area, 15,000 cords, if I remember correctly, for harvest only, and I think for 15,000 cords in the Bay d'Espoir for either harvest or to purchase. That person, Mr. Speaker, is in close conjunction with a Newfoundland person and company who have a lot of experience in the harvesting of pulpwood, particularly as it related to Labrador Linerboard operations, so a Newfoundland company will be certainly supplying all the labour, will be doing all the harvesting operation and will simply be using Mr. Otto Huck as a broker in Montreal to sell on the world marketplace the pulpwood that he produces.

MR. POWER: The same situation applies to the company from Boucherville, Quebec, who are also just primarily brokers who are coming to Newfoundland, who will, I suppose, buy from small Newfoundland sawmilling operations, will buy from skidder operators or pulpwood harvesters a certain amount of wood which then they will take and sell on the world market. It is not possible, Mr. Speaker, to have every single sawmilling operation sell as an individual entity on the world market the pulpwood that he produces. There are occasions where brokers have to take the place and bring some of this pulpwood together so that they can sell it on the world market in a fairly large amount.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting also to see a fish exporting company getting into the wood exporting business, but at least it is -

MR. LUSH: Ocean Harvesters.

MR. FLIGHT: - Ocean Harvesters, Mr. Speaker, always associated with the fishery, now getting into the wood export. That is an interesting concept.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister - he says this programme is to facilitate integrated sawlog operations. I want to ask the minister if any of the timber being shipped out of the Province of which 130,000 cords of timber will be sawlog material, is everything that can be cut going to be sent out or is there going to be an effort to cream off the sawlogs and make the sawlogs available to sawmillers in Newfoundland who, as he knows, are now starving for raw material, or will be retaining the sawlogs?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of explanation, in the member's sort of preliminary remarks he talks about Ocean Harvesters, which is a fishing company, getting involved in the export of timber. It is interesting to note that company being very aggressive and innovative, I suppose, when they went to Iceland or got some, I suppose, querries from Iceland when they happened to be there visiting some of the fish facilities in Iceland, saw that there was a demand for starrigans, fish flake material, and certain vessels that are ordinarily transporting between Europe and Canada, using the St. Lawrence Seaway particularly, now on their return trips to Europe drop by Newfoundland and pick up some of these, I guess what we call starrigans, sort of flake material that runs anywhere from -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. POWER: Well we call them starrigans.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) on the Southern Shore they may call them starrigans.

MR. POWER: I guess it depends on what part of Newfoundland you are talking about. This stuff runs about twenty feet in length and about two inches in diameter.

MR. ROBERTS: Those are longers.

MR. POWER: Longers if you want, okay.

AN HON. MEMBER: Slabs.

MR. POWER: So that company has certainly been innovated in that sense of creating a market and creating some Newfoundland jobs as a result. As it relates to the export of saw log material, we do not permit in this Province, primarily based upon local preference and of course the fact that we do not want to export any unnecessarily unprocessed raw material, we do not permit the export of saw log from the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FLIGHT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it would seem from the areas the minister identified that most of this timber, the 130,000 cords, would come from Bay d'Espoir, Roddickton, Main Brook and Baie Verte Peninsula. Now it would seem to me that none of that, or very little of those limits are - those would be Crown limits. What I want to ask the minister is is any of this timber going to be cut on the paper companies' limits for export? Now, Mr. Speaker, as the minister knows, of course, the timber on Crown lands infested by the budworm is nothing absolutely nothing compared to the amount of timber on the paper companies' limits infested by the budworm. So I want to know, Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, whether we are going to be exporting any of the timber on the companies' limits?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of all of the details of the negotiations with the company but I am aware of the fact that at least 35,000 cords of this wood will be from paper company limits on the Baie Verte Peninsula. That has been negotiated. We are also presently having negotiations for an extra 20,000 cords from company limits that is not involving this agreement. So the actual export permits may go from 130,000 cords to 150,000 cords because of an extra amount we are getting from paper company limits.

Mr. Speaker, it is an on going concern for us that in the Province where you have several millions of cords of wood damaged that we can only export 150,000 cords, however some of it is totally inaccessible.

MR. POWER:

We are forcing the company through their management plans, as we have done in many parts of the Province, to use as much of it as humanly possible in the mills in Grand Falls, Corner Brook and of course in Stephenville when it opens up. So we are working very closely with the companies on one hand to make sure that all of this timber that is exported is not from Crown limits, that as much as possible comes from company limits and also as much as possible of damaged wood on company limits is used by the companies in Newfoundland.

MR. FLIGHT:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: This is a quick preamble, Mr. Speaker; the minister knows there are over 8,000,000 cords of budworm infested timber on paper companies limits and they can only utilize 100,000 cords per year. So, Mr. Speaker, either we arrange to have timber on company limits exported or utilized some way or the bulk of the timber, the 8,000,000, is going to be lost to the economy of the Province. So, either we do start exporting timber off Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters Limited or we are going to lose the bulk of the budworm infested timber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is that these companies that are going to cut now for export under a salvaging programme, will they be paying stumpage to the Province?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, just to clarify the correct amount of figures, there are 16,000,000 cords of wood that are severely infested and dying because of spruce budworm infestation in the Province, not 8,000,000.

MR. FLIGHT: Eight million dead.

MR. POWER: There are 8,000,000 cords that may be lost if we as a government and the companies do not get involved in export the salvage operation. In reality the companies in Newfoundland are using up to forty per cent of the 900,000 cords or so that they use in their operations now. So it is much more than 100,000 cords they are using. It is closer to 360,000 of budworm infested timber that they are using in Grand Falls and Corner Brook

MR. POWER: today. So they have to do that, Mr. Speaker, under our forest management agreement. As it relates to the export of wood, all the companies involved will certainly be required to pay a royalty to the government which approximates stumpage and which will certainly give a return to the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: What about the question?

MR. POWER: They pay royalties.

MR. FLIGHT: No stumpage.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I gather we have settled that there is no stumpage, Mr. Speaker, and it seems to be a valid point for my friend to pursue. Mr. Speaker, a question in the absence of the Premier for, I guess, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) would be the one. It grows out of the Premier's ministerial responsibilities as the Minister for Intergovernmental Affairs, I think that is a correct description of that portfolio. Last week, if the minister will recall, I asked the Premier whether he could make some investigations into the sequence of events that have transpired between the government here and the government in Ottawa with respect to DREE road agreements and the Premier made certain statements and I asked if he would check them because he confirmed he was speaking from memory and memory can be fallible. I wonder if the

MR. E. ROBERTS: minister can tell us whether any opportunity has been taken to check those statements and see whether the Premier's recollection is correct or not?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot state with assurity but I do remember the Premier has been out of the House pretty well since that period of time. I have the impression, and I put in quotation marks the word 'impression'; that the hon. Premier did check and did find that there was nothing which he stated which was contradictory to what was contained in his correspondence.

But I would, Mr. Speaker, like to inform the hon. member that we would want to have that checked and I know the Premier when he comes back in the House will be able to respond in much more detail. I would not take it definitively but it was my impression, when I was speaking with the hon. Premier after that particular day when the Question Period arose and the hon. member asked the question, that there was nothing that was inconsistent in his correspondence with the statements he made at the period of time. But before it is accepted as the actual gospel I would want to check with the hon. Premier on that fact.

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

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I hear what the minister says and I know he says 'impressions'. So I certainly will not go beyond that except that to suggest that I am under a different impression that I think it would be wise to check. I wonder though, growing out of it, if the minister would undertake to lay upon the table of the House whatever written communications—and I assume there are some. I do not know that, but I assume there

MR. E. ROBERTS: are some-written communications that may have passed between the minister at Ottawa, Mr. De Bane and our minister, the Premier, with respect to DREE roads agreements during - let us take the calendar period of the 1980/81 fiscal year which is the year, of course, that ended two or three days past or a week past. I think that would solve the matter. And I have a reason for asking because I think it is a very important issue as to when the Province became aware that there would be no DREE roads agreements. I am not sure we have the full story yet.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the Premier would have no objection to doing this when he returns subject to the caveat always that there is not something in the correspondence which happens to be a matter of confidential communication between one government and the other, which I am sure the hon. member will appreciate. I will draw it to

MR. MARSHALL: the hon. the Premier's attention when he returns.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, if I might, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the caveat about confidentiality and I assume that means that if the letter is not marked 'private and confidential' then the Premier is willing to table it. But could the minister - the Premier will be back in the House, I know not when - could the minister, perhaps, get in touch with the Premier, or with officials, and give us an answer possibly tomorrow or even Friday? We have been waiting a week now. I know the Premier has much on his mind, but I wonder if we could have an answer?

It is a very important point, it has very wide ramifications, I do want to know the answers.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I certainly undertake to get in touch with the Premier but, I mean, whether the hon. the Premier in his present activities can be contacted, he is moving about the place where he is so fast, and with such success -

MR. ROBERTS: He is certainly not (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: - he is a hard party, Mr. Speaker, to catch up with at the present time. But I will, of course, mention it to the hon. the Premier. I would not wish to undertake with the hon. member that it would be tabled immediately, but you can certainly expect the hon. the Premier back in the House by Monday, and at that period of time I am sure he will be able to deal with it. But in the duration, if something can be done we will

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member used the - what is it? A verb, I think is it, 'to look into'. I am not exactly certain if he means 'look into' it, shall we say, from the point of view of investigation or if he meant 'look into' in terms of observation, just simple observation. I can tell the hon. minister that I did look into the quarters occupied by the Opposition members on a social basis I think when the House rose last June. I think there was a gathering and I was invited and at that time -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

DR. COLLINS: - to find out where I was going I did actually look into the area and I actually looked around the area -

AN HON. MEMBER: - had a drink with the minister.

DR. COLLINS: - having entered. And I think that I was impressed by the decor. I was rather taken with the size and the whole area was rather pleasing, rather spacious. Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I did not look into it in the other sense, in terms of carrying out a definitive investigation.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) wishes to yield for a supplementary?

MR. LUSH: I yield.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder if the minister would undertake to exchange our opulent quarters that he has looked into with the opulent quarters available to other members of the House who sit in support of the government. If so, when can the exchange begin?

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible) not too bad.

MR. ROBERTS: Careful, 'Haig' or we will find out how much you spent on carpets.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall in the recent past a similar type of invitation although going back a bit further than that I did have a similar type of invitation to the quarters occupied by government members. So I do not think it would fair from my memory to compare the two. It is not my prerogative anyway to allot space like that, I am afraid.

MR. ROBERTS: Well said.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. speaker, a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, on the same topic as my hon. friend and colleague, the member for Windsor-Buchans, and specifically I want to

MR. LUSH:

question the minister with respect to the areas which will be harvested . The minister mentions in the last paragraph but one that the areas involved stretch across the Province with major emphasis in the areas of Bay d'Espoir. We go a good distance before we mention them and they are supposed to stretch across the Province. Specifically I would like to know whether the Bonavista Bay area is included in this, which is a large forested area, a lot of logging activity going on there in that whole Bonavista Bay area, the Bonavista Peninsula right up around to the Northeast coast and into Gander. I wonder if there is any harvesting activity going on in that area specifically?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, it seems I cannot win. I hear the Opposition complaining sometimes that Ministerial Statements are too long and contain too much information and unnecessary material. Yesterday I tried to make a Ministerial Statement of some pertinence and tried to keep it reasonably short and to the point, and now I find that I did not probably include enough information to include the actual areas. I can give the member just a general breakdown as I recollect it, but I will also be glad to bring him in a map tomorrow and the actual blocks of where the wood is being taken. My memory may not have the actual details of that. I know there are thirty-five thousand cords from the Baie Verte Peninsula, and there is another thirty-five to forty thousand cords from the Bay d'Espoir region. There are two operations, one for fifteen thousand cords from the Roddickton area, which is an integrated sawmilling approach. That is not budworm salvage but primarily something to make the sawmilling operation that much more viable.

MR. ROBERTS: Canada Bay, is it?

MR. POWER: That is Canada Bay and a new one in Main Brook, Maynard's mill, which is a DREE agreement that they have just signed to get a mill going there. In order to make that sawmilling one of the conditions of the sawmilling agreement with the DREE people was the fact that they would be allowed to export pulpwood so we have also given them, I believe, ten or fifteen thousand cords. So we have Roddickton, Main Brook, the Stephenville area where there is fifteen thousand cords coming from -

MR. FLIGHT: All Crown land.

MR. POWER: - also some in the Baie Verte area which is company land and some from Bay d'Espoir. But as I say, those details are not accurate, they are just general. I am not sure. I will be glad to get the information for the member.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by the names mentioned, Bay D'Espoir, Roddickton, Main Brook and Baie Verte and then the minister in my question did not name the area I questioned about but did put in another one, Stephenville, and it rather sounded like a roads list for paving submitted by the Department of Transportation and Communications. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I would like for the minister to undertake to find out whether that large area, the Bonavista Bay area, the Northeast Coast up around Gander, Central Newfoundland in other words, is included in this programme?

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is, What was the procedure followed in the selection of these companies? Was this advertised? Just what was the procedure used?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I outlined

MR. POWER: in my opening remarks to the first question from the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), the procedure that we did use. Primarily we went through the advertising procedures and also sent telexes to anyone in Newfoundland who was involved in any serious way in the harvesting of pulpwood at the time, either for companies or for export. The proposals that we got back were some of some significance, the ones that we talked about in the statement yesterday. We did have proposals back from other persons who possibly had no experience. I know a couple of teachers from one part of the Province applied who had no harvesting experience, had no market and were not giving an export permit at that time. So we had that type of thing happening, but most of the persons who were serious about the export market, who had some harvesting experience, we certainly dealt with very fairly and aboveboard and anybody who wanted to could apply.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not expect the minister to have this information available - if he does, fine - but I am just wondering if the minister could undertake, if he does not have that information now, to provide the House with what amount of wood, what cordage is given each company. I expect that there is a cordage given to each company, so could the minister undertake to supply the House with specifically what cordage is given each contractor?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I guess I could come in tomorrow with another Ministerial Statement saying exactly

MR. POWER: what areas we are going to have and exactly the cordages given to each company but I will certainly undertake to get that for the House and possibly table it tomorrow rather than make the statement on it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further questions?
The hon.member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs. In view of a meeting yesterday in Happy Valley - Goose Bay where representatives of the combined councils meeting in Labrador, the combined councils of Labrador had a meeting and there were questions asked to one of the ministers whether there will be an investigation into the cost of food in the Province, in particular in Labrador where prices in Labrador are way higher than anywhere else on the Island.

