

VOL. 3

NO. 62

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 p.m - 6:00 p.m.
Wednesday, June 17, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, in November 1980, my colleague and former Environment Minister, the hon. Ron Dawe, addressed the House of Assembly on the subject of acid rain, noting that it was one of the most serious environmental problems facing certain parts of North America today. In particular, he stressed the implications of this phenomenon with respect to the threat that acid rain poses to fresh water fish stocks in Newfoundland and Labrador.

By way of background, I should remind the hon. members that Newfoundland is a receptor and not a contributor to the problem of acid rain, that we are at the end-of-the-tunnel insofar as this pollutant "fallout" is concerned. In his statement last Fall, Mr. Dawe spoke of the work already underway to assess the impact of acid precipitation in Newfoundland. Although this monitoring has only been underway for some four years, which is too short a period to establish any trends, rainfall pH over this period has averaged 4.6 or roughly ten times the acidity of clean unpolluted rain, which has a pH 5.6. The effects of this acidic rainfall on our lakes and streams depends greatly on the sensitivity of those receiving waters which, in turn, is governed by the nature of the underlying bedrock and surrounding soils. Our geology is similar to that of areas affected by acid rain in Northern Ontario and the Northeastern United States, so we can anticipate a similar serious impact on the fish life in many of our lakes. This geology, which is largely granitic in nature, is devoid of the "buffering" capacity associated with the kind of limestone rocks underlying lakes on the West Coast of the

MR. ANDREWS: Island. Our calculations show that although, in general, our water systems have not been stressed to the point where fish or aquatic life is in danger of destruction, many of the lakes are so low in buffering capacity that they are highly sensitive to any further increase in the acidity of the precipitation. We have estimated that a decrease in the average pH of only .2 units, which is equivalent of a 50 per cent increase in the acid loading of precipitation today, would shift some of our lakes into a highly stressed or unproductive state.

In April, I presented a brief at Halifax to the Parliamentary Sub-Committee studying the problems of acid rain. This brief underscored this Province's deep concern for the insidious problem and was enthusiastically received by the Sub-Committee. This brief was also presented at a conference on acid rain held at the Canada-United States Centre of the State University of New York, Buffalo; that was on May 1st, and 2nd. of this year.

Mr. Speaker, I voiced my apprehension about the relaxation of controls on air pollution currently being proposed by the Reagan administration. Using available and projected control technology, a 50 per cent increase in the amount of acidic pollution over the next

MR. ANDREWS: twenty years is optimistically forecast. With relaxation of controls on existing or new United States industries, this projected increase in emission could take place within a much shorter time span. In Newfoundland, we could expect a more pronounced negative effect from such an occurrence.

Without going into the extensive content of our brief, I will summarize our concluding remarks to the Sub-Committee as follows: (1) Newfoundland recognizes acid precipitation as one of the most serious environmental problems facing eastern North America today. (2) Because of the immense costs of required air pollution controls, the political will to impose these costs on industry, and consequently society, will not be manifested until both the Canadian and American public consciousness is raised sufficiently to perceive the seriousness of the problem. (3) There is a great need for more research into the mechanics of acid rain formation and its predicted distribution under various weather conditions. (4) The federal government should vigorously pursue the concluding of the Canada-United States agreement encompassing a commitment by both governments to encourage the reduction of sulphur and nitrogen oxides in the air. (5) The federal government should ensure that all funding agreements provided as part of its energy conservation programmes for the conservation of oil-fired power generation facilities to coal, specify local commitments to incorporate all necessary pollution controls. (6) Because the ambient air quality is conventionally an area of provincial jurisdiction, and in view of the fact that the federal government recently amended the Clean Air Act to give reciprocal protection to the United States

MR. ANDREWS: regarding trans-boundary air pollutants, the federal government should initiate discussions to establish federal/provincial agreements similar to the Environmental Accords in effect in some provinces so that the provisions of the recent amendment can be enacted. (7) The problem is multi-faceted, as will be any solutions. We must work hard and quickly to bring about improvements but we must be patient, as receptor improvements will take time. We are going to need all the resources available to us and we shall require the co-operation of all groups, agencies and individuals in the nation, and some of those outside of our borders.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this statement has served to inform the honourable members of this House about the ongoing developments with the subject of acid rain. In the interests of all Newfoundlanders, I intent to report to the House on a periodic basis as further information becomes available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: This is rather a serious matter, but to say that this Province has any control over this, basically it has not. The conservative administration of Washington under the leadership of Mr. Reagan has basically control over it. And instead of our own Provincial government

MR. HISCOCK: again blaming it on Ottawa, it would be much better if our provinces throughout the country join in with Ottawa to fight the conservative administration of Mr. Regan to combat this acid rain. Because now we are seeing more environmental controls being relaxed in the United States, more money being spent on defence basically because it is the philosophy of the conservative administration, which this administration, by the way, supports in its philosophy, but to say that we as a Province have very much control over it, we do not.

I would much prefer to see the Minister of Environment and Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Andrews) get up in this House and announce a Summer youth programme that we do have some jurisdiction over, or to announce that we are going to have a unit for environment, for pollution control to co-ordinate all the various units, federal, provincial, Coast Guard, to combat oil pollution off this coast, get into some jurisdiction where we have some.

This is a federal matter with regard to the federal government of the United States and we, as provinces, should be joining in the fight against the United States that they are relaxing their control.

But again, I am a little bit surprised that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, if we do not get power from Labrador by the year 1987, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has a choice of either building a unit at Holyrood, Unit 4, or going to coal-fired generators. And if we go to coal-fired generators, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, this is one of the major causes of acid rain.

MR. HISCOCK: So I would hope that the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) is keeping an eye on Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and to make sure that we co-operate with the federal government to overcome this programme.

Mr. Speaker, we share the concern, but look for co-operation between this Province and the other provinces in letting the Americans know in no uncertain terms that this is a major concern and we have no intention of allowing the environment to be polluted by industrial waste coming across the border from the United States.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): If I may, we have some distinguished visitors in our galleries today. I would like to welcome first of all on behalf of all hon. members, the Mayor of the Town of Carbonear, Mr. Milton Peach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: And visiting with us from the Northwest Territories, seated in the Speaker's gallery, is Mr. George Erasmus. Welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Further statements?

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, it is not so much a statement as I want to make available to all hon. members a copy of the Directory of Manufacturers - 1981 produced by the Department of Development. It is a fairly comprehensive document that lists in alphabetical order the companies that are doing business in the

MR. WINDSOR: Province. They are listed also by geographical area. They are listed alphabetically by product and, as well, there is a complete listing of craft manufacturers in Newfoundland and Labrador. The document is a very popular one and is of great benefit to companies wishing to do joint ventures in the Province and to ensure compliance with the local preference policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

- MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Deputy House Leader.
- MR. MOORES: Favouritism.
- MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I wonder if the Premier has yet received a letter from the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour in which they are requesting the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn)?
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.
- PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I received a telex early this morning from the Federation of Labour requesting the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower. And I responded this morning, fifteen or twenty minutes after I received the telex, indicating to them that I thanked them for their telex, that public statements that I have made over the last couple of days and weeks indicate where I stand on it and that I had full confidence in the present Minister of Labour and Manpower to carry out his duties wisely and responsibly as he has done in the past.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.
- MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.
- MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova,
- MR. LUSH: I take it then from the Premier that he takes this request from the Federation of Labour, which is representative of labour in this Province, which is the voice of labour in this Province, so I take it that the Premier takes this request from the Federation of Labour no more seriously than from the other individual unions that have requested the minister's resignation throughout the Province in recent weeks?
- MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are various people and various organizations who speak for labour in this Province. The general body that is supposed to speak for labour, I guess, comes from the Federation of Labour, although I have spoken to quite a few labour groups and leaders in the Province who do not have the same views about labour legislation, about the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), about this administration as does a number of members of the Federation of Labour. So when one says that the Federation of Labour speaks for all the workers of this Province, whilst it is true, generally speaking, in its specifics it loses some of its strength because there are quite a few people at the executive level of the Federation of Labour who are ardent members of a political party which is opposed to the present party that forms the government of this Province.

So one has to take that into consideration, you know, in talking about it. There are other labour leaders who support the party opposite, I think the head of the Fishermen's Union could be perhaps classified into that. I think there are leaders in the construction unions who are good supporters of this party, there are labour leaders in the forestry sector who are good supporters of this party, so it varies from sector to sector and whilst I appreciate, respect and understand the whole question, the Federation of Labour has a right to request it. I have an equally legitimate right to

PREMIER PECKFORD:

respond in the way I think is necessary. I choose my Cabinet and I will stand or fall on whom I choose and their policies and how they behave in the same way, no doubt, the Federation of Labour has to do likewise with their executive so, you know, that is fair ball.

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

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

MR. LUSH: If I understand the Premier -

MR. NEARY: It has nothing to do with politics. The minister interfered with the Labour Relations Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: This is the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker. We do not have to tolerate in this House the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) injecting, as he is, across the House and -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Interrupting his own member.

MR. MARSHALL: This is the Question Period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: His colleague who was on his feet is entitled to be heard without the intonations of the hon. member for LaPoile in the background.

MR. NEARY: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, that the hon. gentleman is rather testy today, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that if he and the Premier think the House will be closed in two weeks as they tried to

MR. NEARY: boost the morale of their caucus this morning, I have news for them. Maybe three months would be more like it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! To the point of order.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman does not like the parliamentary traditions, Mr. Speaker, he insists on practicing law and being a minister anyway, let him go out -

MR. HANCOCK: Go out and ride his bike.

MR. NEARY: - let him go out and ride his bike, if he does not like the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
With respect to the point of order, I would that there is a legitimate point of order because hon. members should not be shouting across the House, and I have made that point many many times before. And when it becomes increasingly obvious to the Chair, then the Chair will take necessary action.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the supplementary question that I was about to propose to the Premier is it looks like the Premier probably has put a new perspective on people that are elected to public office, particularly representative of the Province. In just a brief preamble, the Newfoundland Federation of Labour to my mind is the voice for labour in this Province. And just as the Premier speaks for the people of this Province, or so he says when he talks about the Constitution, is the Premier now saying that when he speaks out about the Constitution, when he speaks about those matters that he is not speaking on behalf of the Province any more than the Federation of Labour is now speaking for labour in this Province?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Opposition tell me I am not speaking for everyone in this Province and to call an election, so I can only go by their own remarks.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (H. Newhook). In view of the very strong and very serious statement this morning in the media by the Mayor of Carbonear that essentially the town of Carbonear has been shafted because it has chosen to elect a Liberal member to this House of Assembly, would the hon. minister inform this House, or attempt to inform this House, if she intends to meet with the

MR. R. MOORES:

councillors and the Mayor of the town of Carbonear within seven days as requested by the Mayor and council in a telegram to her office this morning?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I have not received the telegram from the council of Carbonear, not as yet. And I have never, ever yet refused to meet with a council and I do not think that I shall refuse this one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook). It is one thing to meet with a town council and it is another to meet with them with an attitude of trying to come across with some type of resolution to the problems that they are facing. Is it possible that I can receive from the minister a commitment that she will do more at this meeting, that I understand or I presume she has now committed herself to attending, that she will do more than pay lip service to a very serious problem now facing not only the town of Carbonear but a number of communities in this Province who have either already resigned - councils have already resigned - or are threatening to resign?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I always deal very seriously with all councils and I do not just give lip service to anything, any concerns of councils.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. MOORES: The minister, if I heard her correctly, Mr. Speaker, said that she always deals seriously with town councils or any group that she meets with. On November 25th., 1980, you along with a senior official of your department met with the town council of Carbonear and at that time you committed yourself orally to placing the town of Carbonear on a number one priority basis for capital funding this year. Now that you have denied, rejected capital funding to the town of Carbonear, do you still, does the hon. member still claim that she -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. R. MOORES: - does the hon. minister still claim that she deals seriously with the town council of Carbonear?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, A number of councils this year, even though they were placed in a priority listing, will be disappointed. There will be 75 per cent of our municipalities disappointed this year and Carbonear is just very unfortunate to be one of these. But there just was not enough funding, Mr. Speaker,

MRS. NEWHOOK: to be able to go ahead and to approve all of the projects.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). In view of the fact that this provincial government has many employees working in Labrador, and the Northern allowance that is presently paid to these employees is much below what is paid by any other province that has employees working in the Northern sections of the province, has the minister any plans of increasing the Northern allowance for workers of this government who are working in Labrador?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely sure -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not entirely sure that the hon. member does have his facts straight. I will check out the details of the various employees of the provincial government in Labrador as to their Northern allowance payments, and I will bring whatever information seems appropriate to the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

DR. COLLINS: - hon. member either individually or here in the House.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My supplementary is I would like to ask the minister again, does he have any plans of increasing the Northern allowance for employees of his government that are presently working in Labrador?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Mr. Speaker, that sort of subject is under review periodically. The payments to the Public Service in various aspects of their payment are reviewed by government at certain times and the Northern allowances for workers in Labrador will be reviewed along with other payments that are due the Public Service.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand the purpose for Northern allowances as sort of an initiative to get people to work in the North. And could the minister also, when he is reviewing the Northern allowance status, could he consider having the Northern allowance that is paid to the employees being tax free, being exempt from taxes? At the present time a large majority of this Northern allowance that is being paid as an incentive - it is an allowance that is being paid as an incentive for people working in the North - and a large amount of this is being taken away for tax purposes to pay probably for the Premier's house and so on. I was just wondering if the Minister of Finance could consider tax-freeing this Northern allowance?