MR. G. WARREN: Is the minister now intending to have an investigation into food pricing in the Province?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, yes, the Consumer Affairs people in conjunction with the appropriate officials in the Department of Mines and Energy are planning a study with respect to fuel prices with one of the purposes being to attempt to find the reasons for the differences in those prices.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I said 'food' not 'fuel', and I do not know what Mines and Energy has to do with food.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I thought you said 'fuel'.

MR. G. WARREN: I think, Mr. Speaker, if we look at the Daily News paper on Tuesday we could see that a box of food in the Province, and in particular in Labrador City and in Goose Bay, it is way above the average in other communities. So what I am asking is that are we going to - the Premier announced that about six or seven months ago when his wife went shopping - and the prices have not been reduced. I am just wondering is the minister still going to wait? How much longer is the minister going to wait before he does ask for an investigation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, that investigation is such, you know, that obviously that can mean a great number of things certainly in terms of food prices in Labrador and, indeed, throughout the Province. We are aware obviously of quite high costs and inflation but also of the factor - and this is, I think, what the hon. gentleman is alluding to and that is the discrepancies in prices, sometimes in different parts of the Province but also in the

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: same particular region of the Province there could be discrepancies as well. We are aware of that. We are examining the various options to see, you know, what is the most efficacious way of dealing with it. Obviously one important thing is public information, which I think the hon. member will agree that we have made some worthwhile progress there. There is much more now public information and that, I think, is a very important factor. Because obviously there is a competitive element and when people know of price discrepancies a lot of the responsibility or a certain amount of it rests on the consumer him or herself. And that is one aspect of it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There are other aspects as well. We are looking at the various possibilities open but to date no decision has been made as to what the next move should be.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

X

I want again, Mr. Speaker, to direct a question to the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands with regard to his answer to an earlier question. Would the minister tell the House why it is that these companies, all fairly reputable companies in their own right - the timber they are shipping out of this Province is as valuable in the market that it is being received as if it were not budworm infested, that has nothing to do with it. This timber is as valuable. The land the timber is coming off, Mr. Speaker, needs reforestation and good forest management programmes in the future to see that the forest regenerates itself. So why are these companies, Mr. Speaker, who will make some money on this, not be charged stumpage by the Province of Newfoundland for the timber they are cutting and exporting?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

X

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, let me see if I can clarify the situation. The stumpage or royalty fees are paid by the harvester, not by the export companies as such. If they happen to be one and the same, if, for instance, Maynards cut on one hand and export on the other, it is the cutting side of the operation to which the stumpage fees are charged. If you have Otto Huck or Henderson from Montreal or from Quebec, who are simply

MR. POWER: buying timber in the Province, then the stumpage fee has already been paid by the harvesters. So a stumpage fee does not necessarily have to be paid by the export company, it is paid by the person who produces. They may be one and the same, but then again, they may not be.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would tell us if the people are cutting the wood for the exporter? Because it is the exporter who is going to put the dollars up in this case, Mr. Speaker. He is going to have small contractors cutting wood that he can export and on which he is going to make some money. Now, will the private contractor who is going to supply the wood to the exporter, will that contractor, will the people who cut the wood pay stumpage to the Province in this case?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes in some circumstances and no in another.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: A firm maybe?

MR. POWER: A firm maybe, if you want, but the situation is such that if the person in the example that you used here, the company that is harvesting the wood, selling it to a broker to allow it to be sold on the world market, it is possible that there can be an arrangement made, depending upon the price paid by the broker to the harvester, and that price will either take into account that stumpage has been paid by the individual or will be collected and reimbursed to the government by the export company.

MR. POWER: In either case, from a government point of view, we charge stumpage based upon harvest. That stumpage is paid to the government either directly by the harvester or by the exporting company. But in reality, Mr. Speaker, the stumpage fee relates to a harvesting. Whether it is used in the Province or outside the Province does not really make a difference, as long as we collect it.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I am confused. The minister said he was confused. In the first part of the Question Period the minister answered an emphatic 'no' that the stumpage was not being paid to the Province on the 130,000 cords of pulp wood that are going to be exported. Now, Mr. Speaker, is stumpage being paid? I do not care who it is being paid by, whether it is being paid by the exporter or the harvester; will the Province receive stumpage for the 130,000 cords of wood that we are going to cut and export?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, you are going to have to bear with me when I bring in my next Ministerial Statement, it is said to be several pages long.

Mr. Speaker, there are going to be 130,000 cords of wood cut in the Province, stumpage is to be paid to the provincial government; that will be paid either by the harvesters or collected by the export company, based upon the arrangements that they work out amongst themselves, okay? Stumpage will be paid to the Province.

MR. FLIGHT: Why did you say no on the first question? What you need is a quick call to Sterling Hoddinott.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to question 39. This question was asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and it was essentially the same question that was asked previously and answered on June 6, 1980. It is really just an update on that answer. It relates to the resignation of the former Deputy Minister of Finance.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members' Day we are debating motion number 1, which was moved by the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock). I believe the debate the last day was adjourned by the hon. the Minister of Rural, Northern and Agricultural Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural, Northern and Agricultural Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand that I have something like four or five minutes left.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member has approximately five minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: By Leave!

MR. GOUDIE: I thank the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) for leave, but I do not think I will take him up on the invitation today.

MR. GOUDIE: All I was suggesting last week, Mr. Speaker, was that in relation to resource development, and obviously resource development is the primary concern in this particular motion, resource development will take place to a great extent within the confines of my district and other districts in Labrador. And I think what I would like to do in concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, is to do two things; number one, to suggest to the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock), in whose name this motion stands on the Order Paper today, is that whether or not I support the motion will depend entirely on how well he addresses himself in the final remarks in concluding the debate. And secondly, to point out to him one resource that we have in Labrador, and in his district and other areas of the Island part of the Province, and provide him with a sample of how this particular resource can be developed in one particular way.

Last night I came back from Labrador from attending the combined councils meetings, along with my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and one of the tremendous resources we have in Northern Labrador is approximately 200,000 head of caribou which are harvested to a certain extent each year. The season remains open until the 25th. of April, I believe, and as an example of one of the ways that that resource can be used, if one of the pages would be so kind as to oblige, perhaps the young lady here, could take this sample to the member for St. Mary's-The Capes -

MR. HANCOCK: I tasted it downstairs.

MR. GOUDIE: - that he can use and decide on whether or not he likes something called nitku.

MR. HANCOCK: - that one to be better than the other one.

MR. GOUDIE: Nitku is dried caribou meat, Mr. Speaker, one of the ways in which the native peoples of the Labrador portion of our Province at least prepare caribou meat and that is one example of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I might tell the hon. member that he has actually nine minutes remaining, not five minutes. So he can go until three forty-six.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again I will suggest that I will not take advantage of the nine minutes remaining. My remarks were made last week and with that sample sent over to the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) then I will conclude my remarks by saying simply, Mr. Speaker, meskametin. X

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

X
MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, in rising in support of this motion so ably put forward by my colleague the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock), I am going to run down through the resolution: 'WHEREAS THE PROVINCE of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment record in Canada'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any disagreement on either side of the House, any disagreement at all on the other side of the House that that is a true fact. It is fact, number one, and it is a true fact. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate it to my own district of Torngat Mountains where at the present time, and this is a very clearly probably accurate statistic in the Torngat Mountain district, the unemployment record in Canada - now the Torngat district, yes, by the way, is the district that I represent it is the furthestmost district in Northern Labrador. At the present time, this past month, the unemployment rate in the Torngat Mountains district is something like 66 per cent.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. WARREN: Sixty-six per cent unemployment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would think that this government should look more seriously at the things that are very essential for the survival of people because we know - now that is only just one district. I bet if you go into the district of Eagle River you will find a similar instance; if you go into the Naskaupi district, in the district of the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), I would venture to say that the employment rate is way up in the forties, the unemployment insurance rate is probably up in the forties in that district. So, Mr. Speaker, that part of the resolution is absolutely correct. We do have the highest

MR. WARREN:

unemployment record in Canada.

'AND WHEREAS there are a number of areas in the Province where the unemployment figures are far beyond the provincial average' - now I just gave you an example - 'AND WHEREAS many areas of the Province depend on a single resource'; how true, Mr. Speaker. At the present time the only resource in my district is the fishery. The fishery is the only resource and if that falls there is not another thing available, Mr. Speaker. So therefore, as the

MR. WARREN:

hon. the Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development said earlier, I also have a piece of dried caribou meat. It is very delicious, Mr. Speaker, it is very delicious and it is a human resource, Mr. Speaker. I am going to ask the hon. Mr. Speaker that you should have a piece, Mr. Speaker. It would be right that you as the Speaker of the house should this very valuable resource because, Mr. Speaker, this resource comes right from the heart of my district, right from Nain itself and it is cured by the people in my district and I assure you that if you take this and eat it, I am sure that you will say it is the second to none that you have tasted.

So, Mr. Speaker, if one of the pages would come along I would gladly ask them to take this to you.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a resource that could be developed. This is a resource that could be developed and furthermore I think what we should do in conjunction with the Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development (J. Goudie) is for all members of this hon. House and even the Press to taste this very valuable and delicious food and let the people know that there is a resource available and a potential resource available right up in the heart of Torngat Mountains.

Now, Mr. Speaker, and we have the resources already known and available to our Province could, if properly developed, provide food and permanent employment to everyone in the growing Newfoundland and Labrador labour force. Mr. Speaker, I do not know, I suppose it was only just pure coincidence that the hon. member for Naskaupi and myself travelled last night together and we came into the

April 8, 1981

Tape No. 1049

EL - 2

MR. WARREN: possession of this valuable resource that we decided today in speaking to the resolution that we would just give an example of how some resources are available in this Province that should be exploited.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, last week the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) rose in speaking on this resolution and he started going back over the Smallwood era. He started bringing in Smallwood and his government of days gone by into the picture. He started going over all the industries that were closed down. He never mentioned, Mr. Speaker, about the industrial development park in Donovans that was started up by the Smallwood administration. He never mentioned, Mr. Speaker, about the Marystown Shipyard. He never mentioned, Mr. Speaker, about Newfoundland Hardwoods. There are many, many others, Mr. Speaker, that he did not even mention.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I have done, I went through the last ten years, from 1972 up to the present day. Mr. Speaker, what industries have closed down, what industries? 1972 - nil; 1973 - nil; 1974 - nil; and so on Mr. Speaker, and I got up to 1981 and I did not put down nil because we are only midway through 1981 but I put down nothing to date. Although yesterday, a couple of days ago there was some kind of an announcement made for activity in Arnold's Cove that there is going to be some kind of a development for offshore oil and gas, now whether that has anything to do with the by-election out there or not I do not know, Mr. Speaker. So we could look back over the last eight or nine years, the last eight or nine years we could see that this government did not close down too many of their own industries due to the fact that they did not start any industries. So Mr. Speaker, if the government does not start anything, how can anything close down that is not started in the first place?

Mr. Speaker, for the past ten years this government has been occupied on nothingness, occupied with nothing at all. What a record! What a record, Mr. Speaker, this government has. Mr. Speaker, what record

MR. WARREN:

this government has for the past
ten years.

So, therefore, I think this is
a very valuable resolution. This is a very valuable
resolution and I believe, I believe that this government
would do what is necessary for a government to do, instead
of ministers in this House

MR. WARREN:

getting and making Ministerial Statements on hearsay, with no foundation to half of the statements they are making, like the one the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) made, I think, the statement that he made yesterday and a couple that are here on my desk.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are many reputable companies, small businesses, logging companies that could do the harvesting and selling of this wood over and above the companies that the hon. the minister named.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I had a call from a constituent of mine - in fact, I think it must have been fifteen or twenty calls I received the last three or four weeks. And it was a concern. It may not have anything to do with this particular motion, Mr. Speaker, but I want to relay to the House what is happening, what this government is doing in the Torngat Mountains. And I am glad that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is in his seat because I think it is very, very valuable. It is too bad that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) is not here because his department is the one that is involved.

Mr. Speaker, since way back in the early 1950s the provincial government took over the operation of retail stores in five of the communities in my district. Now, the whole operation - they did everything from supplying food, hardware, clothing, everything was carried in these stores. Anyone having their cheques would just go in and they would cash your cheque, and it was to carry on the whole business of the community, Mr. Speaker. Now, within the past five or six months there have been many very dramatic changes taking place in stores in

MR. WARREN:

Makkovik, Hopedale, Postville, Davis Inlet and Nain. Now, a dramatic change has taken place, Mr. Speaker, and I have heard that the changes have taken place because of regulations or government policy. Now, I cannot recall - and I have been in the House for the past two years - I cannot recall any policy changes in things that have been going on for the last twenty-five years. So I will tell you what has happened, Mr. Speaker. Two days ago an Inuit hunter wanted to go caribou hunting. That is a very valuable resource - caribou. He wanted to go caribou hunting,

MR. WARREN: so the motor in a skidoo is just an example. The motor in the skidoo was gone so he had to buy a new motor. He had his refund on income tax come, a \$1300 or \$1400 cheque, and he could not buy a skidoo motor for \$400. Now, why? Here is the reason why: The government stores there, along the coast, will not cash cheques, will not carry money to cash people's cheques. Now, is that not a degrading formula for this government to follow? All along the coast, Mr. Speaker, they are not carrying any money to cash cheques. Now, there are people in Nain, in Hopedale, in Makkovik, in Postville, and in Davis Inlet who have cheques; the child credit returns, income tax refunds, social assistance cheques, and the government store there is not carrying enough money to change cheques for those people. Now, they have their money - they cannot get any credit at the store because they are not allowed - but they cannot even cash their cheques.

MR. AYLWARD: How do they change them ordinarily?

MR. WARREN: Ordinarily, until about four or five months ago, the government stores would, each month, carry enough money to change cheques, about \$30,000 or \$40,000 at a time. All of a sudden this is cut out. This is a degrading service that is administered by this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was just one example. Every month, as I said earlier, there is roughly 66 per cent unemployed and that means they are either on social assistance or on unemployment insurance. Each month they get social assistance cheques or unemployment insurance cheques. So likewise, Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds of problems.

I have talked to representatives of the department who are up there, civil servants, and their

MR. WARREN: hands are tied because somebody, who is supposed to have authority, is writing them letters and saying, 'Look, you are not allowed to cash any more cheques'.

Take, for example, a teacher in Hopedale, Mr. Speaker, in fact, I would say any hon. member here, if he were living in a remote area as I was for many years - my cheque from the government would just go into the bank and when I needed - I did not need any amount of money up North. When I needed money to buy food I would go down and write out a personal cheque. And the teachers and nurses and any other people who are employed up there, civil servants or anyone else, they do the same thing, they have a bank account set up here in St. John's or in Goose Bay, somewhere like that, or probably in Corner Brook. And if they need fifty dollars, they have a C.O.D. parcel coming in the mail from Simpsons, they cannot go down to the store and write a cheque for fifty dollars. So, Mr. Speaker, this government is using a deterrent factor in providing services along the Labrador coast. If this government, as those retail stores were originally set up for - that is why the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, in years gone by, took over the operation of those stores, to provide services for the people concerned

MR. G. WARREN: and now we are not doing it.