MR. HISCOCK: That is fair enough.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think I can assure the hon. member that when we do the review we will do a full review. We will review it in all its aspects and all its implications.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

June 16, 1981

Tape No. 2559

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. I thought first I might ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) but I think probably I will direct my question to the Premier. And I do it in a non-partisan, non-political way, Mr. Speaker, because it is a matter with which I am very concerned. And I

MR. NEARY:

would like for the Premier to deal with it not by merely just saying it is Ottawa's fault or attacking Ottawa, because the matter I am going to raise has to do with onshore processing of caplin. We are into the caplin season now as everybody knows and we all know how important the caplin is to the codfish, and, Mr. Speaker, we all know also that the caplin are being sucked up every day, are being caught in nets and traps every day in large volumes in different parts of Newfoundland. And the question I want to ask the Premier is this, and I am very concerned about this - as a matter of fact, I am outraged over it when I think about all the hungry people in the world - that the only caplin apparently that is being sold to the Japanese are the female caplin. Apparently all they want are the spawney caplin, the roe, and the male caplin are dumped.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The hon. member is about to ask a question?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get the Premier's views on this because I believe it is something that we should do something about. I do not think we should allow this to continue for another year. The large percentage of the catch of caplin is dumped by the fish processing companies. Now would the hon. gentleman care to respond to that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just in this last twenty-four hours the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who I have already indicated knows more about fishery than any other member in this House and who is one of the great Ministers of Fisheries in Newfoundland for all time, who has been -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - briefing the caucus and the Cabinet on the problem with squid in the Province, and the problem with the ten per cent subsidy reduction by the federal government, and on caplin, and I pass the answer over to our competent Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to completely obliterate with information and with ideas about the fishery the question just asked by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, with that kind of an introduction from the Premier I guess I will carry on from there. Mr. Speaker, the caplin fishery is again, of course, managed by the federal authorities under the quota system and it is, as are all the quotas for different species, set and managed by the federal authorities. This year the federal authorities in their wisdom, or lack of wisdom, decided to set a quota of 30,000 metric tons of caplin to be caught in our waters from Cape St. Mary's to Cape Freels by the inshore catching effort. The companies who are involved in the marketplace, and the people who are knowledgeable in the marketplace say that the market can only take approximately 10,000 to 15,000 metric tons maximum, and of course that market is mainly involving the female species of the caplin, which means that the other caplin, in most cases there

MR. MORGAN:

is no market for it. And this is causing a problem in most areas because that caplin is being dumped by fishermen, not being taken by the companies who are buying and going out to export caplin. What we want to see done, we want to see a regulation put in place to prevent the dumping of caplin in the Province. In fact, we feel that any fish protein, any protein of any type, should never be dumped at a time when we have a hungry world looking for food.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: And any fish protein should not be dumped, and we would like to see that a regulation. Again it is a matter where federal authorities have control, they have jurisdiction; we cannot act, they will not give us jurisdiction, they will not take any action. But hopefully they will listen to reason and will bring in a regulation whereby if that male caplin cannot be exported for the market in Japan in particular, that at least it be bought by the companies and put into fish meal. At least the fishermen then would not have to dump that species.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen can slam their flippers down on the desk all they like, but the matter I am talking about is under provincial jurisdiction. The minister just tried to mislead the House. The processing of caplin as well as other species of the sea is done under a provincial licence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada only manages the fish in the ocean while it is in the sea. Once it comes onshore, it comes under the jurisdiction

MR. NEARY: of the provincial government.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. gentleman should not be debating the answer now, he should be asking a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am merely trying to set the record straight because the hon. gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - attempted to mislead the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That is not -

MR. NEARY: Well, let me ask the hon. gentleman if, when he issued the licence to processors onshore, when he issued these licences did he put in a provision that they were not allowed to dump caplin, that if they were to get into the caplin business they had to market the male and the female, and if they could not do that then their licence would be cancelled? Did the hon. gentleman put that provision in the provincial licence?

MR. WARREN: No, no way.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously again misinformed as to what is happening in this aspect of our economy again, the fishing industry; because the fact is that in most cases it is not the plants. The plants are not buying fish and dumping it -

MR. HANCOCK: Answer the questions.

MR. MORGAN: - the plants are not buying caplin and dumping it. It is the fact that fishermen only have a market for the female caplin and they have no choice but dump the male caplin.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: - unless somebody is going to buy it, and nobody is going to buy it if they cannot process it. And what we are saying right now is that we should find

June 17, 1981

Tape No. 2561

SD - 3

MR. MORGAN:

the means -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

- Mr. Speaker, if we could have

some -

MR. HANCOCK:

Answer the question now, answer

the question.

MR. MORGAN:

- quiet from those people who

yap off a lot on the other side ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the caplin fishery, as I mentioned earlier, for the last couple of years has become rather a lucrative fishery. And we have had consultations. We sat down recently, for example, the officials and myself in government sat down with all the companies who are involved in buying caplin. We wanted to know what their total capacity was to buy from fishermen; we wanted to know what their freezing capacity was; we wanted to know what their market capacity was. We sat down for at least a three or four hour discussion involving the Fishermen's Union and all companies who are buying caplin. And the fact is they only have an export market for the female species, And why should they buy the male species right now if there is no market for it? And what we have to do in conjunction with the federal government and with the industry which is involved in the marketplace, is to hopefully find markets for our fishmeal product which could be utilizing the male species of caplin. So what is happening now, unfortunately the fishermen are having a difficult time finding a market for the male caplin and therefore they have to dump that species. We hate to see it and we do not want to see it. We want to overcome any wasteful dumping or waste of any fish protein that we have in our waters.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what a gigantic bluff! - a statement by the minister to indicate that he does not know what he is talking about. He does not understand the fishing industry. Is the hon. gentleman aware that caplin cannot be used for fishmeal because it is too oily? And is the hon. gentleman aware of this, that the fishermen do sell their catch of caplin to the

MR. NEARY: fish processors and they have a very sensitive machine in their plants that separate the female caplin from the male caplin? The hon. gentleman is apparently not aware of that, Mr. Speaker. Is he aware of it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman is aware of that, then is it not a provincial responsibility to see that this waste of protein, this waste of food is stopped immediately?

MR. HANCOCK: Get Walter Carter back!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed quite aware. Just recently I had representations from a number of fishermen and my concern is with the fishermen as well as the processors, in fact, both, equal concern I guess. We have had representations from fishermen who are saying that they are not going to survive this year with regard to dependence on the caplin fishery because of the mismanagement by the federal government. An example of that was that the inshore boats in Conception Bay right now are unable to get any caplin to sell because the larger boats are taking most of that caplin.

MR. BARRY: Like St. Phillips?

MR. MORGAN: Well, the hon. gentleman mentioned St. Phillips as an example. I saw it last week myself. The larger boats are getting most of the caplin if not all of them. And, of course, there is a limited market for the caplin so that means the market is being filled by the supplies from the larger boats. So the inshore fishermen, the smaller boat fishermen,

MR. MORGAN: are indeed having a very serious problem. I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, of what caplin goes into fishmeal. I am also quite aware, and the hon. gentleman is obviously not, that there is now new technical expertise which will indicate that caplin can be and will be used, and hopefully by this time next year that the male caplin will not have to be dumped, it will be used for export in the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if before another processor's licence is issued in this Province, that a provision will be put in that never again, in the history of this Province will so much protein food, will so much produce of the ocean, namely caplin, be allowed to be dumped in this Province? If there is no market for it, that the processors not be allowed just to process the female caplin and dump the male species. Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if he is prepared to do that?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to to anything within reason to protect the fishermen and the fishing industry and also at the same time help the trade. The fact is, fortunately, Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that we do have today, we do have jurisdiction over the issuing of processing licenses and control over processing licenses, because the Federal minister just recently announced that he would not issue one more, not one more additional license in this Province, and if that was in a policy where he had any jurisdiction, the new plant going on Bell Island, for example, would not be going ahead, the new plant down in Nipper's Harbour would not go ahead, and other areas around the Province where there is a need for plants

MR. MORGAN: to market the fisherman's catch. So fortunately we do have jurisdiction over the marketing sector and we are setting conditions to the licenses that we issue. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we are setting conditions and regulations -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) new.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this yappy dog -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - he does not speak, he just yaps.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that we do have now regulations linking into the licenses we issue.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) the minister.

MR. MORGAN: We are not going to interfere with the private sector of the industry. We are going to consult with them, sure we are, and we will consult. And any regulation, any regulation put in place governing the prevention of ever dumping fish again, we have worked out in consultation with the Fishermen's Union and the Fish Trades of this Province.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question also for the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan). When there is a caplin quote, I believe, of 30,000 metric tons in certain sections of this Province, I would like to ask the minister why he and his department have not made any representation to Ottawa to impose like quotas in Southern Newfoundland? I might add that I assume you are aware, Mr. Minister, that there is no quota there and seiners and other boats, large and small, are greatly interfering with the inshore fishery.

MR. NEARY: He does not know anything about it, that is the reason.

MR. TULK: Now, why did you not do that?

MR. J. MORGAN: I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the federal minister, who will be in the Province this week, will address that problem on the South Coast of the Province, because he is the man, he and his authorities set the quotas for caplin, set the quotas for cod, set the quotas for herring, set the quotas for squid and on we go; they set the quotas.

But, Mr. Speaker, if we had jurisdiction right now after meeting with fishermen along the Burin Peninsula, after meeting with fishermen in Fortune Bay, meeting with fishermen in Placentia Bay last week, out among the islands in Placentia Bay, if we had the jurisdiction, after listening to and consulting with fishermen, we would not allow any fishing in the area for caplin right now because the caplin stocks have not been heavy in these bays for the last ten years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HOLLETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. D. HOLLETT: To me that is just not acceptable, Mr. Speaker, to say that we do not have jurisdiction. The minister has a right to -

MR. S. NEARY: Make representation.

MR. D. HOLLETT: - make representation with -

MR. S. NEARY: Consultation.

MR. D. HOLLETT: - consultation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. D. HOLLETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the minister makes representation to the best of his ability this morning there was no representation made either to the regional office

MR. D. HOLLETT: or to the Ottawa office concerning this question. And I would like to ask the minister if he would make the representation to see what would happen.

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I, indeed, will make representations. I do it almost on a daily basis.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. WARREN: You have never done it.

MR. TULK: You are always yacking.

MR. J. MORGAN: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, when we make representations to try to protect something or prevent something going around in the fishing industry, what are we doing? We are confronting, so the Opposition says, confrontation all the time, we are separatists or something if we try to fight and protect the fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. BARRY: Good point! Good point!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. MORGAN: We have been making representations for the past number of weeks and they announced last night a reduction on the bounty for fishing vessels to our fishermen. A 10 per cent cut from the fishermen of our Province, a 10 per cent cut in the subsidization of fishing vessels.

MR. D. HOLLETT: What did you do with the subsidies on 15-foot boats?

MR. J. MORGAN: Representations on that
(inaudible).

MR. L. BARRY: You got them now! You got them now!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Hon. minister.

MR. J. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the protection of the Chair.

Mr. Speaker, representation against the reduction of fishing vessel subsidy, representation on the trading away of our squid products, representations on the freeze on the moratorium of CFV numbers for fishermen to have new boats in the Province, and representations on the inshore quota which is going to be a major problem in our Province's inshore fishery. On and on we go. Every second day we are in consultation with officials, representations, letters, telegrams, telexes always on behalf of the fishermen of our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

I would like to welcome to the gallery today on behalf of hon. members a group of Boy Scouts from St. Pius the Tenth who are here along with their leader, Dr. Moore. We welcome them to the gallery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a document entitled, Submission To Senate Committee on National Finance. Yesterday in Ottawa, on behalf of the government, I appeared before the Senate Committee when the subject matter of this submission and matters related thereto were the subject of discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Further reports?

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of more than 200 residents of the West Hills subdivision in my district, who are supporting the efforts of a bunch of children, their own children, of course, from that area, who have written a number of letters to various people requesting that some recreation facilities be provided in that area.

The petition, Mr. Speaker, is one that I certainly whole-heartedly support. It reads, "We, the undersigned, agree with the concerns of the boys and girls of West Hills in trying to obtain a suitable playground for this area. We feel a suitable facility should be provided as soon as possible."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the petition is not one asking for a massive stadium complex, or a recreational complex, it is simply some basic playground facilities, some play areas where these children can pass their idle hours in recreation, preferably with even just a minimal of recreational facilities made available.

The area of course is under the jurisdiction of the St. John's Metropolitan Area Board and I will be immediately making representation to them as I hope others will as well. Certainly I will support this petition and I will be supporting

MR. WINDSOR: any efforts that they can make to have these facilities provided.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the petition, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I support this petition from West Hills, in the district of Mount Pearl, 220 people. Not only the people in West Hills and Mount Pearl area are in need of playgrounds, but playgrounds throughout all this Province. Maybe if the Mount Pearl Arena would have been managed and that we would have a lot more money in Mount Pearl district to look after it, as well as the Trepassey Arena and various other promises made by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order! To the petition.

MR. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker, I do support this petition and I hope that this government would make a policy that all the money that comes in from Loto Canada, the Provincial Loto, and all the other - \$3.5 million - that this would go into recreation over and above what it is. This Party stands for it that we would put this money into general recreation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that a Minister of the Crown has to get up and ask this government for some money for a playground, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), a playground, not a stadium, not anything that is large, and I would say, Mr. Speaker, it only goes to show how financially troubled this Province is in. Ten years ago we were almost going bankrupt with \$750 million, now we got a \$3.5 billion debt, Mr. Speaker.

So in supporting the petition I hope that the people in Mount Pearl, and the younger people throughout this Province, the sooner they wake up and get rid of this

June 16, 1981

Tape No. 3565

NM - 3

MR. HISCOCK: government then we will find out that
we will end up getting more playgrounds and more other facilities
in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from the great district of Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: - to support a recreational facility that comes under the jurisdiction, I believe, of the Metro Board. And that application will be presented to the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Andrews) and to Metro Board and to Municipal Affairs so that in his efforts to get playground facilities for his people these facilities will be as successful as the stadium, for example, that the hon. member got for his district several years ago -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DINN: - which is a recreational facility that I am sure -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - the minister is very, very proud of because it is one of the only recreational facilities -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - in the Province that operates in the black. So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition presented by the minister on behalf of his constituents, some 200 or 250 constituents from the West Hills area. I have travelled through that area, know there is a need for additional playground facilities and I am sure that the minister will be successful in his quest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): This being Wednesday, Private Members' Day, we will be debating Motion No. 8 and the last day the debate was adjourned by the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) who has eleven minutes remaining.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Last week in speaking in this debate, of course I dealt at length with the employment situation in the Province and, of course, many hon. members opposite wondered where all of this increased employment took place in the labour force. Well, Mr. Speaker, I did some research, as is my wont - I am always into the figures and I am always doing research on labour and labour statistics, and, of course, Statistics Canada provides me with quite a few of my statistics - and just for hon. members opposite, just for their understanding of what is going on in the Province, I thought I would outline a few statistics that are available to them but that they apparently do not have the capability of looking up. So, Mr. Speaker, I will just take the month, for example, of January, 1981, and compare that with January, 1980, and look at several areas in the economy to see where this increased employment has taken place.

Mr. Speaker, in January, 1980,

we had

MR. DINN:

156,000 people working in Newfoundland - employed. In January, 1981 we had 171,000. Now, I am sure hon. members opposite have their pens out and they are diligently doing their little bits of math and they will no doubt find out that there is a significant increase in employment in the month of January, 1981 over January, 1980.

MR. HANCOCK: You drove them all out to Alberta, boy.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes is interrupting. He knows that that is unparliamentary, that it is breaking the rules of the House and he knows he should not do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is all right for you to interfere with a judicial body.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for LaPoile is now interrupting. He is also breaking the rules of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile knows that I do not break the rules of the Department of Labour and Manpower because, Mr. Speaker, I read the book on how not to act when you are a minister, I read the Mifflin report.

Mr. Speaker, the increase in employment in 1981 over 1980 showed up, for example, in the manufacturing sector. In the manufacturing sector we had 15,000 in 1980 and in 1981 we had 22,000. The manufacturing sector, of course, covers a lot of areas; it covers food processing, fish processing and so on. So we had plus 7,000 in the manufacturing sector in 1981 over 1980.

MR. DINN: We had increases in other areas, for example, in the financial, insurance and real estate areas. Because, of course, as we all know, there is an increase in home construction, particularly in the St. John's area, but in Newfoundland in general, I guess, as a result of exploration offshore. And as a result of that we had an increase in that area of about 2,000 people. Last year in that area we had 5,000 and this year we had 7,000 so that is an increase of 2,000. We had increases in public administration. I have not completed the research on public administration. That covers, of course, federal and provincial, and possibly there was an increase in employment in the federal area; I do not believe that the employment increased very much in the provincial area as our public servants in this Province are becoming more efficient and, of course, doing the jobs that they were employed to do, and I do not believe there was very much of an increase in the public service or public administration in the provincial area.

Of course, we also in other primary - and that includes, of course, the fishery, the forestry and those areas, the primary sector - we had an increase from 12,000 to 15,000 for an increase of 3,000 in the primary sector, and,

MR. DINN: as I said, Mr. Speaker, that includes our primary industries, our fishery, our forestry, our mining and so on. So that answers, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the questions raised by, I believe, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), who is not here this afternoon but no doubt tomorrow will grasp Hansard and go through it and find out and become aware of the question he asked last week, I am sure he is still interested, and he will become aware of where these increases took place and he will realize from those figures and from the statistics that indeed the economic outlook for Newfoundland in the future looks good and of course in the past several years has improved considerably in that in 1979 over 1978 we had some 9,000 more jobs than we had the previous year and in 1980 we had something like 9,500 more jobs, that is 1980 over 1979 and in 1981, from January to May - that is the latest statistics we have - if we average them out over the five months we are running at a pace of approximately 9,800 which indicates of course that that is higher than last year. And if we continue on this trend, Mr. Speaker, for the remaining months of this year, if that trend continues for the seven months remaining, then it will indicate to hon. members - of course, several things will take place; number one, the employment growth rate in Newfoundland will be better than any province in Canada, as it was last year. Last year Newfoundland's employment growth rate was higher than any province in Canada and that, of course, includes Alberta. We ran at about an increase of approximately 6 per cent, 1980 over 1979, and that was higher than any province in Canada. One would think that Alberta would be higher. I believe Alberta, as a matter of fact,

MR. DINN: was second to us last year and if the present trend continues this year, 1981 of course, we will be able to proudly boast that we led the country again in employment growth rate and of course that augurs well for the future. Now that does not mean that there are not people unemployed. There are hundreds, there are thousands of people in Newfoundland unemployed today and we have to do everything within our power to get these people employed. That means, Mr. Speaker, that our local preference offshore has to play a part and of course -

MR. HANCOCK: You cannot afford local preference.

MR. DINN: The hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) is interrupting in the debate again. He will have an opportunity this afternoon to speak and I know the hon. member will participate in the debate. The local preference to this point in time, as I indicated to hon. members yesterday in debate, we have something like 704 people working offshore right now and, of course, every 2,000 people that we can get into the labour force, become employed into the labour force, it means that our unemployment rate will go down a percentage point. That is approximately how it works out.

MR. HANCOCK: What happens if no more Newfoundlanders can work in Alberta?

MR. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making a point. He generally makes his points not in debate but he breaks the rules of the House and interrupts speakers when they are speaking, but I will answer the hon. gentleman because for his information what is happening is this: The federal government does not like our local preference policy. I think the hon. member agrees

MR. DINN: with that. But, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has local preference in hundreds of areas of Canada. For example, in building the Northern Gas Pipeline, as part of that approval process included in their regulations is local preference. You have to hire people from the North first before you hire people qualified from the South. That is local preference. In building a Michelin plant in Nova Scotia, as I indicated to hon. members opposite, you see, what they are doing is falling into old federal trap - we are not allowed to do it but they are allowed to do it. The federal Liberal government in building a Michelin plant in Windsor, Nova Scotia, they did not only specify Nova Scotians in building that Michelin plant, they provided dollars and on the basis of - they said these dollars are provided on the basis of local preference, you shall hire people from Windsor, Windsor, Nova Scotia.

MR. HANCOCK: They did not go bragging about it.

MR. DINN: They did not go bragging about it, Mr. Speaker? Why do things through the backdoor? The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower in Nova Scotia when I was up there, he said, "How is your local preference policy working out?" And I informed him, of course, what had happened

MR. DINN: during the Winter and of course what happened in '78 and he agreed. He said, 'Look, we basically get no jobs out of the offshore in Nova Scotia, basically get none. We have no control.' And I said, 'Well, do you talk to the oil industry?' And he said, 'Yes.' And I said, 'Well, why do you not bring in the local preference policy?' And he said, 'Because we do not want to be unpopular.' But, I said, 'You have a lot of people unemployed here, what are you going to do about it?' He said, 'Well, I am not going to do anything.' But, he said, 'What I do is; he said; I carry your regulations around in my back pocket and every once in a while when I am talking to these people, I say, 'We are going to bring these in if you do not hire some Nova Scotians.' And it does not work. I mean, it just simply does not work.

Mr. Speaker, the only way to do it is the way we have done it and we are proud of it. The Federal Government does it, they do it in the North, they do it in Nova Scotia, they have done it in Windsor, it is part of the Michelin Contract. 'We will give you X number of million dollars if you will employ people from Windsor.' We are doing it here, we are proud of it. We have 704 jobs now. I predict that it will go over a thousand this Summer when the three new drill rigs come in.

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

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak to this motion presented by the hon. member for Stephenville (F. Stagg). I think it is one of the most craziest, if not ridiculous motions ever to be brought into this House. It has been brought in, Mr. Speaker, by a member on the government side

MR. WARREN: who has one aim, probably the one aim that this government has, Mr. Speaker, to see the breakup of Canada. This is what this government on that side would like to see, the breakup of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to read for the record on Tuesday, June 9th, it was in the Montreal Gazette and I will read it exactly, Mr. Speaker, as it says here.

"Premier Brian Peckford of Newfoundland has passed the bounds of legitimate dissent on the Federal project for constitutional reform. Not content with being merely the fastest mouth in the East on Provincial rights, he has now taken to preaching the code of the outlaw. Even if Prime Minister Trudeau's project for constitutional patriation and a charter of rights becomes law, Mr. Peckford said last week in Calgary, dissenting Provinces should consider ignoring parts of it".

Now, Mr. Speaker, there it is by a Premier of the Province of Newfoundland going up to Calgary and saying, 'Look, even if that becomes law, ignore it.' Mr. Speaker, what do you expect from a premier of this Province? Now, if that is not a separatist move, if that is not a separatist comment by a Premier of a Province, who wants to see Canada broken up, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is, because that is the kind of comment that you will hear anyone talk about if you want to get rid of being part of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to continue, "They could tell Mr. Trudeau, 'We cannot live with this proposal. We will maintain and live under our old constitution' -

MR. HOLLETT: The old constitution.

MR. WARREN: - "under the old constitution. Now it goes on, "This is an outrageous proposition" - this is what the editorial says, "This is an outrageous proposition, especially coming from a provincial Premier whose clear duty is to uphold the law and the rule of law." Now the Premier does not even know that he is the Premier of a Province,

MR. WARREN: apparently. He does not even know that he represents five hundred-odd thousand Newfoundlanders who are proud to be Canadians, Mr. Speaker, and here the Premier gets up in Calgary and more or less says, 'look, we will ignore it if the constitution is in favour of Prime Minister Trudeau's constitutional proposal.'

MR. MOORES: How can a separatist (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, "Mr. Peckford's repellant thesis is that provincial governments may ignore a constitution sanctioned by the Supreme Court, the Canadian Parliament and the British Parliament." The Premier of the Province, Mr. Speaker. Shame, shame, Sir, I am ashamed to be in this House to see a Premier of this Province acting so much anti-Canadian as this man acted in Calgary last week. Mr. Speaker, it is disgusting for a Premier, not only that but to be able to sit in his chair and put a smile across his face such as there is only me saying this sort of thing. But, Mr. Speaker, I could tell the hon. Premier that when he has the intestinal fortitude of going to the people and calling an election, the people of this Province will let the Premier know that we are just as much Canadians and Newfoundlanders together. We are a part of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier should realize that.

MR. G. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what this Premier said again, 'The Premier of Newfoundland, of course, is not the only provincial leader to hold particular views on what it means to be part of this country, but no other Premier has gone as far as to put his Province beyond the reach of the Canadian constitutional law.' Ten Premiers, Mr. Speaker, and this is the only Premier. And not only that, they - listen to the next sentence, Mr. Speaker.