And the reason, Mr. Speaker, we are not doing it - and this is what I cannot understand - all of sudden within the past five or six months it has become a policy, it has become a regulation, Mr. Speaker, it has be-

come a regulation.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Five minutes.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if the man cannot listen for five more minutes it is just too bad because I am sure it must be hurting him knowing that he is part of this government, he is part of this government who are bringing in these kind of stupid regulations to the people that is so drastically affected. Mr. Speaker, I would say the hon. member should be ashamed of himself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this government was concerned about the lives of those people the first thing I would venture to say that is where the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is gone now. He felt so miserable, he felt so bad about it 'I had better go back and check on this and see what is going on' because this cannot be in this day in age. This cannot be realistic in this day in age, Mr. Speaker. So I would hope the Minister of Finance will come back earlier with a decision saying, 'Look, we will make sure that those stores will carry enough money to accomodate people in there who have cheques and cannot cash them.' It is not too big of a request to ask, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is roughly about, by latest report, about 225 caribou within an hour's ski-doo ride from Nain. Now that is a very valuable resource. That is a very valuable resource, Mr. Speaker. And if taken correctly and if we are in consultation with the people this resource could be a viable operation. However, I wish to caution that the people concerned are not looking forward with

MR. G. WARREN: groups or companies just moving in and making a slaughter. They are not concerned that. It is a resource that they are depending on. And if there are any plans that I have heard as I have heard through the grapevines that there are plans afoot to have a commercial harvest in this area. Then I strongly suggest that every precaution, every precaution necessary will be taken. Because this is one of the remaining, remaining few resources that the people have left to them. And surely goodness this government, if we are going to stop all cash flow into the communities surely goodness we are not going to cut off the flow of fresh supply of meat. So just be careful, be careful, Mr. Speaker,

MR. WARREN: I urge this government to act with every extreme precaution because already this government is cutting of the cash flow, this government is cutting of the cash flow into these communities. The Department of Social Services are issuing cheques every month which are rightfully deserved. However, Mr. Speaker - the minister was not here earlier - the people cannot cash these cheques because there is no money there.

MR. HICKEY: Why?

MR. WARREN: Why is there no money there? There is no money in the stores. That is why.

MR. HICKEY: How come?

MR. WARREN: You had better ask your Premier. You had better ask the Premier. It all happened within the last five or six months.

MR. HICKEY: Every store runs out of money occasionally.

MR. WARREN: Every store - not for the last six months they do not. So I would say that the minister should check the facts, that the people cannot cash their cheques in the stores because the store managers have been requested by officials.

MR. FLIGHT: He issues the cheques and then puts a stop-payment on them. That is what they do.

MR. WARREN: Officials of the department, Mr. Speaker, have been requested, the managers -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: The managers in those stores have been instructed not to request too much cash. I would say the hon. Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) will remember that when Labrador Services was under his department if they requested \$10,000 or \$50,000 they got it.

MR. HICKEY: That is right. When I was around they got it.

April 8, 1981

Tape No. 1054

AH-2

MR. WARREN: That is right, Mr. Speaker, they got it when the minister was there. If they wanted \$50,000 in the stores to operate the services they got it to operate the services.

MR. HICKEY: That might have been it. I might have been too generous.

MR. WARREN: Well, if the hon. member is too generous, I am sure the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is just on the other side of the fence altogether. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to blame the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) but it is something internally wrong with the government saying, 'Look, we are not going to bring too much cash along the Labrador Coast,' then I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to look at it very carefully.

I believe my time has expired.
Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution and the potential resources are available and I hope that when this government decides to open up new avenues into resource development the one thing we should take in mind is consideration for the people.

Thank you. X

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HANCOCK: Oh, we are going to hear it now.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, you are going to hear it now but we are not going to hear to the people of Newfoundland, 'Let them suffer.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: We are going to talk, Mr. Speaker, about -

MR. HANCOCK: I will have a few words for you this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MARSHALL: Okay, I will hear it when the hon. member speaks to end the debate and I wait in anxious anticipation, but in the meantime the hon. gentleman has twenty minutes at the end of the debate, in the meantime he can suffer and I am glad to say that the rest of Newfoundland is not suffering but I will probably suffer when I hear him speak.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have this motion put forth by the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock). And it reads as follows:
WHEREAS THE PROVINCE of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment record in Canada'. That is a recital, it is near the truth. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, you could say that it has a high unemployment but he does not choose to say that the unemployment rate has come down by a very dramatic 4 per cent within the past couple of years nearing 5 per cent now as the Minister of Manpower and Labour (Mr. Dinn) has said. He has left that out but I mean we still have the highest unemployment rate in Canada but it is going down as a result of the policies of the government.

'WHEREAS there are a number of areas in the Province where the unemployment figures are far beyond the provincial average;' that is true. It will be true for a period of time yet to come. I suppose

MR. MARSHALL: it is true in any of the prosperous provinces of Canada that there are certain areas where there is more unemployment than elsewhere. So we can agree with that.

'WHEREAS many areas of the Province depend on a single resource', which is the fishery in most cases. We can agree with that, we do not disagree with that.

'AND WHEREAS the resources already know and available to our Province could, if properly developed, provide full and permanent employment to everyone in the growing Newfoundland and Labrador labour force', we agree with that. We have great faith in the future of Newfoundland. We draw issue with the approach taken by the gentlemen there opposite and their way in which they would have the resources developed in this Province by in effect not asserting the rights of Newfoundlanders, but we can agree with that but we would not agree with the interpretation they put on it.

'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED', and this is the operative part of the resolution, 'that this House fully debate all aspects of resource development in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.' Now what government could be against that? What House of Assembly could be against that? Nobody could be against that. Why should you not at any time fully debate all aspects of resource development in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador?

MR. DINN: What are we here for?

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly nobody - as the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) said, 'What are we here for?', certainly. So we can agree with that part of the resolution.

The next part of the resolution 'BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government target areas of high unemployment with a view to producing a plan for the joint federal/provincial co-operation aimed at improving the economy of those areas and to creating long term jobs for

MR. MARSHALL: unemployed residents of this Province'. Well, Mr. Speaker, we can agree with that at well, there is no problem with that. The only thing is, I suppose, that we could say as a result of our record that perhaps it should be amended technically to say, 'BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government of the Province continue to identify target areas because we have been doing it, we have been very conscious of it in the member for Naskaupi's area (Mr. Goudie) particularly, in the Happy Valley area we have been very, very concerned with the unemployment area and we have been making moves, the acute unemployment problem, we have been making moves in that direction, we have been making moves in other areas.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like what?

MR. MARSHALL: And I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if we wish to we could say that we vote for the motion if it were stated, 'to continue to identify target areas' but we do not want to be small minded in these areas. We can take it for granted that we can vote for a resolution like this that the government target areas for high unemployment to mean an endorsement of the fact that the government continue really to identify high areas of unemployment and target areas for developments as the resolution says.

So, Mr. Speaker, to the surprise of the hon. member perhaps we can say that as far as the government is concerned I can see no reason why the government would not vote for this resolution that is really in effect a motherhood resolution.

MR. MARSHALL: But there are a few matters that I would like to draw to the attention of the House in supporting the resolution to point out that there is definitely, I think, a difference in approach and a difference in the way in which this side of the House would interpret the resolution in voting for it and that in which the side opposite would interpret it.

In our opinion, the major target area to be addressed by the government, and has been addressed by the government, the major target area of high unemployment, although it has come down, is the entire area of Newfoundland. Certainly, it is beneficial to address oneself to smaller areas of the Province where the employment is more - unemployment, that is, is more acute than in others and we will continue to do so but I do not think that the hon. member, when he brought in his motion and the debate that has emanated from the other side would indicate that they are thinking in the broad aspect that this government would think in terms of, that is, the area of all Newfoundland itself. I would suggest that their interpretation of the application of this resolution would be like the shot of a 22 gun, a 22 calibre gun, for instance, as opposed to the shot of a shotgun. As far as we are concerned, we would take the aspect of the shot of a shotgun, the hon. members are taking the aspects of individual areas. We believe in covering the whole area.

Now, in connection with the whole area and the development of the whole area, it is inconceivable to me how the hon. members there opposite could introduce a resolution like this. Now, bear in mind when I say this, in all of my talk, I am saying that we are going to vote for this resolution. We are going to endorse this resolution but I do

MR. MARSHALL: want to point out certain aspects of it that the hon. members seem to skirt away from time to time and at all times and seemingly do not address themselves to those issues and in doing so really are not discharging, I submit, their duties to Newfoundlanders as Newfoundlanders.

When you consider the major target area of unemployment in this Province, I do not see how one could fail to get up in this debate and address oneself to the policy of this government with respect to the ownership and control of our offshore resources as opposed to the policy of hon. gentlemen there opposite of siding with their colleagues in Ottawa in attempting to deny us ownership and control of our offshore resources.

How could, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition not support? And this continues to come up in this session again and again and again, and I think the Opposition is allowed from time to time to get away from it. Now, they are elected members and they represent people in this Province and their constituents, and indeed all of the Province, have a right to know where the Opposition stands with respect to ownership and control of offshore resources. And it is beyond my ken and it is **beyond my** comprehension as to how the hon. gentlemen there opposite can, as Newfoundlanders, take the position that they have, which is against this government's policy that this government has the right and control to offshore resources because that is their position.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is the greatest target area of high unemployment. The hon. gentleman wishes us to address ourselves to various target areas for employment and I can think of no area where the employment, the rate of unemployment would be reduced more than to the area of control of our offshore resources.

Now, let me demonstrate

MR. MARSHALL: this. I think the best illustration, because for some reason or other, I do not know what it is, Newfoundlanders love things that come from away. If a Newfoundlander says it or somebody close to them in their community says it they do not seem to believe it, but they love the CFAers, they love the statements from away. Before Confederation, if it came from jolly old Britian they believed it, they believed it as if it was the Holy Writ. Now if it comes from Toronto or Ontario they now believe it.

So, Mr. Speaker, to give you some of the examples of what is going to happen if we do not get ownership and control of the offshore, I would like to refer to an article, which I can table, in the Financial Post, the issue of March 7th., 1981, and this deals, the headline is "Hibernia will bring energy war to a head", it is by Christopher Waddell, who is a well known writer, contributor to the Financial Post, and to other journalistic endeavours in Canada.

And this particular article deals with the then perceived plan of Mobil to bring the issue of the offshore ownership in Newfoundland to a head before the federal courts of this Province. And it goes on to say, and I invite Your Honour to look at it not from the point of view of the main purpose then of the newsworthy item of the article itself with respect to the possible court act, but to look at it, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of the effect of us not getting ownership and control of our offshore resources.

It says, "The company," being Mobil, "has made no secret of its desire to use four 50,000-barrels-a day floating production units to gather Hibernia's estimated 1.85 billion barrels of crude. The units would be brought on stream in sequence applying experience gained with the first platform to the other units.

"Oil would be fed to a

MR. MARSHALL: floating storage facility (on site) with tankers taking it to whatever Canadian refinery needs crude." Who said that, Mr. Speaker? "Says Ed Barroll, Vice-President of exploration and production for Mobil in Calgary.

"Such a scheme," the article went on, Mr. Speaker, "runs counter to Newfoundland's development plans." Now these are the plans of this government, "It," this government, "favours a fixed production platform anchored to the ocean floor with crude being shipped the 3,300 kilometers from the field to Newfoundland by pipeline.

"The construction of a pipeline would also allow for recovery of an estimated two trillion cubic feet of natural gas in Hibernia."

Then it goes on to discuss the statements which are made as this government's desire to realize fully the full extent of the resource, to realize the gas as well as the oil derived from the Hibernia field, which I will not go into. It is here for hon. members to see. As I say, I know most hon. members will be familiar with the article, but I shall table it if hon. members wish to see it.

But it goes on to say, "From the Province's point of view, a pipeline could guarantee that the great bulk of Hibernia's crude would be landed in the Province." Now, Mr. Speaker, do you know what that means for the Hibernia crude to be landed in this Province? Why do we want ownership and control? Hibernia crude landed in this Province, can Your Honour visualize what an enormous amount of jobs would be gained by crude being landed in this Province rather than somewhere else? So "Landed in this Province and forwarded to the PetroCanada-owned Come By Chance refinery, rather than being processed in other Eastern Canadian refineries."

It goes on to say what Ottawa officials would do. "Ottawa's officials see the pipeline as a political but not a practical solution. Energy, Mines and Resources bureaucrats

MR. MARSHALL: 'have no preferred production systems or means of getting the oil to shore. It seems highly likely,' the article goes on to say, 'that the federal government will back the floating platform proposal and off-loading of oil on to tankers simply because of technical difficulties involved in building a pipeline.' Now, Mr. Speaker, do we think that for one moment, if there were any technical difficulties in building a pipeline, say, into Toronto or into Montreal, do the people of Newfoundland really believe that that would be an impediment to building a pipeline? I do not know fully myself, Mr. Speaker, as to the - fully appreciate the technicalities of building a pipeline with respect to floating platforms, but this is an edict from the Central Canada Financial Post which indicates the policy of the federal government.

For that reason, I cannot see the hon. gentlemen there opposite leading a Resolution like this relating to the employment in this Province, without dealing with this gut issue that is before us with respect to ownership and control of our offshore resources.

There is no doubt from this particular article alone, Mr. Speaker, that hundreds of thousands of jobs will be lost if the hon. gentlemen there opposite get their way. Because this is the philosophy of the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentlemen who bring into this House a Resolution of this nature to maximize employment, at the same time, Mr. Speaker, would have it so that they would support their federal counterparts in Ottawa who would deprive Newfoundland of its natural rights. And that is what we mean when we talk about ownership and control. We mean other things as well. In case the hon. gentlemen do not understand, we mean control of the rate of development. It goes on in that article to say that Ottawa wants to extract it right away

MR. MARSHALL:

to get self-sufficiency.

This, Mr. Speaker, may obviously not be in the interests of the people of Newfoundland at the present time. Now, it is beyond our wildest comprehension with the unemployment rate at the stage it is to talk about a superheated economy, but a superheated economy, Mr. Speaker, can be twice as disastrous as one that is not producing, which we presently have but which is improving under this present administration. That is another reason why we want control. I do not know how it is that the hon. gentlemen there opposite can be so narrow in their perspectives that they can bring up a Resolution like this and not address themselves to the gut issues, as I say, that are before the people of this Province. And I do not know how to get it before the businessmen and the hon. gentlemen there opposite and other interest groups in this Province to show that the clue to our unemployment in this Province to a large, large degree rests upon our getting our vital and basic right for ownership and control.