'Not even Premier Levesque, whose party's goal is an independent Quebec, not even Premier Levesque has gone as far as our Premier has gone! Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not a little disgrace from the tiny Premier from the tiny Island of Newfoundland, expecting to be cut off from the rest of Canada and wander away out into the Atlantic. And that is what the Premier wants! That is what the Premier wants! But I will tell the Premier the majority of Newfoundlanders do not want that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will continue on some other comments that was made by the editorial: 'But the opposing provinces, including Newfoundland, until now have acted responsibly, - until now, until June 9th. have acted responsibly'. An editorial giving them credit for this, Mr. Speaker! 'They have raised court challenges to the Trudeau package, opposed it in public campaigns, and are fighting it on the political front. They are perfectly justified in carrying the battle to London, even in petitioning the Queen if they can stand the humiliation. All of that is legitimate dissent!' Mr. Speaker, you know, so far, up until June 9th., it has not been too bad what they have been doing. Now, 'Mr. Peckford's latest buchanneering advice is not. Only he has been witless enough or despotic enough to suggest that the law can be ignored.'

MR. G. WARREN: Now here is a Premier who is more or less saying, 'We can ignore the law! We can ignore the law! I am the Premier of Newfoundland! We do not want RCMP! We do not want Newfoundland Constabulary! We do not want any law in this Province! I will be the lawman! I will have a Crown on my head and I will rule Newfoundland the way I see fit to rule Newfoundland!' That is not the kind of Premier we want in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and that is not the kind of Premier we are going to have in this Province after the next election.

Once the new Constitution has become law every rule and tradition of responsible government, every cannon of democracy requires that citizens, including provincial premiers, live by that law. To counsel otherwise is to be either a fool or a traitor.' Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the Premier, a fool or a traitor? Mr. Speaker, probably he can be both of it.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Both.

MR. G. WARREN: He could be both of it, yes.

So, Mr. Speaker, here as we heard earlier we have a Premier of this Province, and here is what the Montreal Gazette says about our illustrious Premier. I would say it is something that the Premier can go home tonight and be proud of. He can go home tonight and be proud of! Be proud that he is a fighting Newfoundlander!

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree, and so does a lot of other Newfoundlanders agree he is a fighting Newfoundlander. But, Mr. Speaker, he is fighting to separate Newfoundland more than fifteen miles across the Strait. He is trying to get her away from Canada altogether! Mr. Speaker, that is what he is trying to do with Newfoundland.

MR. G. WARREN: And, Mr. Speaker, with this resolution he has allowed one member of his government to bring into this House, with this resolution, Mr. Speaker, he is doing exactly what he is aiming to do, separate Newfoundland from Canada!

Now, Mr. Speaker, the last part of the resolution, 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House endorses the position of the government as set forth in its white paper "Towards the Twenty First Century - Together"; Mr. Speaker, that last word 'together' does not mean a row of beans to the Premier! It does not mean a row of beans to the Premier because he has does not have any togetherness. He does not have anything to talk about togetherness. He wants to keep away from Ottawa as far as he can.

MR. D. HOLLETT: And every labour union and every thing else in the Province.

MR. G. WARREN: And, Mr. Speaker, recently every labour union in this Province - even, in fact, today, Mr. Speaker, Tom Mayo,

MR. WARREN: President of the Newfoundland labour movement asked for the resignation of the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). But the Premier says, 'He does not do any wrong. I call the shots, I am your Premier.' Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of stand that this Premier has taken.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the Premier some advice. It is going right throughout Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, that under the capable leadership of our leader, Mr. Stirling, we are going to win the next election. And there is no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, the word is going out. The last Gallup poll that the Premier himself had done - and I have seen copies of it - has shown that if the Premier now at this present day called an election, he would be sitting over on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: I have seen from the results, Mr. Speaker, poll by poll, that this government is going down. And that is why this Premier, day after day his ministers are coming up with statements to try to get something to hang their hats on, something that they can go to the people with. And that is why the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) is gone. His nomination will not even be saved.

MR. STEWART: No?

MR. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: In Toward the Twenty-First Century-Together, August, 1980, on the first page, the Premier said, 'The people of Newfoundland and Labrador are equally citizens of Canada and of this Province.' Mr. Speaker, those are the truest words that were ever written or ever spoken, but, Mr. Speaker, what is

MR. WARREN: the point of fighting words that you cannot put in action? Because this Premier cannot put these words in action, Mr. Speaker.

'As loyal and proud Canadians, we also have a deep attachment to our country as a people, and to its institutions.' Mr. Speaker, I for one, always consider myself as a Newfoundlander but I am equally proud to be a Canadian, and that is more than can be said for the Premier and his government of the present day.

There are eight Premiers, Mr. Speaker, who oppose the Constitution. There was a Gallup poll done, Mr. Speaker, with 2,500 people surveyed from Newfoundland to British Columbia and the basic question was asked, Do you favour the federal position regarding the Constitution? The Gallup poll, Mr. Speaker, says 73 per cent were in favour of the federal government's position towards the Constitution.

MR. WHITE: Repeat that again.

MR. WARREN: Seventy-three per cent, Mr. Speaker, were in favour of the federal government's attitude towards the Constitution. Now, this included, Mr. Speaker, eight provinces where eight Premiers are against. So, Mr. Speaker, we can see once and for all that the Premier of this Province does not speak for his people. We have a Gallup poll that shows he does not speak for his people, and again I challenge him to go to the people, go anytime during the middle of the Summer. Stop your holidays; do not go down South or wherever you go on your holidays. Stop your holidays and let us go to the people. I would say the people would enjoy an August election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on Page 4, the Premier says, 'The Newfoundland Government firmly believes in a federation where both the federal and provincial governments are strong and viable.'

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, what a crock of beans! What a story from the Premier, because he does not even believe that, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is just putting it in to let the news media have the feeling that 'Look, I am fighting for Newfoundland.' But, Mr. Speaker, then let him go to Calgary and he says, 'Look, law or no law, we are going to fight when the Supreme Court brings down the ruling' - which, by the way, is going to be done in favour of the federal government - 'regardless, when they bring it down we are going to fight against it. Law or no law we are going to fight against it.' And like the editorial said, Mr. Speaker, he has to be either a fool or a traitor, and I would submit that he is both, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. member will have to withdraw that word 'traitor'.

MR. WARREN: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw in the best interests of the House. But, I am sure he may not be a fool or a traitor, but the actions indicate he is not a very good Newfoundlander either, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on page 16 of this report it gives another example of how this Premier is tied up, is so confident - in fact, today, Mr. Speaker, the Premier got up and introduced his Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to answer a question. Now he must be quite proud of the Minister of Fisheries because on page 16 he is talking about the fisheries and he says, 'Each coastal province should have paramount authority regarding harvesting plans, the allocation of a shared fish stock, the licencing of their own fishing boats'. Now, the licencing of their own fishing boats, yes, Mr. Speaker, that is a good thing for the Department of Fisheries to have. I would venture to say that if that were the case the Minister of Fisheries would do the same thing he did in the Bellevue by-election, he would go out and he would have his two rear end pockets filled, he would have his two vest pockets filled, he would have every pocket on him filled with licences to give out to whoever wanted them. They could be teachers, they could be nurses, they could be doctors, whoever wanted a licence would have a licence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland people do not want that, the fishermen do not want that. Mr. Speaker, this is what the Premier is saying, 'Look, give the Minister of Fisheries a pocket full of licences and let him do what he wants to do with them.' God help the fisheries of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: He has already destroyed the fishery, and I am sure if he had any more control it would be doomed.

MR. TULK: Hear, hear! Doomed!

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) at the present time has too much authority with the fishermen. He has too much authority.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries was concerned about the fishery, he would not have said about three months ago, or a month and a half ago, that there would be fishermen along the Labrador coast who could qualify to get loans through the Loan Board for out-board motors, he would have brought in that policy before the fishing season started. Now is the time. If he is going to bring in that policy, do not wait until the Fall to bring it in. People in Labrador do not fish after October month, Mr. Speaker, because at that time, in the area in which they live, there is ice and snow.

Mr. Speaker, on page 9 the Premier again says in this fantastic paper, 'Citizens throughout Canada traditionally enjoy the excercises of democratic rights and fundamental freedoms'. Now just listening to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) about fifteen minutes ago, those democratic rights and fundamental freedoms are gone. 'Newfoundlanders, you up there, do not come back, you cannot get jobs in Newfoundland'. This is the attitude of this government, 'You are away, stay away'. Just imagine what would happen if every province, Alberta, Ontario, Manitoba, Nova Scotia were to say, 'Okay, Newfies, boy, you go back home now, you are taking jobs away from our people'? What would the Minister of Labour and Manpower do?

MR. WARREN: He would get up in this House tomorrow and give a Ministerial Statement saying, 'The unemployment rate in Newfoundland now is approximately 59 per cent.' He would not say 10 per cent, or 12 per cent, or 14 per cent, he would say 59 per cent. Why? Because Alberta and Nova Scotia and Ontario have sent all the Newfies back home because they had no jobs. 'Here they are, boy, they sent them back home to go on welfare.' Now, that is what the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) wants, he wants to make those kinds of statements. By the policies of this government those are the kinds of statements he is going to make if they do not change their plan on Newfoundlanders first.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that a Newfoundlander should be first, but then, again, if he does not qualify, and there are no programmes available whereby he can become qualified, then the job should go to other Canadians.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know I only have one minute left, and I know I am making a fantastic speech -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: - and I am sure that this government and the Premier should be convinced by now that he definitely should go to the people and call an election. If the Premier does not believe in the Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier does not believe in the Supreme Court of Canada, - if the Premier does not believe that,

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, he cannot believe that he is the Premier of this Province because every man, woman and child in this Province, except the Premier, believes the Supreme Court. And, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier believed the Supreme Court, the least thing they can do, when this constitution is passed in favour of bringing home the constitution, Mr. Speaker, the Premier will not say that he is ignored.

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

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking on this private member's resolution brought forward by my colleague, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), who unfortunately today is not in the House of Assembly, we have to commend him for putting forward this resolution because if I recall last week when I was speaking in a different debate, I mentioned then that this whole matter is indeed of the utmost importance to our Province. And it is important that the people understand how important it is. I imagine soon we will be hearing a decision from the federal courts, the Supreme Court of Canada, as to what their views are, or decisions are, on the matter of having it dealt with by the British House of Commons, or the British Parliament. And I was on the verge of saying a couple of days ago that I was going to express an opinion that I do not think it matters too much what that decision is going to be, or what it will be, that still the damage has been done to our Confederation. The damage has been done and is being done by the kind of attitude of the present national government which is in power, the kind of attitude they have toward the regions of our Country, and toward the provinces in particular.

MR. MORGAN: Now the hon. gentleman who has been speaking in the Opposition, obviously does not understand, and had no reason to find out, or did not want to find out, what we were saying as it pertains to the jurisdiction and the constitutional change as it pertains to the fisheries.

My colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) will, I am sure, be involved in debate. I will not talk too much about the offshore jurisdiction, I want to talk about fisheries because I am responsible for that sector right now in the Premier's Cabinet and this administration. And it is obvious that the party in the Opposition either do not want to understand, have made no attempt to understand, what we have been asking for, what we are asking for now. We have never asked for, never did in the past, never will in the future, ask for total jurisdiction over the fishing industry. We never did in the past and we are not now.

All we are asking Ottawa to do is to share with us the almost total control they now have over our most important industry. And can you imagine the Province of Ontario today if that province had a motor car manufacturing industry that was controlled strictly and totally by Ottawa? Can you imagine the reaction in Ontario if its most important industry was dominated, controlled, regulated, managed, by a national government? I cannot image - yes, indeed I can imagine the reaction from Ontario of that was the case. In our case there is no question that the fishery is the most important industry. It provides most employment, it returns most to the economy, and is of major significance in all areas of the Province, including St. John's area, the urban centres, but more importantly of course the rural areas. But it is controlled, and managed and regulated by Ottawa. We have little or no say in the management of the most important aspects of the fishery. And I indeed was somewhat astounded when I saw a few

MR. MORGAN: months ago on TV the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Stirling, who is not in his seat today, the member for Bonavista North, and he was trying to get at me by criticizing me and he said, "The fisheries are in a mess. The fish quotas are in a mess. The fish licencing is in a mess." Of course, I did not think he was criticizing Mr. LaBlanc. I did not think he was. I did not think he was going to do that as a leader of a party the same stripe here in the Province. He was trying to criticize me and clearly indicating he was not understanding as to who had jurisdiction for what in the fishery.