I think if this session has been marked by any characteristic, it has been singularly marked by the complete lack of the position by the gentlemen there opposite in getting up and saying whether or not they agree with this government - because I believe that this government has enunciated in its policy of ownership and control of resources the interests of the people of Newfoundland - or whether they agree with other parties, whether they take a contrary position, which I also believe - it is not always because somebody disagrees with the government that they are not in the interests of the people of this Province, but how in the name of all that is holy can the hon. gentlemen there opposite take an opposite position to this and still be acting in the interests of the people of Newfoundland?

MR. MARSHALL:

So, Mr. Speaker, that is one point. In supporting this Resolution, I invite the hon. gentlemen to address themselves to these issues at last. We have been waiting for them to address themselves to this issue and we leave no stone unturned to invite them so to do. Are they going, Mr. Speaker, to go against the interests of the people of this Province or are they going to realize deep down inside them, as Newfoundlanders, that necessary for the future employment of this Province, very necessary, is this issue of ownership and control of offshore resources.

MR. W. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman nods his head. I hope when he gets up and speaks in the debate he will nod his head in words as well and indicate that he is prepared to break with the federal Liberals and his counterparts who have not made this -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, okay he points out (inaudible) but come out and say it again. Come up and say it again and put his money where his mouth his and move his seat one step to the left to get away from the policies that have been enunciated by the others. You cannot run with the - what is it? - run with the hound - what is it the -

MR. WOODROW: Run with the hare and hunt with the hounds.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, and that is what the hon. gentleman is trying to do. If he agrees and he wants to stand up as a Newfoundlander he can move his seat just a little bit to the left, as other people have done in the past. If he really agrees, he would be doing a service to his district and the people of Newfoundland.

There are other points, Mr. Speaker, that I have not got time to go into because time does not permit. But there are other issues, Mr. Speaker, that come up in this House affecting employment in this Province that I think the Opposition have to address themselves to. One of which, I think, which will ring out as a real shame for the Opposition is their attitude towards the decision that was rendered by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland last week. A decision that has been hailed by most people from coast to coast as a very intelligent decision, well-written, expressing the true nature of the

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Canadian Confederation.

And instead, Mr. Speaker, it is either being greeted by members on the opposite side with no comment whatsoever or by means of scorn. Now do they not realize that this judgement has indicated that the proposals brought forth by the federal government would, in effect, if implemented reduce Newfoundland and other provinces as well - Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Alberta - merely to geographical units and that Newfoundland will cease to continue to exist, if this is implemented, as an economic and social entity, which it is, and political entity that it is? Now may be some people might think it should not be a political entity but one goes with the other.

And this is in effect what this judgement says, Mr. Speaker. It says that if the proposals that the hon. gentleman's colleagues in Ottawa, particularly those who are sitting on the government side from Newfoundland, if these proposals are implemented, Newfoundland will cease to exist as a Province as well as other provinces.

Now I would like to know their views on that and for them to contemplate in this resolution as to what this is going to do with respect to the unemployment rate. I would like them also, Mr. Speaker, to address themselves to the fact that this particular resolution also connotes that in order to get the employment, target areas for employment there is no more acute target area for unemployment in this Province that we are concerned about than the Happy Valley/Goose Bay area of the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and we are moving in that direction.

But is there any project which could uplift that district, uplift Happy Valley/Goose Bay, uplift Labrador than the development of the Lower Churchill? And what is preventing the development of the Lower Churchill, Mr. Speaker? What is preventing it is the failure of the

MR. W. MARSHALL: federal government to give us our basic rights for the transmission of hydro power in the same way as oil and gas is allowed to be transmitted.

Now the hon. gentlemen there opposite can fiddle and faddle, they can get up and they can use weasel words and they can say what they like but when they speak about unemployment in this Province let them get up, Mr. Speaker, and address themselves to those issues. Let them get up and address themselves to our ownership and control of our offshore instead of the words that they been using and been allowed to sleaze out of it as they have.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. W. MARSHALL: I just say finally, Mr. Speaker - and I understood I had leave -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Oh, the hon. gentlemen said I had leave, that is fine. So let them address themselves to that let them address themselves, Mr. Speaker, to such global issues as the effect of that judgement by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of our Province of which all Newfoundlanders, I feel, can be justly proud of. And ask them to address themselves to that in terms of unemployment in this Province.

Let them also address themselves to the free transmission of electrical power. Mr. Speaker, let them also look to other parties in Canada. There is presently an election going on in the

MR. MARSHALL:

Province of Quebec, and the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) - I do not know why he asked it - asked what the government's position was with respect to that election. As I pointed out at the time, a government would have no position with respect to an election in another Province, but I did point out to the hon. member that the position of the Parti Quebecois, the Liberals and the Union Nationale on items basic to the Province of Quebec, and linguistic rights, and things that were necessary to the kernel of life for the Quebecois in the Province of Quebec were similar with all parties.

Now, why, Mr. Speaker, must it be in this Province where our problems are not linguistic but economic? Why is it that we should be impeded, this government should be impeded by there not being unanimity in all parties in this Province on the basic issues before us. And let them now, Mr. Speaker, get up, use weasle words and say, 'We are for this. Newfoundland gets control of the offshore until such time as it does not receive equalization payments', because what they are saying is, 'We will allow you to have your resource until such time as you can pay your own welfare'.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want to pay our own welfare, we want to contribute to the rest of Canada and pay to those other places that have been unfortunate enough, like we in the future, to contribute. We have as much right to our human dignity as the Provinces of Ontario or Alberta or any other province in Canada. So that is why, Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this resolution, but I want it to be known, and known in crystal clear language, that when we support it we see it with a much broader and different meaning than the hon. gentlemen there opposite. We do not cast a

MR. MARSHALL: narrow view on this, as I said when I first spoke, we do not look at like, you know, you are shooting a 22 bullet, we look at like you are shooting a shotgun and you are taking in all of Newfoundland and all Newfoundlanders.

Because, Mr. Speaker, if this is not addressed, and if this business, particularly of ownership and control of our resources is not addressed, and you get away from the silliness and the foolishness that is brought up from time to time about being anti-Confederate and what have you - you can be a good Canadian, Mr. Speaker, and still stand up for your Province. And this is what -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: No. But this is what this government is doing, it is standing up for this Province. And what we do, Mr. Speaker, we invite the hon. gentlemen there opposite to stand up with us in statesmenlike fashion and endorse one, two, three, four, and five, the policies which this government has enunciated for the betterment of the people of this Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this is a magnanimous resolution, one that points out a severe problem in this Province, our number one problem, one that the government does not like to recognize as the number one problem, namely unemployment, and then goes on to suggest, Mr. Speaker, some solutions or procedure for a solution.

And, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is what is important. It is one thing to recognize the problem; number two is to do something about it, and that

MR. LUSH: is what I want to talk about in the main, but, first of all, I do want to deal with some of the matters raised by the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Speaker, who seems, every time he gets up to speak, to only want to talk about offshore oil as if that were the panacea for this Province's problems, as if that were the cure-all for the economic woes and the financial problems that beset this Province.

I refer the hon. member, and all hon. members really, to the study that was done by the Economic Council of Canada, From Dependency to Self-Reliance that this government likes to dismiss. Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that everything in this is now the ideal, it is not exactly what we should be doing, but, Mr. Speaker, there are some good suggestions in this particular document. And may I remind hon. members what it says about offshore oil and gas. It

MR.LUSH: says, "Our analysis brings us to the conclusion that the discovery of commercially viable oil and gas deposits off the shores of Newfoundland and Labrador, will have an important impact on the provincial economy but it will not be a panacea for all of the Province's ills. The effect on unemployment is not expected to be large and most of the jobs will be in one shot construction activities. It seems unlikely, therefore, that oil and gas will be the answer to Newfoundland's problems of high unemployment and low productivity." Now, Mr. Speaker, there it is and I only use that so that we can keep our feet on the ground. This constant, Mr. Speaker, these constant pronouncements of how the offshore oil and gas is going to solve this Province's problems, Mr. Speaker, are a lot of nonsense. And where we stand on it: We have said so so many times that we support the government on trying to gain control and ownership of our offshore oil and gas but we do not think that is the be all and end all. We would support the provincial government. Indeed this party is on record as having been the first party to enunciate that particular policy so, Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the members opposite get up and constantly refer to and ask members on this side to stand and give their position. Mr. Speaker, I have given the position. We support the transmission of hydro power across Quebec, naturally. We support that.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.LUSH: What do the hon. members think, that there is something magic about that side that makes them greater Newfoundlanders than on this side? Do hon. members over there think that there is something in the air that causes them to breathe a different type of oxygen or something to make them better Newfoundlanders and to have more concern? What inanities, Mr. Speaker, completely stupid. And if we cannot get in this hon. House and debate on a

April 8, 1981

Tape No. 1061

AH-2

MR. LUSH: different level from that, Mr. Speaker, than to question our patriotism and to question our concern is absolutely ridiculous -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - and I am tired of doing it. Now, Mr. Speaker, we support the transmission of power across Quebec. Sure we do. But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members over there, they do not know what they support. One minute they are talking about the transmission and another minute they are talking about the free transmission. They do not know what they are talking about. Mr. Speaker, we support the government. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) would like to have us out shouting loud and clear to all the people of Newfoundland and Canada about the Supreme Court's decision. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not necessary. The government members take care of that. They take care of that. If we disagreed with anything we would have said it. We have said nothing. We left that to the government. These were the people that were dealing with it and if we wanted to say anything differently we would have said so. Mr. Speaker, everything that the hon. member raised here today was nothing but a red herring, nothing, Mr. Speaker, but a red herring and again using the constitution, these constitutional matters as an excuse for doing nothing. All of these years we have come through and we have not known the problem but all of a sudden, as I have said before, the constitution is the culprit. That is what has caused us all the problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, what does the federal member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) think about all of this constitutional kerfuffle? What does he think of it? What does he say about it? Now, Mr. Speaker, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Crosbie says, "Liberals obsessive on patriation." He says, Mr. Speaker

MR. LUSH: -and he is speaking at a certain Tory rally somewhere up along, and he says, "The Liberal government is constipated by the constitution and there is no movement." Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say the same thing equally applies to the government of this Province. It is the government of this Province that is causing the no movement. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are part of the problem. So that is the federal member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), that is his view of the constitution, that the Liberal government is too preoccupied with it and as a result of that we are not taking care of the other problems, the other economic problems of Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH:

I would suggest that the same thing applies, the same is equally said about the government of this Province. He goes on to say, 'Even if the Canadian Constitution was the best in the world, it will not change the 12.2 increase of the cost of living or the 83 cent Canadian dollar.'

Mr. Speaker, that tells you, that tells us all what the hon. federal member for St. John's West (J. Crosbie) thinks of the constitution. That tells you what he thinks of the constitution and no doubt if he thinks that the Federal Government is preoccupied with the constitution and he thinks that the Federal Government is obsessed with the constitution and if he thinks the Liberal Government, the Federal Liberal Government in Canada is constipated by this constitution, he must obviously feel the same thing about the Provincial Government of this Province.

But so much for that. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about things related to the unemployment problem of this Province that have nothing to do with the constitution. Because this government would give us the feeling that if the constitution is not straightened out in the next ten years, we are just going to drift along, there is going to be no action, trying to bluff the people of Newfoundland that there is nothing else can be done, 'We have to wait until we gain control and ownership of the offshore oil and gas'. And Mr. Speaker, I have indicated the view taken by the Economic Council of Canada which was commissioned to look into the economic problems of this Province, and I have indicated what they have said about the offshore oil and gas.

Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly we want that to be a part, we want that to be a part of the solution. It will certainly help us immensely. It will put

MR. LUSH: extra dollars into the economy and though it will not solve all of the unemployment problems in this Province, it will give us, I suppose, seven or eight thousand jobs. And again, that is what the Economic Council says. It specifies that with the biggest oil development in the world, we can only expect to get 7,000 or 8,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, that is certainly a good addition to the economy but that is not here yet. Does that mean the government is going to sit idly by and let human beings just deteriorate intellectually, physically while we are waiting to gain some constitutional rights, Mr. Speaker? If this drags on for another year, another year and a half, another two years, there is nothing that can be done. Mr. Speaker, I submit that that is not the case.

Mr. Speaker, our unemployment problem is a severe one. It is a severe one. Now, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (J. Dinn) jumps up every now and again and is quite delighted when we get a monthly fluctuation, when we get a drop from one month to the other, which he realizes is not worth a row of beans. What we look at, Mr. Speaker, are the yearly averages. But that is fine, we welcome any fluctuations. It is always good news if there are more people employed this month than there were the previous month. Why all Newfoundlanders welcome that. But let us face the facts, Mr. Speaker, our unemployment is still outrageously high. It is still disgracefully high. The yearly average for 1980 was 13.5 percent. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is scandalous, it is scandalous. Still just about double the national average, that is what it is, Mr. Speaker. We can play around with the figures how we like, we can dilly-dally with the figures in any manner we like, that is still just about double the national average and, Mr. Speaker, that

April 8, 1981

Tape No. 1062

EL - 3

MR. LUSH:

is sad, it is disgracefull.

And what progress are we making?

From 1978 until 1980, and I use that period of time, because the Minister of Labour and Manpower (J. Dinn) in a recent statement used the figures, of course to his own convenience, when he said that there was a

MR. LUSH:

5 per cent improvement in the rate of employment in this Province or a drop of 5 per cent in the unemployment rate ever since the time that Premier Peckford assumed office. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not exactly true, because we can use statistics any way we like, and what the minister did was to use monthly statistics. He took the month when the Premier assumed office and took the seasonally adjusted figure with that, which again is a poor figure for calculating any permanent direction in the economy, he took the seasonally adjusted figure in the month that the Premier assumed office and took the last one in February - I assume that is what he did - and found out there was a 5 per cent increase. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is not an accurate picture. The accurate picture is this, that in 1978, our unemployment rate averaged out for the year - and that is the only figure with any meaning - the figure averaged out for the year 1978 was 16.4 per cent unemployed, and in 1980 it was 13.5 per cent, a drop,

Mr. Speaker, and we welcome that, but it is not a drop of 5 per cent in the unemployed, it is a drop of a little less than 3 per cent. It is 2.9 per cent. So that will indicate, Mr. Speaker, how the government now are trying to play around with these figures and give a different impression of what the unemployment rate of this Province is.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I take no pride, and neither should anybody on that side, that our unemployment rate today is 13.5 per cent -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

- 13.5 per cent, just about double the national average, and which would, Mr. Speaker, be totally unacceptable in any other province in Canada.