MR. MORGAN: But the fact is that all we are asking for under the constitutional change today is what Quebec has had since 1922. In 1922 the national federal government delegated, in other words gave authority by delegation to the Party in power in the Province of Quebec the kind of jurisdiction that we are asking for now - the right to be able to manage the affairs of an industry, a sector of an industry, which is of a local, provincial nature. We do not want to get involved in negotiations with the foreign nations, we do not want to get involved in setting international quotas, we do not want to get involved in setting total allowable catches for all of Canada. We do not want to get involved in these things. We do not want to get involved in the surveillance of the 200 mile limit. We do not want any of these things, that is the national level. But when it gets down to setting a quota in a Bonavista Bay or in a Conception Bay or a Trinity Bay or a Placentia Bay, a local little bay in Newfoundland, when it gets down to setting these quotas, when it gets involved to a man in Fogo who cannot get a fishing licence for his fishing vessel and he cannot go fishing this Summer because of the fact he cannot get that little licence to put on the side of his boat, a little plate, he cannot go fishing, that is the kind of thing that we think could be best managed by the local government irrespective of stripe, by the local government, the provincial government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: And that is the reason why just recently, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition can play all the games they would like but the fact is, and the facts are there for anybody to see and can be tabled in the House if necessary - that a questionnaire was sent out to 14,000 bona fide, genuine fishermen, not one of them was a part time licenced fisherman, not one of them was part time fishing, they were all full time fishermen, and we decided to send out and try to get

MR. MORGAN: the views of the fishermen. We said, what are their views? Let us find out what their views are about this overall issue of jurisdiction and management of the fisheries as it pertains to the local issues. Let us find out from them. And there was not any intention, just merely to find out what the views of the fishermen are. That questionnaire came back from all over the Province in most cases with the fishermen's names already on that questionnaire who are not afraid. Out of the total number that came back, Mr. Speaker, from all these genuine bona fide fishermen -

MR. TULK: How many came back?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - 95 per cent of these fishermen, 95 per cent of the number that came back, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: How many came back?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, please ask the member for Fogo -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: He does not defend the fishery; people from Fogo call me every second week saying, 'Look, we ignore our member, he does not understand our problems'. And we understand from them he is afraid to go to Ottawa to complain about them. That is the complaint from the fishermen of Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: If I could be heard, Mr. Speaker, if I could be heard in silence, please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that questionnaire came back with fishermen's names from all over the Province, all around the Province. And when you do a poll, like a national poll or any other poll, it is the percentage

MR. MORGAN: of that return that comes back is the key factor. And, Mr. Speaker, 95 per cent of the fishermen of our Province clearly pointed out to the Premier of this Province, clearly pointed out to the Newfoundland government that we are not in favour of the present way in which the federal government is managing our fishery. We are in favour, Mr. Speaker - this is the fishermen speaking - we are in favour of the Newfoundland government having jurisdiction over the issues of a local nature, the issues that affect us so that we can go into St. John's and resolve them - we cannot get a fishing licence or we cannot get a licence for our boat or we are upset with the way the quotas are set for the herring stocks, we are upset with the quota being set for the cod stocks in the inshore water. And these are the kind of things that we are talking about doing, the kind of things we want to do with the jurisdiction we are asking for, the same kind, as I mentioned the jurisdiction now given to the Province of Quebec since 1922. And that is all we are asking for. But yet the Opposition party had to, in the last number of months, try to twist it around and say, "The Province wants total, full control over the fishing industry." We never did ask for that, we never will ask for that. We are merely asking for to the federal level of government, which as I mentioned earlier has total jurisdiction now, to share part of that jurisdiction with us, the government here.

And with regard to setting of quotas, once a total allowable catch is set, then if there is going to be a disagreement among regions or sections of a region, like, for example Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, and we have had some disagreements in the past over the harvesting of a stock off the Coast of Newfoundland, the Northern cod stocks; if that came to a point of disagreement then we could call upon the federal government to take some kind of decision,

MR. MORGAN: a decision to arbitrate the situation then that would resolve any possible differences between two provinces. These are the kinds of things we asked for under the constitution and when these fishermen spoke to us in the questionnaire, they clearly told us that they want a change in the present situation. And it is not good enough for the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Romeo LeBlanc) to sit side by side with the Prime Minister of the country and to say, "Well, I have not heard from anybody in Newfoundland who wants the Province to have jurisdiction. I have not heard from anybody in Newfoundland who wants the government to have provincial jurisdiction." Mr. Speaker, that is a very, very poor argument. The fact is, Mr. LeBlanc and his colleagues in Ottawa, and his senior advisors, do they have to answer telephone calls weekends, up until two o'clock in the morning? My home number - I am not complaining. I listen to all the fishermen who call me - my number is listed. Everybody who wants to find me can find me at home. I get calls night and day. Every evening at home, weekends in particular. And Sundays is a prime day because fishermen are not fishing. And if Mr. LeBlanc could only get these kinds of calls from people who are totally frustrated, totally confused because, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: How do you know he does not?

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman should never have asked that question. Because I have examples of Committees on Fogo Island who cannot even get a reply from Mr. LeBlanc, let alone individual fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I have a Rural Development Association up on the Great Northern Peninsula which has been trying for two months. And they called me two days ago and said, "I hear he is coming to the Western part of the Province." I said, "I hear he is coming over and I hope he deals with your problem." In fact, he has three major problems to deal with in the Western part of Newfoundland and I sincerely hope that he will take his responsibilities seriously and he will deal with these three major problems. Maybe that is the reason why the MP has got him over there, Mr. Tobin. Maybe it is the reason why Mr. Rompkey is going to be travelling with him, that they understand these problems and they are going to try and resolve them. Now what are the problems? Oh, there are three, three major problems.

First of all there is the problem down in the Southwestern coast of the Province with 250 drift net fishermen who cannot fish for salmon and these people want to receive compensation. They received compensation last year and suddenly the federal government cuts them of, compensation for being refused the right to fish for salmon on the Southwestern coast. Then there is the problem up in the Strait of Belle Isle where the federal licensing system has created one heck of a mess, one heck of a mess, where they have issued x number of auto trawl licenses for the larger lineliners and left the other larger boats without these auto trawl licenses. The boats out here doing the dragging or the trawling with auto trawl licenses are getting all the fish, and the other fellows are here with no licenses. And I would say Mr. LeBlanc is going to have to go down and announce, hopefully, x number of licenses for those fishermen who need them.

MR. MORGAN: But over and above that he is going to have to resolve a problem on the Southern coast of Labrador. When the hon. gentleman is standing in the House in different debates, he never mentions these kinds of problems. I have heard Labrador mentioned a number of times. There is a problem in the L'Anse-a-Loup, L'Anse-au-Clair area of Labrador right now where there are twenty fishermen who do nothing else but fish, have no other means of a livelihood, have no way of earning a dollar and they cannot go fishing. And the reason why they cannot go fishing? Not because they have not got a license, they have a license in their back pockets, but they cannot get that little license plate to go on the side of their boat and the fisheries officers have told them, the federal officers, if you go out fishing without that license on your boat, your boat will be confiscated. They have been told that, twenty of them right now - to be exact, twenty-one as of yesterday afternoon. That problem, I sincerely hope, he will resolve and give these fishermen the right that they should have, the right to fish to earn a living, and to give them the licenses for their boats.

Then there is the major problem which has not been mentioned by the member for that area up in LaPoile - up on the St. Barbe coast where we have a fish plant partially constructed for the past three years, where H.B. Nickerson's are going to spend millions of dollars - and the hon. gentleman from the area, I mentioned it to him outside the House last week. I said, "Why is it that you have not mentioned that problem?" "Oh," he said, "that is federal. That is federal. I do not want to mention that in the House."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

June 17, 1981

Tape No. 2575

ah-4

MR. MORGAN: Now, that is a quote. That is the kind of thing, you see, that is going on, Mr. Speaker. That is insincere representation on behalf of the people they represent.

MR. HISCOCK: You are getting pretty low now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the truth is that if you are going to be a genuine, concerned representative -

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: of the people who elected you to the House of Assembly, elected you to be their member, to represent them on behalf of their problems and their concerns, you have to be genuine. You have to take all concerns whether it be a federal problem or a provincial problem. You have to deal with them in a genuine, sincere way. And there is no point in coming in and trying to play politics and attack us across the House, when you have a major problem left which is under their good friends in Ottawa who refuse to take some action.

And there is a third problem and that is a problem he is going to have to address. He is going to have to explain to the residents of the St. Barbe coast why a multi-million dollar fish plant, partially constructed, is left there in that state. Why it is left in that state. And, of course, we know the answer. He is going to have to explain why it is Federal Fisheries and Oceans is refusing to support the application to the DREE department asking for financial assistance in the construction of that plant. And that is an example of, where I found a few days ago - someone mentioned they could call Mr. LeBlanc and talk to him at home. Well, the development association in that area - and this is in correspondence wired to me by telex a few days ago, they sent me a copy of the telex they sent to the federal minister as long as two and a half months ago, no reply. They phoned him a number of times. They have asked Mr. Tobin, their MP, to get a hold of him a number of times. This is an association, a development association. So I said to them just recently,

MR. MORGAN: 'Well, you have a major problem, you understand whose jurisdiction is preventing it from being resolved, when the man responsible arrives in the Province, take it to him and hopefully he will resolve it'.

Now, I can understand why - since I started off these remarks - the federal minister is going to be on the Western side of our Province the next two days. I sincerely hope he is going in to resolve these three major problems that exist under his jurisdiction, under his responsibility. Now, -

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) development association.

MR. MORGAN: Pardon?

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: The Development Association is in the member for St. Barbe's (Mr. Bennett) district.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Irrespective of who is present, Mr. Speaker, it is a properly elected Development Association working on behalf of the people.

MR. WARREN: How about your (inaudible) in Bonavista?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I have covered most of the points but - in regards to the constitution I am sure I have not, because they are numerous. But I will say that in this debate what we are asking for is that the House of Assembly endorse the Newfoundland Government's position towards the - which is clearly outlined in this document called Towards the Twenty-First Century. And that clearly outlines our position. And I am sure if the hon. gentleman from Carbonear (Mr. Moores), the hon. gentleman from Burin (Mr. Hollett), the hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), who represent fishermen, if they look carefully and read carefully what we are saying about the jurisdiction and the shared jurisdiction that we are asking for with respect to the fishing

MR. MORGAN: industry, they would not say it is unreasonable. It is being very reasonable. That is all we are asking for, a reasonable position, that no longer should we have a situation when our most important industry that affects thousands of Newfoundlanders, be totally controlled and totally managed by a government, so far removed from the scene, sitting up in Ottawa. That is all we are asking for.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MOORES: To be as relevant as I can to the motion, the resolution before the House, Mr. Speaker, the constitutional issue in Canada is a dead issue. We asked the Premier of this Province a year, almost a year and a half ago if he would have in this House a debate on constitutional matters confronting Canada and the Province of Newfoundland, And at that time he shrugged off the question as he normally does. He avoided it and over a period of time, approximately a year and a half, we have seen this very important issue in Canadian history go past this House. In fact, it has been deliberately re-routed, past the legislature of Newfoundland and brought in now, two weeks before the Supreme Court of Canada is about to pass down its judgement as to whether the constitutional changes are legitimate or not.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is indicative of the way the government of this Province have handled just about every major issue

MR. MOORES: that has come up in the last couple of years. And not only that, not only have they handled them as irresponsibly as this, but they are getting away with it, Mr. Speaker, getting away with it and not being held accountable for it. What is the point now for any member, including the Minister of Fisheries, to get up in this House and talk about constitutions and constitutional changes when they are irrelevant, when the issue is long gone, when the issue is dead and when it is of no consequence or importance to the people of this Province?

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: That, in itself, Mr. Speaker, that concept, that attitude of dealing with major issues such as this, of by-passing the Legislature, of by-passing this formal forum for debate and discussion, is in effect the substantive cause of this government continuing to have confrontation with this Opposition and confrontation with provinces, groups and individuals in this nation. They do not want to face problems, they would rather either avoid them, ignore them or confront in a roundabout way. And that is what we are seeing in this issue and that is what we are going to continue to see.

I will give you two very important local examples, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) tabled in this House of Assembly the list of roads projects and then scurried out, took off like some yellow bandanna and did not have the intestinal fortitude to face the Opposition in this House and account for his decisions.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs, (Mrs. Newhook) just a few days ago, tabled her list of projects for capital grants for municipalities and then took off out the door and we did not see her until

MR. MOORES: two days later. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the crux of the problem. When the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) rises in this House and talks about the differences of opinion and procedure and the way the fishery in this Province is being handled and the confrontation that exists between Ottawa and Newfoundland, then he is talking about a situation that has been created by the Province itself, by the attitude of its Premier, an attitude that has now permeated the entire Cabinet and the entire government. They do not want to sit down and discuss sensibly the problems facing this Province and this nation, they want to either ignore it altogether or ignore it by creating red herrings of confrontation. And that is not going to do the Province of Newfoundland or its people any good. And it is going to continue.

The President of the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union, in an interview with CBC just a month or so ago, stated categorically and unequivocally that he felt that the federal government under Romeo LeBlanc is managing the fishery in this Province as well as it can be managed. He also referred to the management of the Northern cod stock, and 'If,' he said, 'the management of the Northern cod stock were the only issue in this Province,' he would be happy. And he went on to say that he was happy with the federal government quota system for the Northern cod. And he said the problem lies with the Minister of Fisheries in this Province. And I quote Cashin as saying, 'Foolish and stupid' -

MR. WARREN: Yes, exactly.

MR. MOORES: 'Foolish and stupid' are the arguments of the Minister of Fisheries in this Province. Now, what a contradictory recommendation to that of the Premier!

MR. MOORES:

The Premier of this Province gets up and says that the Minister of Fisheries, the present one (Mr. Morgan) is the best Minister of Fisheries we have ever had in this Province, and the President of the largest fish union in this Province, the only fish union in this Province, the only union related to fishing activities that means anything in this Province, says that the man is foolish and stupid and does not know what he is talking about. Now, how can the Premier,

MR. MOORES: who is responsible in total - in sum total the Premier is responsible for our greatest resource other than our human resource, the fishery - how can he reconcile these two contradictory statements? I will tell you how he can reconcile them, confrontation. As long as he confronts any and everything, then that is fine. It does not matter whether he can reconcile them, it does not matter whether he can see any justification, any logic, any substance, any seriousness in it, as long as he confronts an issue, as long as he confronts a statement, as long as he confronts a set of circumstances, that is what matters. And that is how that government is being run right now.

We saw it when the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) made her statement just a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, in the capital grants in this Province, and it only took me about fifteen minutes to mathematically, arithmetically calculate just what any person can interpret from this list of capital projects and fundings for the municipalities in this Province. Fifteen minutes it took me, fifteen minutes to establish that every community in this Province was being treated equally, that every community in this Province and every district in this Province was being treated fair and judiciously, fifteen minutes to tabulate that every voter in this Province, regardless of their political persuasion was being treated equally. A very equal government we have, a government concerned with equity and equality. That is what we have and they showed it, Mr. Speaker, with their real round of British fair play. No question about it, they showed it with British fair play when the Minister of Municipal Affairs announced the capital fundings for this Province. No doubt about it, fair, good, honest, clean

MR. MOORES: government, a government established on the principles of democracy, principles of democracy that override party politics, and petty politics, a principle that says that no matter how a person votes he is to be treated fair and equitably. That is why 73 per cent of the communities - 73 versus 27, that is fair and equal. That is fifty/fifty.

MR. HODDER: That is equality.

MR. MOORES: Seventy-three per cent versus 27 per cent were communities in PC districts, districts represented in this House by members of the government side. And then 90 per cent of the funding - 90/10, that is fifty/fifty. That is equality, 90/10 - 90 per cent of the funding went to communities represented by government members in this House including a heartbreaking \$1 million for road work in St. John's. Man, that took the wind right out of me - \$1 million for the City of St. John's where they have so many dirt roads, and so much dust choking the people in here.

MR. HOLLETT: And \$650,000 to Mount Pearl.

MR. MOORES: I read an editorial in The Evening Telegram a few weeks ago and the editorial dealt with potholes in the City of St. John's and how manholes, where the men were working, the manholes were being worked around and were left jutting up over the pavement about two or three inches. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was aghast. I fell back into the chair where I was reading the paper and I said, 'My dear Lord, not potholes in St. John's, they would not dare.' And as a result, of course, we now see \$1 million going to the City of St. John's to straighten out the potholes, to straighten out the manholes that are sticking up over the pavement. We are giving \$1 million to St. John's to be fair and equitable now, to be fair and equitable, British fair play. There are 100,000 people in

MR. MOORES: this city - \$1 million.

MR. TULK: Give according to need.

MR. MOORES: Give according to need. All these potholes and dirt roads, and clotheslines being covered with dust, and people cannot open their windows. Oh, my lord, we got \$1 million for

MR. R. MOORES:

100,000 people, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) should be ashamed of herself to give only \$1 million to the city of St. John's for 100,000 people! Hang your head in shame!

MR. HOLLETT:

And they had a surplus last year.

MR. R. MOORES:

Yes, hang your head in shame,

Mr. Speaker!

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about equality in Canada, how Newfoundland should be considered equal, as an equal partner of Confederation. Then let us take that one step and relegate it to equality within this Province. How can the Premier of Newfoundland espouse with quasi-profundity the need for equality in this country -

MR. TULK:

. Beautiful! Beautiful!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

- while at the same time, Mr.

Speaker, relegating the principles of equality on a provincial level, to that you would not see in Uganda I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, Constitutions - if I have ever seen a pseudo intellectual in my life, then it is the Premier of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES:

- a man with no more substance,

no more substantially based knowledge - when I see the Premier of this Province go up to Ottawa somewhere and try to - no wonder he confronts with Pierre Trudeau, no wonder he has to confront the Prime Minister of this country, the two are so far apart intellectually that that is the only thing the man can do. That is the only thing the Premier of this Province can do. You cannot talk above your intellect. You cannot talk, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CARTER:

What are you talking about?

MR. R. MOORES: The member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) at least is not to the point where he self-deludes himself, where the self-delusion is such that I think that I could go and discuss with Pierre Trudeau on the same intellectual level.

MR. D. HOLLETT: You could, I would say.

MR. R. MOORES: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I would be stepping somewhat out of the bounds of my meager abilities. But the Premier of this Province not only suspects that he is equal as a citizen, but he suspects that he is equal intellectually. Therefore, when the Prime Minister of this country gets poisoned with the man for being so stupid and childless and so totally irrelevant to the issues that confront this country, then he can only ignore the Premier of Newfoundland. I mean, what else would you expect? When I meet a drunken man in a bar, for instance, in Carbonear and he starts talking to me about roads and pavement, I just ignore the man because he is drunk and the man is not responsible for his actions! Well, the Premier of this Province, intellectually speaking, is a drunken man! Intellectually speaking, in comparison to the Prime Minister of this country, the Premier of this Province is no more than a drunken man. And that in itself causes the confrontation.

I will give you another example, Mr. Speaker, one more example of how this Premier tends to relegate two levels of philosophical, principled thinking. You cannot take, for instance, local preference policy for hiring of workers - you can, of course, you can. If you are so pseudo intellectual as to think you can, you can do anything, stupid or otherwise! But you cannot relegate an issue such as local preference hiring to the much greater principle of the mobility of a nation's citizens.

June 17th., 1981

Tape No. 2579

DW - 3

MR. R. MOORES: The mobility of a nation's citizens, the right for me to go and work anywhere in this nation, is an issue of such paramount and fundamental importance to the vitality, to the operation of this nation that you cannot be so parochial as to relegate it to a local preference policy in hiring.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. MOORES: And I say to you now, 'Let there be no mistake, no mistake at all that I was born a Canadian,

MR. MOORES: and if it came to where I have to choose between this Province and Canada, then I will choose Canada every time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Right on.

MR. MOORES: Now, there are those -

MR. HISCOCK: It is also mine. It is also mine.

MR. HOLLETT: If you had to make a choice.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. TULK: But you do not have to make a choice. You do not have to make a choice.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MOORES: This may not, of course - and I never intended it to be anything other than a personal statement of my feelings. I am sure there are members on the government side of this House -

MR. LUSH: It is like putting himself before God.

MR. HANCOCK: They have to get the Premier to make up their minds. They have to get permission to speak over there. We have independent minds over here.

MR. MOORES: - and there are members on this side of the House, on the Opposition side of the House, who would not agree with that. I mean, for instance, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Hollett), the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) were not born Canadians.

AN HON. MEMBER: I was. I was.

MR. MOORES: You are not here, you just left - sorry. They were not born Canadians they were born Newfoundlanders and then became, by naturalization, Canadians as a result of Confederation. That is not true, however, of the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores), I was born a Canadian. And if it comes for a decision between the futile, feeble, foolishness of a man who is separatist to the very core, a man who wants to take this Province out of Confederation -

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: - at some point -

MR. HANCOCK: Two Canadians. I am going with Canada.

MR. MOORES: - at some point in the future - and if the few independent members on the government side had any sense, they would put a stop to it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: But if we allow - this Premier wants to take this Province at some time - if he is allowed to continue as Premier by the people of this Province, he wants to take it out of Confederation at some time. He wants that, I know he wants it, and he knows he wants it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: Occasionally he has the sub-conscious slips, Mr. Speaker, where he lets it out and then tries to cover it up. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I have spent the last twenty minutes or so speaking on an issue - trying to avoid speaking on an issue that is dead, the constitutional issue. And for the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who has not been in this House

MR. MOORES:

for the last forty-five days, except for one day, has not been in this House for forty-five days, had the gall to come in here last week and introduce this spurious, irrelevant resolution as a private member. I would say not only should the member for Stephenville be ashamed to introduce a topic where there is a dead issue, but the Premier of this Province should hang his head in shame for allowing this important issue to by-pass this Legislature, the people's forum for debate, and now brought in a year and a half later when it is of no consequence to anyone.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: Away to go 'Rod'.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Oh, we got him up.

MR. MOORES: We are going to hear the hon. Curly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: You are getting a little thin on top are you not?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is really unfortunate, you know, that we have these statements coming from the Opposition, and I guess we have a clear statement of where the Opposition stands on not just the constitutional debate but on resource development, on all federal/provincial issues. And I guess, you know, we have the message that is coming from the other side in this debate, a clear expression of their philosophy, and that is Canada first, before Newfoundland.

MR. POWER: That is right.

MR. BARRY: Now, that is the premise where the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) and the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) start. That is where they start, Mr. Speaker, Canada first. And it does not matter how much they have to grovel, it does not matter how much they have to surrender in terms of provincial resources, it does not matter how much they have to give up every time Prime Minister Trudeau comes down and pats their Leader on the head and tells him to sit down and be a good boy but he is not going to get his offshore mineral rights. The federal government is going to take those away, it does not matter, Mr. Speaker, it does not matter how much Mr. Trudeau takes them and shoves their nose in it, it does not matter because, Mr. Speaker, they start with the premise they accept Mr. Trudeau's position that it is Canada first whenever there is any conflict between the national interest and the provincial interest. Whenever there is any conflict at all, Mr. Speaker the national interest totally blanks out the right of Newfoundlanders to get up and fight for their God-given birthright.

MR. POWER: They cannot do it, that is right,

MR. BARRY: All the Prime Minister has to do is stand up and say, 'I am the Prime Minister of this country, I speak for the whole country, me, me, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: 'and, Mr. Speaker, 'it is blasphemy to say anything against what I say is good for the country'. That is all he has to do, get up and say that-and the member

MR. BARRY: for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock)
is applauding -

MR. HOUSE: Be quiet. The dumb shall speak
and not be heard.

MR. BARRY: - he is agreeing. And at least he
has the courage, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Carbonear (Mr.
Moore), at least they have the courage to clearly come out
and express the policy of their colleagues who they sit with.
Their entire caucus, Mr. Speaker, has shown time after time
in debate on every issue of federal/provincial relations,
that that is their position - Canada first - and as soon
as the Prime Minister of Canada raises the question of
national interest and says, 'Hey, hold it, I speak for all
of Canada and I think that this policy is good', they shut up
like good little boys, they shut up, quite. They say, 'Yes,
Sir, no, Sir, three bags full, Sir', and sit down and that
is the end of any debate or discussion, that is the end
of any fight from them on the other side for provincial
interests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the corollary
to Barry's theorem is that when you are getting to them, when
you are getting to the nerve -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that
members on the other side do not want to hear the Minister
of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). There is no quorum in the
House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: There is a quorum in the House,
can you not count?

MR. BARRY: Do your count. Do your count,
my colleagues are in rapt attention.

MR. MORGAN: There is a quorum in the House,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please!

We have a quorum.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

We have a quorum, Mr. Speaker. My colleagues are in rapt attention everytime I get up to speak-

MR. MORGAN:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

-on every word. Mr. Speaker, it always amazes me that they get up and say there is no quorum as they leave the House. They walk out to create no quorum, to interrupt the business of the people's House. When we have all of this important legislation before the House, the Opposition are playing these childish, silly, foolish games.

MR. MORGAN:

There is only one member who will not play that game, he is in the House.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, and he is to be commended. He is to be commended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

There is one member with responsibility, who agrees that the people's House should remain open to do the people's business and should not be interrupted periodically by these childish, foolish, silly games that - What do they call him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, they cannot (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Do they call him a leader over there or - but anyhow, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the point I was making, we have had an honest, articulate, clear, emphatic statement of Liberal policy that whenever there was any conflict between the interests of Newfoundland and the interests, I suppose, of any other part of Canada - that must be what they are saying, because we are part of Canada in Newfoundland. So whenever there is a conflict between the interests of this Province and the interests, say, of central Canada, Ontario and Quebec

MR. BARRY: or even, I suppose, a conflict, although there rarely is, between Newfoundland and the interests of the Western provinces, Newfoundland has to take last place. Again I commend the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) for his honesty. I commend the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) for applauding and clearly showing what he agrees with. And I ask every member opposite to get up and clearly - and I believe - sorry I missed the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), he has applauded as well, so he accepts that same position, that Newfoundland and Labrador comes last, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the second policy decision made by their caucus, which is going to see them buried again in the next election, the second decision that they have made, strategic decision is to engage in a red-neck smearing campaign of lashing out this label, 'Separatist'. And whenever, Mr. Speaker, any member in this House has the courage to get up and point out that this little Province of five hundred and eighty-odd thousand people have a few rights down here - we have the right to be treated equally - as soon as one member of this House - and they all happen to be on this side because there is no courage to do that on the other side - as soon as a member of this House gets up to try and fight for Newfoundland's interests, to try and make our points heard, the points that will go to make a better Canada, Mr. Speaker, a better Canada, as soon as that is done we are labelled 'Separatists'. Mr. Speaker, that is a red-neck smear campaign and there is no question about it. And it is going to backlash and the people of this Province are going to know who is there fighting for

MR. BARRY: the interests of the people of this Province and who is just trying to play silly, foolish childish, political games of the grossest partisan type.