MR. LUSH: It is an outrageously, ridiculously high level of unemployment, play with the figures how you will.

Mr. Speaker, again I have asked the minister the question and I still got no response, I have asked the minister the question, in view of the fact that he jumps up and down with great glee and delight every time there is a fluctuation in the statistics from month to month, how does he correlate that with the government's own document which states that over the next five years our unemployment rate is going to stay at about 14 per cent? - a document that was just completed this year in which the government say the unemployment rate is going to remain at 14 per cent over the next five years, and yet the minister jumps up and down when you get a little fluctuation from month to month. Mr. Speaker, I would be ashamed to talk about our unemployment figures as long as they stay at about 13.5 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I can also go into the projections for the future, but I am not going to do that. But let me assure hon. members they do not look good. I can go into the figures, the projections done by APEC, which were just done recently, and demonstrate what the unemployment figures for this Province will be. And over the next ten years they project, even with ownership and control of offshore oil, there are going to be outrageously high unemployment figures - unemployment in this Province. So, Mr. Speaker, so much for that, of holding out to the people of Newfoundland that great panacea or that great cure-all, Mr. Speaker, of owning and controlling our offshore oil.

Our problems are going to be solved, Mr. Speaker, through a co-ordinated effort of the development of all of our resources, not just offshore oil.

MR. LUSH: And by all of our resources, Mr. Speaker, I refer to our human resources and our physical resources, our natural resources, the resources, Mr. Speaker, in the ocean, on the ground, and our human resources.

I believe that we are falling down at this moment on the training of human resources, training people for the skills that are going to be needed tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, our offshore oil is a good indication of that. We have known this for some time, Mr. Speaker, that there was oil and gas off our shores. Did we then try to put programmes into the trade schools, the vocational schools, to try to train our Newfoundlanders so that they could qualify for those jobs? No, Mr. Speaker, the government were caught with their pants down, they were caught ill-prepared, unprepared, and what did we have to do? We had to bring in a local preference policy to protect our Newfoundlanders and give them on the job training.

MR. LUSH: That is not the way to develop, that is not the way to develop a country. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, because I want to get on to another area, just let say one of the greatest weaknesses in this Province today with respect to our training of our human resources is that the programmes that we are offered in our trade schools today are not linked to the demands of the labour market, they are not linked. We have people going into courses for which there is no demand. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not to say that a person should not be allowed to go into any course the person would like, but at least there should be some activity of co-ordinating the programmes that are offered at our trade schools with the labour demands and our young people should be informed of this so that they, by choice, can go into courses for which there is hope at the end of them that they are going to get a job, not like the many hundreds of young people who are doing courses now at our trades schools and no hope for employment.

I want to talk about two of our natural resources, Mr. Speaker, that are most underdeveloped and I want to talk about agriculture which is a large industry in the district of Terra Nova.

There was no mention of them in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, no mention of them, yet, not too long ago the government announced a policy of self-sufficiency in several areas, in agriculture, root crops, in other areas, poultry. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have reached it with poultry, chicken, eggs and the like, and in turnip, I believe, as a root crop, but that is it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Goudie) were here. I would like to ask the minister, for example, what is the status of the hog industry in this Province today. I would like to know what

MR. LUSH: the status of it is. I would like to know what the government is doing. I understand that the industry is on the brink of collapsing, and there are suggestions on the minister's desk from the swine producers of this Province. It has been there for some time and there has been no action taken on it, and the hog industry is going to go down the drain if this minister does not stand up and do something.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the constitutional debate and here we have a traditional resource that can provide much more employment, and again the Economic Council of Canada agrees with me on this point, that we can provide much more employment, we can become much more self-sufficient in many areas of agriculture. But, Mr. Speaker, this hog industry is the one that concerns me because I understand that we produce one of the best products anywhere in the world. But, Mr. Speaker, we are in trouble and the government is not giving it the kind of support that it needs when the Minister of Agriculture has on his desk suggestions and requests from the hog people in this Province, from the Swine Producers Association, of what can be done to solve this problem and there is no action being taken.

This is not a constitutional matter, Mr. Speaker. We cannot slough that off on Ottawa. We cannot slough that problem off on Ottawa. I would like for the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Goudie), and all the other attachments that are to that, to deal with that problem.

I would like to get into forestry, Mr. Speaker, but I realize I do not have the time. But, again, a tremendously underdeveloped industry, underdeveloped natural resource and I refer specifically - and I would like to talk about forest management and all of these, but just let me finish up, one day I will get

MR. LUSH: into it, the point I want to get into is the mess that the small sawmill operations are in in this Province. That is what I want to get unto but, Mr. Speaker, I see -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member's time has expired unless there is leave. Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What do you want to say? How much time do you need? Adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to give the hon. member leave?

MR. DINN: How long do you want? What do you want to say?

MR. LUSH: That is okay, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

MR. LUSH: That is all right, I will say it another day. I will say it another day.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, yes, the hon. member spoke for twenty minutes. He is going to save what he had to say for another day because he did not say anything the last twenty minutes he

MR. DINN: used here in the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DINN: We are speaking to a very important resolution here today put forward by the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock). And I am going to wait until the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes stands up to speak to this resolution in closing the debate. I want to hear what the hon. member has to say about the fishery, about offshore oil and gas, about forestry and about all the rest of it, about jobs that he wants because that is what this is all about. This resolution, developing our resources, is all about trying to make this Province a 'have' Province. And that is basically what we are all about. And we have our proposals out, we have our policies out and we are doing things about it. Now, contrary to what the hon. labour critic over there has said, we are making progress and it may not be as fast as we would like it but we are certainly making progress.

I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman who proposed the motion, some of the problems that we do have, some of the difficult I have with respect to that resolution and the hon. member's different positions that he has taken here in the House with respect to the fishery, as an example. I outlined here in a Ministerial Statement last week that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was on TV against our position, basically, on the Northern cod and he stated it quite clearly that he would go over and negotiate and possibly negotiate more of it away to have peace between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. I outlined to the hon. gentleman at that time that each 1,000 metric tons of fish is eighteen jobs, that this year 11,000 metric tons of fish that went to Nova Scotian plants was 200 jobs at \$12,000 a year which is about \$2.4 million and is significant,

MR. DINN: would have an impact on most of our rural districts in this Province, anywhere there is a fish plant or fishermen. Also, last year the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) gave 25,000 metric tons of fish to foreigners and just to relate that to the same kind of formula, you are talking about 450 jobs there and \$5.5 million. And these are very significant things, they are little things there different policies and different people are just gnawing away at Newfoundland and taking jobs from us that we should have. And the hon. member may not realize it, but this will become more important in the future. As the hon. member may or may not know, we expect that the fish stock will double in the next five years and that means that if that fish resource is allowed to go overseas or allowed to go to Nova Scotia, then we simply will not have the jobs here and it will affect the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock), it will affect Trepassey and it will affect Arnold's Cove and it will affect all of these plants, so that we have to be speaking

MR. DINN: here in this House with one voice because it is too important to be political. We have to speak here with one voice on all of these resource issues. Every 500 jobs, every 1,000 jobs, every 2,000 jobs - 2,000 jobs is one percentage point the unemployment rate goes down. And it is very important. It is not something that we should treat frivolously, it is something where we should make sure of what we are talking about.

The hon. member says and his resolution states; "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government target areas of high unemployment with a view to promoting a plan for joint Federal/Provincial co-operation". Well, I will give the hon. member an example. I have not told this to anyone outside of government before. It has never been told. It is the story of Canada Works. It is the story of Winter Works. It is the story that the hon. member should know about co-operation and co-ordination and discussion and trying to get the Federal Government thinking in the proper areas, areas of high unemployment, areas where we should be talking about resource based resource development.

About a year and a half ago, I spoke to the Federal Minister of Employment and Immigration. At that time it was Ron Atkey. I said, 'Mr. Atkey' - we had a discussion - I said, 'Mr. Atkey, look, this Canada Works thing is getting out of hand'. I said, 'Let us see if we can do a different programme. If you do not like what we propose, throw it out. But let us have a look at it. Let us see if we can get together and put some of these dollars to good use.' And the hon. member should know that there is about \$20

MR. DINN: million involved on almost an annual yearly basis. And I said, 'what I will do, for you, Mr. Minister, is I will get the resource departments to work, and give me three months, and put their proposals together for where the Canada Works dollars should go, put their proposals in and prioritize them to me. Then we would get together in a joint meeting and prioritize them from a Provincial perspective and we will give you enough projects in resource based areas, where they would be of some use to the people of this Province, so that you do not have to accept our proposals on our priorities, you can go to your federal members, if you wish, you can go to your tag groups, if you wish, choose those projects, put them in whatever areas you want, but put them in realistic resource based development areas and in areas of high unemployment.'

Well, this is what we did: We went to the resource ministers here. They spent several months putting their proposals together. I think we put together 174 proposals. The total amount of money required to finish it off - and some of them were not good projects, we threw them out, we were getting down to the bottom of the barrel, but we took

MR. DINN: the good proposals - I think there was something of the order of seventy-four or seventy-five proposals prioritized that would take up \$36 million or \$46 million - and we sent them to the federal ministers. In my letter I said, and I can table this if the hon. gentleman would like to see it, "These are what we would like to see done, your slipways, and haul-outs, your forestry sawlog areas, all the resource based areas," Tourism was involved, the whole works, agriculture was involved. And we put them to Mr. Atkey at the time and we said, "Mr. Atkey do not just take them because we say they are great, give yourself time, investigate them, pick out those projects, You know, if you want to spread your dollars around equally by federal constituency, have your federal members look at them and tick them off, if they like them or if they do not like them, but choose those, centre your proposals around these projects. You are talking about \$46 million, if there are going to be twenty allocated to Newfoundland next year, then take twenty and let them choose them whichever way they want, it will be something that we can be proud of when the programme is over." And he said, "Okay, thank you very much, you have done a good service here and I will see what I can do."

Well, we had an election in February, out go the Tories and in come the Liberals. So immediately Mr. Axworthy was appointed to the federal Cabinet in Employment and Immigration, and he was not installed in his seat, I do not know if he arrived in his office, but his phone ringing and it was me, and I followed it up with a letter - and I can table that for the hon. gentleman any time he requests it - but I followed it up with a letter and I said, "Mr. Axworthy, I have been discussing with the previous minister a proposal

MR. DINN: for Canada Works that would be of use to this Province that nobody could disagree with. You know, it is something that you would be proud of if you implemented it." And he said, "Well, I will consider it, And", he said, "I will talk to the federal members", And he did, and he came back to me about a month later and he said, "It is not a bad proposal, and we might be able to fit some of these projects in, but," he says, "We are going to do it the old way." And as a result we are back doing the cemetery fences. And I have nothing against painting the cemetery fences or putting in new cemetery fences, but some of these cemeteries got two fences. You know, I mean it is getting to the point where it is a little bit ridiculous.

So that is where my three months of work went with co-operation, and co-ordination and discussion and attempting to get something out of the \$20 million or so that the federal government spends down here in Canada Works.

So I want the hon. member to address himself to his stand on the Northern cod stock and where it should go, whether it should go to Nova Scotia? How many metric tons he would trade off? Or whether it should go overseas so that Romeo would have, or the federal government would have a little more leeway with the manufactured goods that go from Central Canada, whether you can trade off 25,000 metric tons this year or next year. These are very important items.

The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) got up - you know, I have heard different proponents of different things here in this Province. We had Jay Parker who said, "We can only afford to support about 250,000 people here in Newfoundland, so what we should

MR. DINN: do is ship out the other 250,000."

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. DINN: Well, we were going at about 10,000 a year in the 1960s, and if we had listened to Jay Parker we would have 250,000 in this Province and, I suppose, we would not have a big unemployment problem. Well, we reject that as a proposal. And, of course, we had Parzival Copes' of this world. And today, of course, we had the hon. member, the Labour critic for the Opposition side, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) get up and give his proposal as to how he would handle the unemployment problem in this Province.

The unemployment problem in this Province will not be handled by any one magic formula. It will not be handled by offshore oil and gas. It will not be handled by the Northern cod stock. It will not be handled by the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) over here who has worked diligently over the past year or so and gave us 1,800 jobs. It will not be handled by that. But the fact of the matter is, what we have to do here in Newfoundland is claw, scream, yell, negotiate for every single job that we can get.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: Now, offshore oil and gas has been on the go in this Province for sixteen to twenty years, and nothing,

MR. DINN: really, was done. I mean, I looked at the records and I got the records. If the hon. gentleman wants information just come over to my office any morning and I will give him the record of employment offshore when we had no regulations in place or no management regime in place or no anything. And we had up to ten rigs out there in the 1960s and no jobs - none.

Right now, in February - and I give the hon. member this for information purposes - in February we got 617 jobs, offshore on three rigs and seismic vessels and supply vessels and onshore related to offshore because companies are now forced to deal here. That is why they are here, because they are forced to deal here by regulation. So we have 617 jobs in the offshore and we have to go after every single job that we can possibly get.

Last year, because the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) thought it was expedient, we lost 25,000 metric tons to the foreigners in the Northern cod. And that is 450 jobs that we lost last year that we should not have lost, that should not have been negotiated away. We lost this year 200 jobs, man-years. Now, I am not talking about just for that period of time when it happened. It is not eighteen jobs for 1,000 pounds, it is eighteen man-years. It is \$12,000 per job. Okay? So we lost 11,000 metric tons of fish to the Nova Scotian plants, and that is what it means, Sir. And we have to go after every job and we have to fight for them. It is very important. So in the offshore it is 617 at the end of February; it will be more when we get more rigs in the Summer. It will not be as many if the national energy policy stays the way it is. We would have a lot more if we did not have the new national energy policy because we

MR. DINN: would have twelve rigs instead of six. But we have to go after every one of those jobs - 617 in the offshore.

In Forestry, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) has now a management regime in place whereby the three mills will be protected, despite what the Economic Council of Canada says, will be protected if we follow the management regime that is in place and being put in place. The 1,800 jobs that he related to in the hon. House a week or two ago and yesterday were 1,500 in silviculture and there were 300 in the ones that he outlined just a day or so ago, or yesterday, with respect to reclamation of spruce budworm etc.