Mr. Speaker, there is nobody on this side of the House who is ashamed to say that he is a Newfoundlander and a Canadian and that as a Newfoundlander he has the right, yea, even the duty to stand up and criticize a federal policy which will harm this Province and in so doing will harm the nation as a whole, Mr. Speaker. And this is what we do daily and this is what members opposite criticize us for as being Separatists when we do it. Whenever, Mr. Speaker, there is a criticism of a national policy, often a policy which could lead to the disintegration and destruction of this great country that members opposite are supposed to be supporting and promoting, foolish, silly policies that are put forth

MR. BARRY: that could lead to the disintegration of the nation, when we have the audacity to get up and say we disagree, right away we are labelled as a separatist. Now we will see, Mr. Speaker, how far this particular little tactic is going to get members opposite, we will see. And my bet, Mr. Speaker, is that it is going to see them buried in the next election,

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution we have before us today, which I am happy to support, says: 'WHEREAS the federal government has acted unilaterally to change the Canadian Constitution in spite of opposition from eight provincial governments and contrary to the principle of consensus;' I do not think anybody could deny that. They have admitted they are acting unilaterally, that it is going to change the constitution, there has been opposition from eight provincial governments and, obviously, contrary to the principle of consensus. 'AND WHEREAS the federal government's constitutional proposals threaten the powers of the provinces'. Again the Supreme Court of Canada forced the federal lawyer to concede that, in the process of debate before the courts. They finally had to concede that it would affect the powers of the provinces. Their strategy all along, before that, had been to deny that the powers of the provinces were being affected. But when it came down to the crunch in the Supreme Court of Canada, it had to be conceded that the powers of the provinces would be altered by their proposed constitutional amendments. And in the case of Newfoundland, their proposals would remove existing protection from the sacred rights enshrined in our terms of union.

Again remember, Mr. Speaker, when we started making representation, how the Prime Minister came on, 'Oh, no, there is no impact upon these basic

MR. BARRY: rights such as territorial integrity, such as the rights of denominational education and so forth', all of which are used merely as examples, not to point out that these are the only things that would be affected in the provinces. The initial position of the Prime Minister was, 'No, that would not affect those at all'. They ended up, Mr. Speaker, having to amend their proposal, because when it came down to the crunch we were right and they were wrong and they had to admit it, they were forced to admit it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suspect we can also all remember that the Prime Minister of Canada started off by saying, 'There is absolutely no question about the legality of what I am doing, no question about the legality of what I am doing'. It took a decision of our Newfoundland Court to clearly establish that there were very grave legal doubts about the legality of what he was doing, very serious doubts. And that, Mr. Speaker, as far as we can see, is the only thing that forced the Prime Minister of Canada to have the matter referred to the Supreme Court of Canada. Now, can you imagine what the Prime Minister of this country was doing? Attempting to perpetrate an illegal act which, Mr. Speaker, if he had gotten away with it, that would have been it, it would have been all over. It would be too late then, after the constitution had been patriated by the UK Parliament, it would be too late for anybody to point out, oh, what the Prime Minister had done was illegal. It would be a fait accompli. It would be all over.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it has not yet been decided which way the Supreme Court of Canada will fall on the issue, whether they will conclude that it is legal and constitutional for the Prime Minister to do what he is proposing.

MR. BARRY: And we cannot comment on the particular court case but we can, Mr. Speaker, comment on the process leading up to the case, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Hansard clearly establishes that it was not members opposite who raised the question of whether it was legal for the Prime Minister of Canada to do what he was proposing. And I think Hansard would probably, if my memory serves me correctly, establishes that they supported, that members opposite supported the federal constitutional proposals and decided, despite the finding of our Supreme Court here in this Province, before they had the benefit of legal argument, decided that there was no doubt. I mean, I am not saying that we are right, necessarily, but I am saying that surely, heavens, the people of this Province expect the legislators of the Province to raise to their attention when there is some doubt, when there is some question about the legality of what the federal government is doing. Now, if I understand members opposite correctly, what they are saying is that, no, we are separatists if we dare raise questions such as 'Is what the Prime Minister is proposing legal?' Members opposite have to bend their heads and say, 'Yes, Sir, no, Sir, three bags full, Sir. You have said it and, therefore, it must be legal.' You know, it is like the person who is charged with a crime being hauled into court and the magistrate saying to him, 'Well, obviously, if the police have arrested you must be guilty, you must have done something or they would not have you here'. In the same way, in the same fashion, members opposite, because the Prime Minister of the country says something, because their colleagues in Ottawa in the same party, who, obviously,

MR. BARRY: must run the provincial caucus because they are rudderless - they are without a rudder down here, without a leader, so they have to get direction from somewhere and they have had to fall back upon direction from their federal colleagues, Because of this unhappy and sorry state that the Liberal party of this Province has fallen into, being totally leaderless, rudderless - the leader not even here on one of the most important debates to take place in this House on the constitution. Mr. Speaker -

MR. HOUSE: He is gone to Ottawa for some more advice.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is calling for direction.

MR. BARRY: Yes, he is probably calling Ottawa for direction as to how he should tackle this particular issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we ask the people of this Province who do you want representing you in government, do you want people who are not afraid to raise a question and say to the Prime Minister or any federal Cabinet minister, 'Hey, take a second look at what you are proposing here. It does not seem to be absolutely clear that it is legal.' No, Mr. Speaker, because it was put forth by their leaders in Ottawa, the people who give them directions in Ottawa, they had to meekly, blindly accept it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think that Jim Coutts is talking to Richard Cashin and talking to Ed Roberts too much these days.

MR. BARRY: You figure that is it.

MR. MORGAN: There is a lot to that, there is a lot to that. You are talking about two big men in the Province and not talking about the Leader of the Opposition

June 17, 1981

Tape No. 2584

GS - 3

MR. BARRY:

And, Mr. Speaker, they have to fall back upon quoting editorials. They cannot make up their own minds in this House, they have to fall back on quoting editorials from

MR. BARRY: the newspapers of other provinces, from that
bastion -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Of Newfoundland nationalism.

MR. BARRY: - of Newfoundland nationalism,
The Montreal Gazette.

Mr. Speaker, there are , I think,
points clearly made in our constitutional proposal which
this resolution asks this House to endorse. I missed one
WHEREAS, where we said , 'The federal government's unilateral
actions are divisive and contrary to the concept of federalism -

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - as historically recognized in
Canada.' Now, surely members opposite cannot disagree with that.
when you have eight provincial governments getting up and saying,
'Ah, hold on here, there is something wrong. We do not like this
it is wrong. Bad. Now , Mr. Speaker, surely they have to
admit that it might be a little bit divisive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the position
paper we put forth Towards The Twenty-First Century - Together is
basically a plea for equality. It is a plea for the federal
government to recognize that Canada as a whole will be a better
country if we can maintain a viable provincial government, a
government that will have control of its resources, that will
in turn provide revenue which will in turn permit the Province to
provide services to the people of the Province which is what it
is all about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask
members opposite to be a little more responsible, to be a little
less quick to get up and label people as separatists -

MR. MORGAN: It is terrible.

MR. BARRY: - because we stand and fight
for the interest of our Province, because we stand and fight for

MR. BARRY: the interest of Canada in saying that a strong Newfoundland will help ensure a strong Canada.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear'

MR. MORGAN: A good job, 'Les'.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, in looking at the resolution I regret that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is not here to close the debate, maybe it is because he is ashamed of the resolution itself.

But, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this resolution on the constitution, the court itself will bring down the decision in the future and I am quite proud and pleased to be on the side of one thing, The Charter of Rights for the nation, the one thing, a Charter of Rights for equality for the disabled, for the blind, and for different languages in this country. Also, I am quite proud that we do want to have a strong Canada. And when my colleagues for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) and Carbonear (Mr. Moores) say that they are Canadians - if they ever had to make a decision was the question, that they are Canadian first - there is no question about it, Mr. Speaker.

We really have to go back to 1949, or 1948, and ask why did we as a Province enter into the debate on joining

MR. E. HISCOCK:

the nation of Canada when we were but a nation of Newfoundland and Labrador? Why was it that we wanted to join Canada? I ask the Premier this question. Was it purely economic? Was it because we wanted old age pension, youth allowance, baby bonus, roads, hospitals, schools? Were these the material things that we wanted to raise our standard of living when we had \$50 million or \$40 million in the bank and we had people not necessarily dying of starvation but next to it.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. E. HISCOCK: We had one room schools, we had no hospitals, we had no schools, we had no Trans-Canada, we had nothing. Is that why we joined Confederation?

MR. CALLAN: What is going on (inaudible)?

MR. HISCOCK: And when we did join Confederation, did we not automatically become equal Canadians in this country, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY: No, no.

MR. HISCOCK: Did we not want as our fellow Canadians; want to build up this great country, one of the greatest, richest countries in the world, not only in resources but in intellect, in technology and in showing the way for smaller countries and the third world? Is that not why we wanted to join Canada, to be part of a greater community, not necessarily economic community, that we did not want to be navel gazing, that we did not want to link ourselves, our horizons, our intellect, to this small Island ourselves and Labrador, that we wanted to expand our horizons and go for first-class? Go for first-class, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. CALLAN: Is the Premier supposed to (inaudible)

MR. E. HISCOCK: - to become the top-notch people in the world, not only for this Province. Is that not why we

MR. HISCOCK: joined Canada?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is the answer. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Smallwood went to Ottawa asking for deals -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. E. HISCOCK: - or the former Premier, Mr. Moores want to Ottawa, they did not go on hands and knees as the government would like to think now, they went as equal Canadians. And I speak as an equal Canadian from the point of view that, basically, building up this part of Canada, and building it up - and there is no question that there is not one person in this Province who can say that this government, this country, this part of our country of Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador, has not come a long way in the past thirty years, that we have built up this part of Canada to a great part and we have a long ways to go. We do have the Trans-Labrador Highway to go, that we want the federal government to do. We do want the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls which we want the federal government to do. We want the airstrips on the coast of Labrador which we want the federal government to do. We want most of the things with regard to fisheries. There is no doubt about it that when you ask for unilateral action and recognize the concept of Canada, that is basically - the problem, Mr. Speaker, it is a concept of Canada that the Tory provinces have -

MR. BARRETT: You are the one who is always
(inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: Here we have, Mr. Speaker, one country of Canada with a Liberal government and we have ten provinces in the country, the only time ever it happened in the history, ten provinces within the country that are Tory, separatist by way of PQ or NDP, and is it to be understood that they are going to agree with a Liberal philosophy? Of course not, Mr. Speaker, of course not, Mr. Speaker, and that is the essence of the conflict. The essence of the conflict, Mr. Speaker, is that they want to see each of their own areas become kingdoms in themselves.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the fisheries.

MR. HISCOCK: And I would ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), I ask the Minister of Fisheries, and particularly, probably, the Minister of Health (Mr. House) with regard - would be better -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - and, also, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the Premier (Mr. Peckford). Now this five-year program that is coming up with the federal government with social services, and the federal government has stated because of high inflation and because of the constitutionality of the provinces saying that health is our responsibility, education is our responsibility and social services is our responsibility and, also, wanting the total tax dollar all the way and not giving any tax dollars to the federal government. The federal government is saying that constitutionally, if that is your jurisdiction, you have to pay more and you have to pay more because we, as a country, are going into debt \$11 billion a year.