And in the Bay d'Espoir, high unemployment areas - if the hon. member wants to talk about high unemployment - Bay d'Espoir, Roddickton, Main Brook and the Baie Verte Peninsula, high unemployment areas. And that is what we have to do, Mr. Speaker, we have to make sure here in this House, inside and outside this House, that we fight for every single job that we can get our hands on for Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: It does not bother me that much that the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower in Nova Scotia gets a little bit uptight with me. I had a meeting with the Minister of Labour in Nova Scotia about a week or so ago and we talked about regulations in the offshore. The Minister of Labour in Nova Scotia is going around with the regulations for offshore in his back pocket - has not brought them into the House, has not passed any bill, but he goes around with them in his back pocket and when a company comes in that wants to drill offshore, he goes along and he starts pointing at the regulations and

MR. J. DINN: I think, the last time I checked Nova Scotia, offshore jobs, they had thirty-two jobs on two rigs, thirty-two jobs on two rigs which was completely disgraceful! And the rest of the people out there were not Canadians, were not Newfoundlanders! They were from the Philippines or they were from Norway or they were from Spain and we are here with a high unemployment rate and we have to give jobs, for investigating and trying to produce a resource, to Spaniards and to Philipinos and to Norwegians when we have a problem here in the country ourselves. It is time we start to recognize the problem and do something about it.

Now, the hon. member suggested in his motion that we do something about it. Well, I say to the hon. gentleman that that resolution and fifty cents will get him on a metrobus. What I want to hear from the hon. member is where does he stand with respect to the jobs in the Northern cod? Where does he stand with respect to transmission? They have always agreed with transmission of power across Quebec. They have always agreed with that. But do we have to sell it to Quebec for nothing first or should we be pushing the federal government to give us our rights? There is no problem with bringing oil from Alberta, there is no problem with bringing gas from Alberta. We have the pipelines, no problem there. Quebec needs it, they got it. Alberta did not have to sell it to them. So we will pay for the pipeline, we will put it in and we will give it to Quebec because they need the gas, no problem there! Alberta was not forced! We were forced to sell it to Quebec or do nothing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as hon. members may or may not know, this government will develop that resource for the people of this Province and we will not be bought off! We will not be bought off! And the hon. member - not that the

MR. J. DINN: Liberal Party agrees that we should transmit our power across Quebec, that we should transmit our own power across Quebec and that we should get our rightful payment for that power, for that energy, for that export.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member - all I want to hear about him, and I will support his resolution, is where he stands on the Northern cod because that is important not only to me and to everyone in Newfoundland but to the hon. member's district it is important. I want to hear where he stands on the offshore. Not that we agree because the Liberals have always agreed that we own the offshore but they did nothing for sixteen years. They just came over here from Norway and put down their hoe, found nothing and went home. And that is the way it has been for sixteen years.

But we did something about it. And I want the hon. member to stand up and say whether he agrees or disagrees with what we have done because I think it is important. I want the hon. member to tell us where he stands because I want to know. I want to know whether that resolution was thought out - it is a good resolution-whether the hon. member thought that out, whether he agrees with what we are doing because it is important. And if he does, then I will support his resolution. X

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

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

X MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the House is not hardly ready for the question.

Mr. Speaker, there were a couple of things the hon. member opposite mentioned that I would want to allude to quickly. He kept asking the hon. member where he stood on the Northern cod, where he stood on the Northern cod?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the things about the Northern cod that has surfaced lately-where I stand is that I am ashamed, as a Newfoundlander, I am ashamed of my life, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the minister from Nova Scotia saying that the moods of our Fisheries Minister (Mr. Morgan) is controlled by the moon, by the tides -

MR. MOORES: That is what he is saying.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, that is one of things that has surfaced in the Northern cod that I am ashamed of. You know, first our reputation goes from confrontation with Ottawa on the offshore, then it is confrontation with Mobil over the offshore and for a while we could have lived with that because the people of the Province would have said, 'Oh, well, they are entitled to fight with Ottawa, they are entitled to go on with these confrontation tactics'. But then all of a sudden the people says, 'My God, Nova Scotia as well', the province next door, Mr. Speaker, with which we have had the kind of relationships that we have had for the past 500 years. And here is

MR. FLIGHT: the Fisheries Minister for Nova Scotia getting up and making our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) look like a fool, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And having to threaten reprisals -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame.

MR. FLIGHT: - that the hon. members opposite know that if Nova Scotia, if they decide to do it, reprisals that they can indeed put into effect. Mr. Speaker, it is very significant remember that that minister was a Tory, a dyed-in-the-wool, right wing Conservative, a Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: A Tory and he had no choice, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

MR. FLIGHT: He listened and he listened and he listened to maw mouth, to the minister we have in this Province, for a year and he finally, at the risk - he had to break ranks. You know, Mr. Speaker, he had to break ranks with the Tories.

MR. FLIGHT: They got together, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of Nova Scotia and the Premier of Newfoundland and five or six more Tory premiers and they decided to stonewall on the constitution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: - and Mr. Buchanan shored up the Premier of Newfoundland. But, Mr. Speaker, it finally got to a point that the Minister of Fisheries for Nova Scotia and the Premier for Nova Scotia and the rest of the Cabinet said, 'We cannot have any more of that. We

MR. FLIGHT: just cannot stand any more of that kind of tripe coming from Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, we have this spectacle, we have the spectacle on provincial and national television of the Minister of Fisheries for Nova Scotia getting up and telling Newfoundland and telling the world that it would appear that the moods of our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) are controlled by the moon. He cannot find any other way to rationalize the kinds of arguments and the statements that are made by the Minister of Fisheries. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the side effects that has come from the Northern cod.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as well it is well known fact that the budworm came to Newfoundland, seriously, the same year the Tories were elected.

MR. PATTERSON: Model Rod.

MR. FLIGHT: The Tories came with the budworm, Mr. Speaker. And now it is ironical, Mr. Speaker, we find the Tories, this great administration that have developed Newfoundland to such an extent this past ten years - all the industrial development that we see around us, Mr. Speaker, apart from the paper companies, apart from ASARCO mining company, apart from Labrador West, apart from Baie Verte, all the other great industrialization, all the new mines we have seen open this past eight years, Mr. Speaker, all the new industrial projects we see around the Province were all brought here by this administration in the past eight years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Hundreds, Mr. Speaker, of industrialization projects.

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, if they do not want to talk about what they have done, they do not want to point their finger at this industry and that industry and some other industry that they have brought into this Province in the past eight years, they want to talk about the 300 jobs that they created in forestry combating the spruce budworm, 300 jobs, Mr. Speaker, to cut budworm infested timber to ship out of this Province. They are going to cut 130,000 cords.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister indicated today that there are 16 million cords of wood in this Province infested by the budworm. Over 8 million cords, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. PATTERSON: Every time I (inaudible) Catatonic wood (inaudible) Exploits. Tell us about that, that is much better. We have been over this before.

MR. FLIGHT: Come again.

MR. PATTERSON: Catatonic wood Bowaters (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: No, I am going to talk about the Argentia ferry service shortly. I am going to talk about the press release that the member made about the Argentia ferry service now, before I am finished. And I am going to talk about the new deal with ERCO too.

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: I am going to ask the member to tell the people of Newfoundland how much we are still subsidizing ERCO by. He got uptight, he could not believe it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, whom I have great sympathy for, reminds me - he could not believe his ears! He was up patting the Premier on the back and clapping and saying, 'What a success this new

MR. FLIGHT: negotiated deal for ERCO, ERCO is now a contributing factor in this Province', until he found out, Mr. Speaker, that in the first

MR. FLIGHT:

year, and he knocked the old deal, he knocked the original one, in the first year, Mr. Speaker, of that old deal ERCO was not being subsidized by one cent. How much has ERCO been subsidized in the first year of the new deal I wonder? Would the member want to tell us the cost to the people of Newfoundland in electrical subsidies?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. FLIGHT: No, he does not want to hear that. He does not want to hear that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister knows -

MR. MOORES: I got to get up here (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: I am going to kill twenty minutes here do not worry about that. The minister knows now, Mr. Speaker, that all the pulpwood in this Province that is dead and dying by budworm. Of any significance or worth talking about, is located on the two paper companies' limits. And that is a fact, that is where it is. The timber that is left in this Province on Crown land is not worth talking about. And yet the minister cannot - and this administration has been there for eight years. We have had the budworm since they came along. The paper companies have been putting pressure on them like you would not believe and they have caved in to the paper companies on every major decision this past eight years. But they cannot get the paper companies to cave in and agree that we will send Newfoundland people in and create jobs and harvest the budworm infested timber on the paper companies' limits. No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot get an agreement in that area, notwithstanding that is where all the timber worth talking about in Newfoundland is, notwithstanding that the paper companies can only utilize one-tenth of a

MR. FLIGHT: year's - Mr. Speaker, the paper companies, by the minister's own figures, can use three hundred and something thousands cords of budworm infested timber. Now, that figure is high, Mr. Speaker. Before I take the minister's word on that I am going to check the report from the Royal Commission on Forestry. Because I believe it is only in excess of 100,000 cords but I will give the minister the benefit of the doubt. But let us do a little quick mathematical -

MR. MOORES: Computation.

MR. FLIGHT: - computation here. If they use 300,000 cords in one year, there are 8 million cords on their limits, Mr. Speaker, 8 million right now, now how long will it take, Mr. Speaker, to salvage that 8 million cords? And every year there is more added.

So, Mr. Speaker, we talk about industrial development but the Premier came into Central Newfoundland, he came into Grand Falls and he admitted that the economy of Central Newfoundland is in trouble. Everybody is depending on the paper company, Price (Newfoundland). They are the cornerstone, they are the foundation of the economy and there is nothing else. And he admitted, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look at Central Newfoundland and see what we can do to shore up the economy.

Well, what did the minister do? Now, if there is anything, Mr. Speaker, anything at all - anybody with his head screwed on right who looks at a way to do some industrialization in Central Newfoundland, it has got to be based on forestry related industry. Forestry related industry, Mr. Speaker. And the minister comes out with his announcement, that gem of a Ministerial Statement, and he identifies practically every area of Newfoundland

April 8, 1981

Tape No. 1072

GS - 2

MR. FLIGHT: concerned about what the minister's position is on offshore? They know how long it will take them to benefit from offshore, Mr. Speaker. They know there are 6,000 applications on file for jobs in offshore

MR. FLIGHT:

and we have produced, if we believe the figures being spewed out by the hon. minister, 900 so far.

MR. MOORES:

That is nonsense.

MR. FLIGHT:

They know, Mr. Speaker - and of the 6,000 applications the great majority are from the Avalon Peninsula - they know what kind of a chance their sons or daughters got. They know what chances their sons or daughters got for the offshore. And they know something else, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MARSHALL:

Their position is let them suffer.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if my position is let them suffer, I will tell the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) that that is his position and that is that government's position for eight years, 'Let them suffer'. And the people I am talking about, let suffer, is anyone who lives on the other side of the overpass.

MR. MOORES:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Let them suffer because suffering they are, Mr. Speaker, suffering they are and we have a ministry that could not care less. They waltz along on the great issue of the offshore. They want to talk about the constitution and offshore.

MR. YOUNG:

Oh, sit down.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I will sit down - you know I might amend this debate and go on until six o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You cannot amend it.

MR. FLIGHT:

I will amend the motion. You cannot?

MR. YOUNG:

(Inaudible) so sit down.

MR. FLIGHT:

Listen here now, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), I am looking forward to him getting up. I have not heard the Minister of Public Works now in a year and a half standing on his feet and addressing himself to anything in this House of Assembly. So either he does not

MR. FLIGHT: know anything to talk about - and if he does not he should keep quiet and let someone who does. And I will tell you the chair he is sitting in, Mr. Speaker, he should be careful of the chair he is sitting in there.

MR. MOORES: I never heard him speak in six years.

MR. FLIGHT: He never spoke in this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORES: Not in six years.

MR. FLIGHT: Not in six years. And he stands there and tells me to sit down.

MR. POWER: That is pretty (inaudible) for six years.

MR. YOUNG: Look at the pile of manure you have there, look, after all these years.

MR. MOORES: Not in six years, Sir.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, industrialization; The other day someone, I think it was a spokesman for APEC, talked about the linerboard, the industrialization that took place in the linerboard and the great - this Province talks about giveaways. Does the House of Assembly know - and I support the linerboard concept, I suppose Abitibi Pricebeing designated the owners, but do you know what they got that linerboard mill for? Does the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) know what a company, one of the biggest companies in this country, making more money now than ever they made in their history

MR. G. FLIGHT: because of the difference in the dollar, that kind of thing, do you know how much, would the minister care to take a guess at how much they got that mill for in the final analysis?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT: A drop in the bucket compared to the replacement costs.

MR. MOORES: Tell him, tell him.

MR. G. FLIGHT: \$35 million - \$37 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: And how much to put in all the equipment?

MR. G. FLIGHT: To put in all their equipment? Most of all their equipment is - this is where they are making the windfall off that mill, Mr. Speaker. The federal government is going to finance the majority of their equipment, their depreciation allowance and everything else, and the minister knows it. \$35 million, you cannot build a good house, Mr. Speaker, for \$35 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about something else. I want to talk about my district, I want to talk about my district for a minute.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MOORES: Do not go talking about the Smallwood regime.

What are you living in the past for?

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wants to talk about the Smallwood regime. He always wants to talk about the Smallwood regime, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who me?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Yes, that is what the hon. member wants.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) about Smallwood.

MR. G. FLIGHT: But, Mr. Speaker, the member does not want me to remind him that one, two, three, four, five, six members that he is sitting with now were part of the most corrupt, you know, -

MR. HICKEY: What?

MR. G. FLIGHT: Yes, 'corrupt' is a good word. It is as good a word as any. Patronage for eight years, Mr. Speaker. Smallwood never got in twenty-three years what that administration got in eight. And, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) he can tell you, your House Leader.

MR. R. MOORES: Sure, the hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) was a Liberal in 1969. And the hon. member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) and the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) were all Liberals in 1969.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I want to talk -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. R. MOORES: And the Premier.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let us talk about - while we are on sawmilling, while we are talking about jobs, industry, Mr. Speaker, why does the minister not go in and use his ministerial authority to reactivate, to get a timber supply made available to the various sawmillers in Central Newfoundland who can make a living? They can make a living! It is the only area, it is the only resource that we can develop.

MR. POWER: How much can a fellow do with
(inaudible)

MR. G. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister got the answer for his government. He cannot say, 'Oh, well, you know, I have been a minister for six months'. What about the seven and a half years prior to that six months? What about that?

MR. R. MOORES: There has to be accountability.

MR. G. FLIGHT: There has to be accountability, Mr. Speaker. The minister is still administering the same department that he leans very heavily on. So when the minister gets up in this debate why does he not tell us why it is that, if we are talking about industrialization, if we are talking about creating jobs, that in the whole of the Central Newfoundland area, the one resource that you can utilize is the timber resource, the forest resource, and why will the minister not tell us why it is that he is watching sawmillers one by one bite the dust. And the only reason it is happening, the only reason it cannot sustain their operation and maintain a family and employ four or five people is that they cannot get access to the timber limits to cut to keep the mills going because those timber limits are held either by lease or grant by the paper companies. And he cannot, with all of his persuasiveness - the Premier can get up and say, 'We will deal with Mobil, we will deal with any company that do not toe the line with us'. He does not have the same appetite for dealing with the paper companies though. He does not have the same appetite to take on the paper companies.

MR. C. POWER: Do you support (inaudible) speech?

MR. G. FLIGHT: When we find out, Mr. Speaker, what is in the agreements, we will let you know. I do not too much agree with your new agreement on wood exports. It was very easy to identify -

MR. HANCOCK: You do not agree with 900 jobs offshore, you do not agree with the paying jobs in forestry, you do not -

MR. POWER: Where (inaudible) jobs in forestry?

MR. FLIGHT: The federal government gave that minister, Mr. Speaker, \$47 million a few days ago for forest enhancement. And just watch now, Mr. Speaker, watch the Trans-Canada Highway, watch the beautification programmes along the Trans-Canada Highway. Let us see how much of that money will be spent for that kind of a project, Mr. Speaker.

Is any of the \$47 million going to be spent on the limits held by the paper companies? Does the minister want to answer that question?

MR. POWER: Some.

MR. FLIGHT: How much?

MR. C. POWER: It will be based on projects and needs.

MR. FLIGHT: Based on projects and needs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the minister if the great bulk of that \$47 million is not spent on limits held by the paper companies, then the great bulk of that money will be wasted. Because he knows and I know that the timber limits left, owned by the Crown in this Province, are insignificant, Mr. Speaker. They are insignificant. The bulk of the timber, the merchantable timber that will mean anything to Newfoundland economically over the next - forever, is on limits held by the paper companies. So if we do not go in - if they will not do it and they show

MR. FLIGHT: no desire up to this point in time to practise good management, reforestation, reseeding, that kind of thing, rethinning. They have shown no desire to do it up to now. If we do not do it -

MR. POWER: \$24 million
(inaudible) in the next five years.

MR. FLIGHT: \$24 million for the next five years, of which six or seven million dollars is destined for a spray program, I suppose.

MR. POWER: No.

MR. FLIGHT: No?

MR. POWER: No.

MR. FLIGHT: In excess of that?

MR. POWER: (Inaudible) excess (inaudible) spray program.

MR. FLIGHT: What are they going to do with the \$24 million they are going to spend?

MR. POWER: Reforestation, experimentation of different seeds, experimentation -

MR. FLIGHT: Experimentation? Slope logging.

MR. POWER: Reforestation, site preparation, site clearing, pre-commercial thinning, commercial thinning.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, if the minister is not prepared to take it, he will learn the hard way and he is learning already. I have reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is not getting the most co-operation in the world from those paper companies. He is going to learn the hard way what every minister previous to him found out, and either he is prepared to take off the gloves, either he has the backbone to sit down with those paper companies and say it is going to be this way, or else he will go the way of the rest of the ministers.

MR. POWER: That is what my boss tells me every day.

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

The hon. Minister of Social Services. The hon. minister has fifteen minutes.

MR. HICKEY: Very good, Mr. Speaker.

It is a bit difficult for somebody in my portfolio to oppose any resolution which is going to address unemployment. I question, however, what good a debate will do but certainly there is a great deal in this motion that one can agree with in terms of particular areas of the Province where there is high unemployment and certainly nobody is more aware of that than myself in relation to the department that I am in. What is questionable, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not a full-scale debate will make a worthwhile contribution to solving some of the problems that are outlined in this resolution. I could find myself supporting it, Your Honour, just on the prospects that hon. gentlemen opposite might change their position on such vital areas as the offshore or clarify their position. They changed their position on the shared jurisdiction of the fishery. They changed their position on the constitutional battle that is continuing across the country. Because, Your Honour, the very essence of this resolution certainly deals with the primary industry in the Province, the fishery. No industry is more appropriate in terms of full-scale development to produce jobs than the fishery, and yet there is a constant battle going on between provinces and the federal government, a federal government, Mr. Speaker, that does not listen, has not listened and, apparently, will not listen. One of the reasons

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, no government has demonstrated more than this one of its interest, intent and commitment and, indeed its action, to create new jobs than this administration. Why even my own Department of Social Services creates jobs. This Mr. Speaker, was unheard of in past years, but even we create jobs right in my own department. Almost every programme that we have, Mr. Speaker, is geared towards full-scale rehabilitation of all citizens, including the disabled, to put them in to either sheltered employment, part-time employment or full-time employment. My hon. friend who just sat down I thought, as I listened to him, many things change but the situation remains the same because I have heard the hon. gentleman make the same speech he has made today, so many, many times.

MR. YOUNG: The same old speech for six years.

MR. T. HICKEY: And Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, you know, in the kindest way that I can say to him because he is a likeable fellow, you know -

MR. POWER: Who? Who is that?

MR. T. HICKEY: The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight).

MR. POWER: Who? Graham?

MR. T. HICKEY: Well, in the kindest way the best I can say of him -

MR. C. POWER: I thought for a second you meant the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (inaudible).

MR. T. HICKEY: - is that he is a walking contradiction. Because whilst he gives the impression of taking on the big companies and being anti-big company, he is a member of party who have cowardly walked away from the big companies for decades.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. POWER That is true, that is very true.

MR. T. HICKEY: Show me Mr. Speaker, let hon. gentlemen opposite show me, and I had the privilege of sitting over there for five years, let them show me one instance where the Liberal Party, when it was governing this Province, took on a multi-national or, for that matter, took on a large company in this Province. Never! Never! It was always a case Mr. Speaker, of give it away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. HICKEY: It was always a case, Mr. Speaker, it was always a case Mr. Speaker, of short-term planning no long-term planning.

MR. FLIGHT: What does the minister have to say on this Churchill Falls contract?

MR. T. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman is not going to sidetrack me now I am on to a good thing and I am going to pursue it. He is just going to have to sit down and just take it easy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: He knows what I am saying is true. It was never a case, Mr. Speaker, of long-range planning. Who ever heard of that in the former Liberal Government? No one. It was always announcement, after announcement, after announcement, for what? For momentary gain in an election or to do nothing else, Mr. Speaker, but raise the expectations of our people sometimes, I suggest to Your Honour, falsely, falsely.

MR. FLIGHT: They were working.

MR. T. HICKEY: Yes they were working because our people unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlander's, as they are well known, until they get hit almost by a bomb, they are not bad-minded, they are good people, they think the best of a government until it is almost proven to them they are wrong. And that is the sad commentary that has to be made of the Smallwood era, that our people continued to hope and hope and hope. One announcement after the other.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, it is really sad when hon. gentlemen opposite talk - and I do not question their motives, far be it for me or anyone else to question their motives. I will afford them in the most charitable way and say that they too are concerned about their constituents and all the citizens of this Province. I guess the bottom line, Your Honour, is the difference between honourable gentlemen's thinking over there and ours.

AN HON. MEMBER: Really?

MR. HICKEY: Really. Surely no member of this House will in all honesty stand here and say that anyone who comes here takes the trouble of getting here and lives in a profession such as politics, surely nobody questions their motives of being anything other than good and constructive. So what it boils down to, Your Honour, is a matter of difference, philosophical difference, a difference of policy, a difference of thinking.

This government, this administration believes in solid, long-range planning. This administration -

MR. FLIGHT: This one or the one the member was a part of a few years ago?

MR. HICKEY: What difference does it make?

MR. FLIGHT: Oh, it makes a lot of difference.

MR. HICKEY: Is that right?

MR. FLIGHT: Which one is the hon. minister referring to?

MR. HICKEY: I am going to banter back and forth now a little bit with the hon. gentleman. He wants to dig a hole so that I can bury him.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) 1975 to 1979 or is it the one since 1979?

MR. HICKEY: What is the hon. gentleman troubled about? Mr. Speaker, what is the hon. gentleman troubled about

MR. HICKEY: when he refers to, occasionally, about the former administration and this administration. And yet if we over here say anything about the Liberal Administration everybody cries 'wolf'.

I heard the hon. gentleman a little while ago talk about - he used the word 'corruption'. Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to that. One of the greatest tragedies, I guess, of all in this institution is the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite might well have been sucked into a very unfortunate situation by thinking too much, believing too much rumor and by running with the ball very often - in fact, Mr. Speaker, I have yet to see anything positive by way of proof to indicate anything - running with the ball and dwelling on such issues as corruption -

MR. FLIGHT: In 1969-1970 when the Province was brainwashed by Crosbie and a few more, that is why I talk about corruption (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, history will record - and I suppose we can all take the position, Mr. Speaker, and we can say that we will depend on history to adjudicate that issue as to who was right and who was wrong.

MR. FLIGHT: Remember where it came from when you have to sit down and talk, where it started.

MR. HICKEY: The important thing, Mr. Speaker, is this, to get back to the point I was making, the big difference is, the big question is and the most significant fact is that there is a great difference between people who sit on this side and how we seem to do things and hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side. The hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side, Mr. Speaker, are members of a party who, for example, support Mr. Trudeau in his bringing home the constitution and calling into question some very basic rights afforded to this Province in 1949. Clearly they support that,

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, and history will record it. They can get up and moan and groan all they like, they can cop out all they like, their positions are on record in this House of Assembly.

MR. FLIGHT: What did (inaudible) say?

MR. HICKEY: That same group of people, Mr. Speaker, who say they are concerned about unemployment, support the federal government in relation to the shared jurisdiction on the fishery, those same gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, support the federal government in its position on offshore. Those same people, Mr. Speaker, support the federal government on the synchrolift, a whole host of areas like that which are very job labour intensive, job creative and all the rest. And yet, Mr. Speaker, we hear of people expressing real concern, and I do not question, as I said, their sincerity, hear them question the whole issue of unemployment and that we should have a full-scale debate. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to vote for this resolution purely on the basis that any discussion on unemployment that produces one job is worth the exercise. But what is more, Mr. Speaker, maybe through a full-scale debate on unemployment hon. gentlemen opposite might finally see the light, might finally come to the conclusion that this government is correct in the action it has taken as regards to the constitution, as regards to fishery, as regards to offshore, as regards to forestry. Mr. Speaker, maybe most important of all, surely the member for Windsor-Buchans will not question the people or find fault with the people

MR. HICKEY: who put together the Economic Council of Canada's report. Would he disagree with that report?

MR. FLIGHT: Do I disagree with what?

MR. HICKEY: The report on the resource development of this Province. Does he disagree with that?

MR. FLIGHT: No, certainly I (inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Oh, he supports it.

MR. FLIGHT: The hon. members opposite -

MR. HICKEY: Okay, if he supports that, Mr. Speaker, he just got sucked in, Your Honour, because if he supports that, if the hon. gentleman supports that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: - if the hon. gentleman supports that, Mr. Speaker, then he supports not only what the report says, what this government is doing, what this government is doing - in fact, this government, Mr. Speaker, is ahead of what that report says. We are two steps ahead of them. They agree with everything we do.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a couple of seconds left, let me come to one other - one other thing which is wrong with hon. gentlemen opposite. I said a moment ago, 'Somebody passes them a ball and they run with it'. My hon. friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is a classic example. He is greatly concerned today about no cheques, no money in the stores in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I told him I would find out for him and I have. There is lots of money in those stores. The problem the hon. gentleman referred to is that there was an influx of cheques during the last little while because of the refunds in taxation, because of the child tax credits and so on, and that is why, like any other business, they ran out of a few dollars.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I must inform the hon. minister that his time has expired and according to the Standing Orders the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes may close the debate. If the hon. member speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
Probably we did not need interim supply to go through, all their money was in stores in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make on comments that were said from members opposite who started off the debate. Starting off it did not look like we were going to get any heavy-weights up at all. It started off with Mr. Stagg and Mr. Carter but I must say the debate has picked up considerably since then.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member should refer to members by their district and not by their names.

MR. HANCOCK: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Do they still have districts?

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, they do.

The last member that spoke, Mr. Speaker, spoke about the Constitution and we support 'Trudeau'. I would support anybody, Mr. Speaker, to bring that Constitution home and get it out of the way and let us get on with the business of running this country. I think there has been enough time wasted, Mr. Speaker, on that Constitution to have this country in a lot better shape than it is right now, and I would urge the Prime Minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: - to go on and bring it home, Mr. Speaker. We have also seen that the Premier of this

MR. HANCOCK: Province is not always right on his stands, Mr. Speaker, because the Supreme Court of Newfoundland recently ruled against what he thought was a legitimate point that he had when he said that the boundary would change and the denominational system would change under the new Constitution. We have just seen that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: That is no longer so, Mr. Speaker, and never was in doubt not in my mind and no one else's mind on this side. It never was in doubt.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to wander on on this because I want to make some remarks straight back through - and I will go back in reverse order. The last member also spoke about the Churchill Falls and how we gave it away, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was there when that complex was opened at the time. He congratulated Mr. Smallwood on his achievement and his accomplishment. Mr. Speaker, he was there

MR. HANCOCK: and he is now the Minister of Mines and Energy. So at the time, Mr. Speaker, when that contract was signed, maybe if we look back some years it may not have been a bad contract at the time. We find out now that it was because everything has escalated so high, but at the time the Minister of Mines and Energy congratulated the Premier at that time on his accomplishment, Mr. Speaker.

The last member also spoke about more people should get into the fishery, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the minister how many fishermen around this Province are making the salary that that minister is making? There are too many people in the fishery right now and that is what is wrong with the fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: Only a dream.

MR. HANCOCK: There are not too many legitimate fishermen, Mr. Speaker, making an honest and decent living out of the fishery right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: There are not too many, Mr. Speaker. I have a lot in my district who are not making an honest living, and if we do not bring in regulations and cut back on the number of people who are getting into the fisheries in the future, Mr. Speaker, then the fisheries in this Province is going to be in a hell of a bigger and better mess than it is right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: How about the salaries of the public servants?

MR. HANCOCK: I am going to get back to the salaries of the public servants in a minute, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: I sort of agree with the last minister that a full-scale debate in this House sometimes goes unnoticed or unwarranted or very little attention is paid to it, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes we talk, we know what we are talking about but that is about the extent of it, I am sure some of the discussions discussed in this House never goes to Cabinet.

I will go back now to the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). He wants to talk about the fisheries, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) about the fisheries.

MR. HANCOCK: Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, the steps taken recently by the federal government in regulating the number of people who can get into the fisheries is the best thing that ever happened to the fisheries since the fishermen got into a boat in Newfoundland. It is the best thing that ever happened, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: We have to control the number of people getting into the fisheries so that the people in the fisheries now can make an honest and decent living.

I recently, in the last couple of years, well about three years ago, Mr. Speaker, I made several trips on a tractor trailer back and forth to the markets in Boston hauling fish out of Trepassey, I just did it as a favour to one of my friends to give him a hand driving. The markets at that time, Mr. Speaker, were blocked with Newfoundland cod. They could not move them out fast enough. We had to wait there for several days to unload the fish that we were hauling down to Boston. It was a glut market. And I say the only way we are going to get into the European market - we cannot compete with the European markets because

MR. HANCOCK: our costs are so high, our labour costs are so high for one thing, and the Europeans can catch fish and process fish a lot cheaper than the average Newfoundlander can. And I say if we do not trade our fish and get into European markets, then that is it. It is not the only way we are going to get it, but we will never get into the European market if we do not trade off a certain amount of our fish in order to get into that market.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is baloney you are getting on with now.

MR. HANCOCK: You may think that is baloney, Mr. Speaker, but that is the whole intent, the whole purpose of trading off fish.

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) educated opinion.

MR. HANCOCK: You can support what you like but the facts are the facts, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the minister that the fish caught off the Northern cod stocks should be landed in Newfoundland if at all possible, Mr. Speaker. But I wonder how would the hon. minister feel if the Newfoundland cod stock was situated off the Nova Scotian coastline. Would the shoe be on the other foot then, Mr. Speaker? Would the Nova Scotians let us catch the fish and bring it back to our plants to be processed?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Nova Scotia.

MR. HANCOCK: It would be Nova Scotia. Yes, probably it would be. But I would like to see it processed here as much as possible, Mr. Speaker, because it would create employment for our young people and our plant workers around this Province.

The minister also spoke about the Canada development projects. I wonder did the members on that side support Mr. Crosbie when he was Finance Minister when he put a freeze on all Canada development projects and LIP programmes coming into this Province? He put a freeze on them, Mr. Speaker. And I have had people in my district, Mr. Speaker, almost come to blows over those Canada development projects. When you have thirteen people employed and you have about eighty or ninety people in a small community unemployed, they fight like heck, Mr. Speaker, to get on those projects. It is the only bit of employment they have. And this crowd over here, they talk about what we support and what we do not support. I wonder do they support Mr. Crosbie or did they support Mr. Crosbie on his stand to eliminate all funding going into those projects, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: On the basis (inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: On the basis - I am sure they would give you \$20 million and the Province would do the same thing with it as they did with the rural RRAP program,

MR. HANCOCK: designate Tory areas and not include Liberal areas in those programmes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Designate both federal and provincial (inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: Were they?

MR. FLIGHT: Do not mind him. He does not know (inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I was amazed. This is the first time I saw or read this report that I have here. And the member for the Privy Council or St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) thinks that oil is going to be our salvation, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if he wants to know my stand on the offshore it is in Hansard of April 1, 1981. It is on page 2393. That is my stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: That stand has changed.

MR. HANCOCK: Now, what change? If you bring in a resolution and you want my support on that you will get it, Mr. Speaker. I think we have to have control to regulate the amount of flow that is going to come out of it. And I sort of sympathize with the Prime Minister, whether it be Mr. Trudeau or Mr. Clark or whoever, Mr. Speaker, If that Prime Minister has not had the interests of this nation at heart, He has to, Mr. Speaker. I sympathize with him. I know there is going to be a war because we want it and he also wants it, Mr. Speaker, for two different reasons but the two different reasons are the same.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: They are. They are basically the same two reasons, Mr. Speaker. But I support it and I hope I live to see the day, Mr. Speaker, when we will have control of our offshore. And I will support it, Mr. Speaker. I have meetings set up in Ottawa and I am going to present my case to the Newfoundland Minister in Cabinet at that time which

MR. HANCOCK: will be in a couple of weeks time. But, Mr. Speaker, our oil is not our salvation. It is not going to save the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. It is not going to create enough employment although Arnold's Cove seems to think now that it is going to. Yesterday the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) announced that Arnold's Cove has been a site chosen or there is a land freeze. The people out there seem to think -

MR. LUSH: That is going to be rescinded on Monday morning.

MR. HANCOCK: Well, I have heard several comments last night, Mr. Speaker. We were at a meeting in Arnold's Cove with about 550 people. They were just wondering if it is another con job, Mr. Speaker, the same as Come By Chance was.

MR. D. HANCOCK: They are very worried. But, Mr. Speaker, this report says that the oil will only create the -

MR. POWER: The more pertinent question (Inaudible).

MR. D. HANCOCK: "The effect on unemployment is expected to be large and most of the jobs will be on a short construction activity. It seems unlikely, therefore, that oil and gas will be the answer to Newfoundland's problems of high unemployment and low productivity."

Mr. Speaker, that says it for itself. So we have to get off of this kick. The oil is going to come Mr. Speaker. We are not living in a dream world, we cannot feed our families on dreams, we would like to but we cannot do it. So we have to get down and develop the resources that we have, Mr. Speaker.

My hon. friend here for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has been urging this government now for the last six months to get started on this transmission line from the Strait down through into Newfoundland. And, Mr. Speaker, if we do not do that right now - the Newfoundland hydro report from the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro says that we are going to have a power shortage in Newfoundland in 1985. And they would estimate that it will take some five to six years to build that transmission line which would create some 2,000 or 3,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker. So I would urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to create some jobs and then start building that transmission line because whether the power comes on next year or the year after or in five years time, we are still going to need a transmission line in which to have that electricity flow to the Island portion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. HANCOCK: And it is true, Mr. Speaker, that the unemployment rate has dropped 5 per cent. I can assure the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) that the unemployment rate is down in the last month, and the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), because of those projects, and he seemed to support Mr. Crosbie banning them when he was Minister of Finance. He was going to put a freeze on them. The unemployment rate would not be down to 12.76 per cent in Newfoundland today if it was not for those projects. There are thousands of Newfoundlanders around this Province employed on those projects, Mr. Speaker. They are great projects. The wages on those projects are not enough. They are only a little better than starvation wages but they are jobs, and they do mean a lot to rural parts of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

And I would encourage the minister to try and - if the Tories ever take over this government again to try and have those projects continued the same as they were under a Liberal administration. That is the difference between Tories and Liberals, Mr. Speaker, they understand the basic needs of the average people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, we have seen vast improvements. This Province - and I have to refer once again to my old buddy, '333', Mr. Speaker - this Province did see a lot of improvements in its highway systems and outer networks around this Province under the Liberal administration. But in the last ten years, Mr. Speaker, it has almost come to a halt. It is like the Tories took office because they wanted to get rid of Mr. Smallwood. They wanted to get him out but now they have him out and they do not know what to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I would advise hon. members to go out and sit down and have a meeting with that gentleman, Mr. Speaker, to try and bring some industry into this Province. There has not been, Mr. Speaker, in the last two years one new industry created in Newfoundland or Labrador -

MR. FLIGHT: Eight years.

MR. D. HANCOCK: There has been a few closed up. It seems like they do not like the industries that are there, that are supplying employment, Mr. Speaker. But there has not been one new industry - for eight years is it? I do not know, I am only involved in it two years.

MR. FLIGHT: No, eight years.

MR. D. HANCOCK: For the last two years I have not seen any improvements, Mr. Speaker.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Not one in eight years, not one in eight years.

MR. D. HANCOCK: We talk about a pipeline, Mr. Speaker. I was talking to an elderly gentleman some time ago about -

MR. D. HANCOCK: - the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) talking about putting in a pipeline. I was informed by that hon. gentleman, who was a member of the Marine Service in the United States at the time, that the only way we had charts to the offshore from here directly off to Hibernia, was because of the German submarines that used to hide away in the crevices underneath the ocean floor, Mr. Speaker. That is a fact! And he was down in that area and I guess he could see for himself exactly what was there. He said it would be virtually impossible, in his

MR. HANCOCK: opinion, to have a pipeline come from Hibernia inshore in any part of Newfoundland. He said the terrain out there - the only way they got the charts was from German submarines that used to hide away on the ocean floor out there during the war, that was the only way. I never checked it out to see if it was fact so I took his word for it. He was an elderly gentleman and he had no reason to lie to me, Mr. Speaker. And it concerns me, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about Come By Chance and the number of jobs that it could create, and I hope I live to see the day when that oil will come ashore some way and be refined in Newfoundland, because that is the only way that we are going to create long-term jobs for Newfoundlanders, the only way, Mr. Speaker, if that oil comes ashore. If it goes to the Eastern Seaboard or the Quebec Seaboard then poor old Newfoundland is in trouble again. I do not know how long it will take to convert Come By Chance to handle the type of oil that we have in Hibernia and other wells surrounding that area, but if we soon do not do something, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to ship it, because I do not think it is too far away when we are going to see that oil coming on stream. I do not think - if we have to build a new refinery I have an awful feeling it is going to take more than two years to build a refinery, Mr. Speaker. So what are we talking about? We are not going to have the oil if it does not come ashore by pipeline, which I have my doubts about, aboard ships and sent to the Eastern Seaboard or to the Quebec Seaboard to be refined. And that, Mr. Speaker, is not good enough. The government should take the necessary steps and actions now to see that Come By Chance -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: I am trying to follow the hon. gentleman.

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

MR. HICKEY: He is stating a lot of points there and I cannot hear the hon. gentleman because my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) keeps talking. Ask him to be quiet so that I can hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: A very valid point of order. Not only the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), of course, because I think it is fair to say that it has happened on many occasions.

The hon. member for St. Mary's -
The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am glad to see - I did not even hear, Mr. Speaker, because I get carried away. I do not even know what is going on but I thank the member for being interested enough to bring that to the Speaker's attention. I am glad to see that he is interested.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would urge this government to try and take a deep and hard and a serious look at refining the oil here in Newfoundland. Whether it be in Come By Chance or we have to build another refinery, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert in that field. I do not know if Come By Chance can be -

MR. DINN: A point of order.

MR. HANCOCK: - converted, but like I said -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order has been raised by the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is speaking on resource development and whether he supports his resolution or not. I am trying to follow him. I am wondering if he supports his resolution or not because he has said everything - everything that he said since he started the debated is contrary to his resolution.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order -

MR. HANCOCK: Obviously the minister cannot read -

MR. SPEAKER: - the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: - Mr. Speaker, I know he cannot think or he cannot do too much in the House of Assembly because his actions warrant it, but he cannot read, Mr. Speaker. The first part of the resolution, what does it say, Mr. Speaker? "WHEREAS THE PROVINCE of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment record in Canada." What am I talking about if I am not talking about unemployment, Mr. Speaker? I am asking the minister if he is puzzled.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order I rule that there is no point of order but a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. HANCOCK: It is not even a difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: That is an insult, Mr. Speaker.
I want to make some comments here. I have just about finished - not finished - but I would like to have more time because I want to relate to some of the things in my district, Mr. Speaker, and

MR. HANCOCK: I have not even got to them, I am just making comments on what was said by the speakers. But I would like to thank the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) for his piece of caribou meat. I hope the next thing he gives me will be a bit better, Mr. Speaker. That was absolutely terrible.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): Bribery is not permitted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, other thing that could create employment in this Province would be our tourist industry if it was properly developed. And that brings me back to my own district, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) the resolution?

MR. HANCOCK: I will get back to supporting the resolution in a second.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) piece of fresh caribou meat, right?

MR. HANCOCK: We have a large amount of caribou in our area as well. I do not know if the minister is aware of that, but we do. We have one of the largest herds in Newfoundland on the Avalon Peninsula. I know the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) is well aware of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we get back to talking about roads and roads to resources again. I am sorry the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is not here, because every time I speak in the House I intend to mention this fact that our fish - I am tempted to say, will not be going into markets in the future where it comes from areas over dirt roads. Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say that because - I know on the Cape Shore, where we had about 6 million pounds of fish landed last year, it was all trucked over, and most of it in open trucks, the quality of that fish is deteriorating and the markets will not allow that type of

MR. HANCOCK: fish to go into the markets.

So I would urge the government to have a long look at the road conditions that pertain to roads to resources, Mr. Speaker, and try to come up with a solution. Because we have not seen any road work and I do not foresee any in this year's Budget, it does not seem to be too optimistic.

I am going back to 'Mr. Carter,' he said, he did not know if he was going to support the resolution or not. But that does not surprise me because he does not seem to be able to make up his own mind anyway, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): Order, please! The hon. member should refer to a member by his district.

MR. HANCOCK: The hon. member for St. John's -where is he from, Centre? No, North.

MR. FLIGHT: No, they would not have him there.

MR. HANCOCK: The Mount Scio guy.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. HANCOCK: Well, Mr. Speaker, one of the main things that we have seen in this resolution, and I carefully thought about this before I brought it to the House, because it was my first resolution.

MR. LUSH: And a good one at that.

MR. FLIGHT: And a good one at that too, Sir.

MR. HANCOCK: I will ask the members on both sides to decide, because it was my resolution and there was no thought whatsoever went into that resolution, only the wording of the thing, it was totally drawn up by myself. It was the first one I ever did. I did not study any resolutions to try and get any facts. And I mainly presented that resolution

MR. HANCOCK:

because when I take a look around my district and see the problems that we are faced with and what could happen to the district that I represent if, indeed, we had an oil spill, Mr. Speaker, it frightens me to think what - and the possibility is there. As remote as it may seem, Mr. Speaker, it is a possibility. And I would urge the government to target areas of high unemployment like my own, Mr. Speaker. And I generally think of my own district first, probably which I should not do, but I do have the heart of this Island at heart, Mr. Speaker. I am a Newfoundlander, yes and a proud one. I represent a district that depends entirely on the fishing industry, Mr. Speaker. We have to look seriously at bringing a secondary industry into that area because if something happens to our fishery, then I think the people of St. Mary's-the Capes and myself are doomed, Mr. Speaker. And with that I would conclude. I have several other remarks to make, Mr. Speaker. I know time has run out and I thank hon. members. If they want to support the resolution it is entirely up to themselves and if they do not, we all have a mind, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

You have heard the motion. Those in favour 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Contrary 'Nay'.

I declare the motion carried.

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

APRIL 8, 1981



GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

P.O. Box 4750
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1C 5T7

1981-03-31

QUESTION NO. 39 - MARCH 30, 1981

Mr. Neary (La Poile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) cost of moving household effects and personal belongings of Mr. Wm. Fearn, former Deputy Minister of Finance, to the mainland of Canada.
- (b) amount of severance pay granted to Mr. Fearn upon termination of his employment.
- (c) other benefits granted to Mr. Fearn upon the termination of his services as Deputy Minister of Finance and Comptroller for the Province.

ANSWER

- (a) \$12,898.21
- (b) \$42,300.00
- (c) Mr. Fearn was given Group Insurance Coverage to December 15, 1980, however, deductions were made from his final cheque to cover premiums. In October, 1980 he was given a refund of \$133.20 of these premiums.