MR. HISCOCK: And we cannot build a trans-Labrador highway and the air strips and 'x' number of other things if, if, the provinces will not start picking up part of their agreements. And what are we seeing, Mr. Speaker? We are seeing, Mr. Speaker, that we will probably have provinces in this part of the country that will not have the same level of health services, that will not have the same level of education, who will not have the same level of social services. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because each of the provinces see themselves as independent units. And because they see themselves as independent units, they will not give up to the greater good and there are times when the greater good that you have to give up, and that is Canada. There are also times, Mr. Speaker - there is no question about it - that the greater good of Canada for our Province and for other provinces may not necessarily be for the greater good of Canada. And there is nothing wrong with standing up and being counted and fighting for your provincial rights. But, Mr. Speaker, what we see in this country today, we see ten provinces trying to destroy the unity of Canada and trying to get everything for themselves and not realizing - I only asked the question if Mr. Clark was there now as Prime Minister, would we see the confrontation, would we see the confrontation? And I really have to ask that question, Mr. Speaker, yes, we saw the confrontation with the Federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. McGrath, when he was there; so it is the nature of the beast. It is the nature of the provinces to be conflicting and it is the nature of all levels of government, and it is. With regard to being a Canadian, as I said, when we look at it - I believe the Premier ended up saying that we have 2 per cent of the population and technically we should be

MR. HISCOCK:

getting this much money and that much money. But I, as a Canadian own 2 per cent of Air Canada, own 2 per cent of the CNR, own 2 per cent of all the foreign aid that is sent to the third world countries. I own 2 per cent of the CBC and I own 2 per cent of the synchrolift and I own, also, 2 per cent of the defense of our nation and I also own 2 per cent of the coast guard and the National Art Center, as well as the museums in this country. I own-not only because the two national parks are in this Province, I also own 2 per cent of those national parks. So, Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian and as a small population being a Canadian we own it. And as part of our population, 2 per cent we own that. If we ever have - and this was a debate in Quebec, Quebec said we should have economic association and become independent because we can make it on our own - if we ever have to stay in Canada because of economic reasons, Mr. Speaker, so we can get another piece of pavement and we can get another airstrip and so we can get x number of other things from the federal government, if that is why we are part of Canada then maybe the government is right there, that maybe we should not look at this idea of Canada that we should have now, that we should pull out from it and that we should go in our own direction, if we are only in there for that reason. I thought we were in it as a commonalty of people getting together and developing this part of the world so we could show leadership. But instead, no, Mr. Speaker, we have a government that is navel gazing, that is the government is saying to our people that they only can work here.

We have in the offshore, Hibernia, only 450 jobs. The Canadian Armed Forces down in Goose Bay have something like almost 700 jobs, that is servicemen, 310 and supportive staff, 424, being harassed

MR. HISCOCK: by the government with the camp at Eagle River and also at No Name Lake. I still do not know if they have it to this day. And here we want the Canadian Armed Forces to establish their base in Goose Bay. And yet, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing? Not giving them any recreational land for their own personnel to fish and that. And here, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing? We are harassing them to the extent that you would not know but they were foreign armed forces.

But to get back to Labrador, Mr. Speaker, and the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). The federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Romeo Leblanc) ended up keeping the shrimp licenses for the co-op and they formed a company. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, they ended up now having the plant

MR. E. HISCOCK:

in L'Anse-a-Loup, Mary's Harbour and Charlottetown. This company has gone to the government and asked for provincial financing to support the buying of that boat. Do they have it, Mr. Speaker? No, Mr. Speaker. And yet the federal government has done that, set them up and gave them licenses and here is our own provincial government not doing its share there. With regard to the boat bounties on coastal Labrador - the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) - did he give the boat bounties to the people on coastal Labrador? No, Mr. Speaker. And here is a question that I asked with regard to the plant in L'Anse-a-Loup to get an ice making machine and extend it there so you can employ more people. Then the provincial Minister of Fisheries told them that the shrimp company may be able to purchase some limited quantity of ice at Port Saunders and transport the same to L'Anse-a-Loup in an insulated box. However, this will depend entirely on the demand of ice at Port Saunders.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very easy for this government to blame everything on the federal government. But things that come within their jurisdiction, what do they do? So before this Minister of Fisheries gets up and criticizes that the \$13.5 million is going to be spent by the federal fisheries on coastal Labrador, let him ask himself is going to give a guarantee to the shrimp boat? Is he going to establish the boat bounties on the coast? Is he going to come up with a seal policy to take the seals in the Fall and in the Spring? That was asked of him almost two years ago by myself and other development associations.

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the resolution and the resolution - as I said, I am quite pleased, am quite pleased, Mr. Speaker, that I am supporting this resolution, that the federal government did have to go unilaterally after fifty-two years of the inherent conflict

MR. E. HISCOCK:

between the two levels of government.

And, Mr. Speaker, with regard to sacred rights, there was no person who defended the sacred rights of this Province any more than Mr. Smallwood back on Terms 29 when the Conservative Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, was going to change them. And when you talk about the boundary of Labrador with the sacred rights, there are people down in Labrador who are going to have something to say about that. They do not need the Premier or myself or the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) or anybody else to defend their rights. They will look after their rights themselves with regard to the boundary.

And with regard to the offshore, as I said, we have stated time and time again that we own it and that it should be developed for

MR. HISCOCK:

ourselves. And with regard to, Mr. Speaker, the other issue, it is the fishery. We have seen what a mess they have made out at the Loan Board. We have seen how they played politics in the last election, and the fishermen themselves in reality do not want them to have control of their licencing. We have seen what happened in the election in Bellevue where the minister gave out a licence. And this is, unfortunately, a characteristic of ourselves as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that we do not have a tendency to trust ourselves. And the reason why we do not have a tendency to trust ourselves is because of how we have abused things in the past.

But, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this constitution - there was a great outcry with regard to the Canadian flag and it passed. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the constitution there was a great outcry. But yet when the public opinion polls were done did they show that? No, Mr. Speaker. The question that the Conservatives have always latched on to and hung their hat on to is do you agree with the federal government doing it unilaterally? The question then was really asked after it was done, Mr. Speaker, to do it unilaterally, what happened? Did the federal government have no other choice? Because the government themselves in the provinces would not give in, compromise, and that the Prime Minister is using his majority, just like the Premier used his majority, Mr. Speaker, with regard to bringing in a matrimonial law and ramming it down the throats of our people. Just as he did with The Municipal Act, that anybody now in the Province who wants water and sewerage in a small community, Mr. Speaker, got to impose property tax.

But one of the amazing things that I find as a Canadian, and as a Newfoundlander in this Province is that 75 per cent of the communities in this Province,

MR. HISCOCK: municipal communities, asked the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) to go into a cost-sharing arrangement under a 40-60 arrangement. Yet our provincial government cannot do anything with the road unless it is done under a 90-10 relationship. Yet they expect the small communities to go on a 60/40 for roads and that.

And what happened, Mr. Speaker, when these communities said they had their 40 per cent? Did they get their 40 per cent, Mr. Speaker, from the government, from the Minister of Municipal Affairs? No, Mr. Speaker, even when they had their money they were turned down. So 75 per cent of the communities in this Province of ours who wanted and who had their 40 per cent ready and waiting, the Minister of Municipal Affairs turned them down because of not enough money. And I would say to the people of this Province it is about time that — the country was

MR. HISCOCK:

supposed to be bankrupt ten years ago when Mr. Smallwood was here and Mr. Crosbie and everybody else, the country was bankrupt, \$750 million. Now, after ten years, it is \$3.5 billion. We still do not have anything to show and now it is beginning to hurt and it is beginning to pinch, Mr. Speaker. I hope that when the Premier speaks he will not only address some of the issues that we have brought up on this side but that he will, after over almost two and a half years, sit down with the Federal Minister of National Revenue, the representative for this Province, that the two of them will get together, put aside partisan politics - Mr. Jamieson and Mr. Moores could do it, Mr. Smallwood and Mr. Diefenbaker could do it - put that aside and both of them sit down and do what is good for the betterment of this Province irregardless of the political stripe, irregardless of the politics. But come election, take off the gloves and get out and fight for the election, but until then, Mr. Speaker, we have not seen those two levels of government then anyway. All you see is media things with regard to TV, radio and newspapers. I was surprised almost - six or seven months ago the Economic Council of Canada brought down a report and now the Province is only reacting to it. Their initial reaction to it was to throw it in the garbage bin and after they found out, well, maybe there are some good things in that report that criticize the federal government itself so, basically, they took that out of the garbage bin, took out the criticism of DREE and various other things and took it and, again, whacked over Ottawa with it. The point really comes down to the idea that we as a country and we as a province in this part of the nation, if we are going to live in harmony and if we are going to live in co-operation

MR. HISCOCK: in this country, the only way we are going to do it is sit down as civilized human beings, not always seeing eye to eye but willing to compromise from time to time and being very, very strong on our points and saying, no, we are not going to bend. But, Mr. Speaker, what we see now in the country - and I do not necessarily fear for the country because I have utmost faith in its people, not necessarily in its political parties and its politicians but in the long run, Mr. Speaker, it is the people who are going to make sure that Canada survives. Maybe, if the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) would be there, maybe I would ask him that question. Why is it that the Prime Minister of Canada now is the senior politician

MR. HISCOCK: in the West -

AN HON. MEMBER: In the free world.

MR. HISCOCK: - in the free world, replacing all others and that? Why is it that the people of Canada have continued to re-elect him back?

So, Mr. Speaker, in concluding I regret that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is not here to conclude the debate on this motion but realizing probably what the motion consists of, he has probably had a change of heart and he is probably supporting the constitution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have a few words on this resolution before - the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) if the member is concerned, is busy attending to government business with a few dignitaries in town, one of whom is one of the Indian native leaders for Canada. He is down in my office with him right now until I go down. That is where the Minister of Mines and Energy is so cheap shots like that are not necessary in debate on the constitution anyway.

Look, Mr. Speaker, I listened last week and I listened again today as intently as I could. I left the House on a number of occasions very, very briefly, but I wanted to hear what was going on. The debate last week on the offshore, or the week before last, the resolution on the offshore question and the resolution on the constitution that we are having right now, I would say in years to come historians or somebody who is academically inclined is going to have a real field day to see what went on and how flippantly some people examine some of the serious questions that we have in this country. And I find it once again, as was indicated, I guess, by

PREMIER PECKFORD: the Minister of Mines and Energy, I find it really disappointing and sad that on such big issues that the Opposition would tend to do their personal attack and to take a very elementary approach to a very serious and substantive problem. That is the cut and thrust of debate perhaps, Mr. Speaker. I think it is on a lot of issues but on others I do not think it should be and I am disappointed that the Opposition takes the time to quote from such editorials as the Montreal Gazette and to quote certain articles without even asking me a question concerning the way that thing evolved and why certain statements were made or certain other statements were not. They completely, deliberately ignored asking me any questions about it because then they would get clarified what it was I said. The speech was public and copies have been sent everywhere. And then they would get it clear and then they would not have a point to make on it. But be that as it may, as I have indicated from time to time if the Opposition want to take a personal approach on this problem that is their wont and they will live by it or die by it and so will I on what I do and the approach I take.

From my own personal point of view, I find

PREMIER PECKFORD:

it rather sickening and rather unbecoming of leaders and legislators in any jurisdiction or any assembly anywhere in the world but be that as it may.

Now, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can go forward from what the hon. member just said, his last remarks. Why do the people - and that is what it comes down to - why do the people of Canada keep electing the present Prime Minister. Answer, it is very simple - and the Prime Minister understands it better than anybody else does - because he gets the majority of his seats in Ontario and Quebec and under the constitutional proposals, if the hon. members opposite for no other reason -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) snobs (inaudible) Grand Falls and Gander -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I would like to have silence so that I can go ahead and develop my thoughts without interruptions, and I tried to be the same to hon. members opposite when they were speaking and I said nothing and kept quiet. So, I would like the same courtesy, please.

If for no other reason, if the hon. members opposite could not accept a number of the points of opposition that this administration has on the constitutional proposals, if they have tried to make the point of the larger good and forget about the provinces, if they tried to make that point, surely in one area - and I agree that from my point of view there are many, many other areas - but on that one point alone, members of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Opposition who are legislators representing districts in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador should oppose the constitutional package if not on its process, if not on its amending formula as it relates to the way it is set up, at least the amending formula on this, if they agree with everything in the charter and the way it is being done, if they agree with all the other things to do with it and can make up all kinds of arguments, on that point I cannot understand how a legislator in a provincial house can, outside of Ontario and Quebec, can support the notion that when this constitutional proposal, if it is approved and legalized and constitutionalized in England and all the rest of it and becomes the Constitution of Canada, how they can live and support a proposal which has the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario having a veto for all time over any other constitutional proposals perpetually -

MR. THOMS: Two years, for two years.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - perpetually - the hon. member better go look up his proposals again -

MR. THOMS: Two years, two years.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Forever, forever, forever they have a veto over it, and that is one of the key elements besides other parts of the amending formula.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of clarification in this matter. In closing the debate on a private member's resolution at 5:40 the Speaker is to ask the member

MR. L. THOMS:

who introduced the Private Member's Bill to close the debate. As a point of clarification I would like to know what the rule is when the member is not there to close the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, I will make it clear now so it will be clear forever. And that is that at twenty to six the Standing Orders say that the member who introduces the motion has the right to close the debate. However, if the member is not here, then debate proceeds until the House closes at six o'clock or until it is agreed to call it six o'clock.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So that is the first point that that veto power regardless of the population distribution - this is very important, Mr. Speaker - the argument was made in the development when the unilateral proposals came out first, the argument was made 25 per cent of the population of Quebec - 25 per cent of the population of Canada is in Quebec, is in Ontario, over 25 per cent in each of the provinces. Therefore, because of that population stipulation they demand or should have veto power. Well, even that is unacceptable to me given the nature of this nation and the way it is developed. But even if one could make an argument from that it goes on into perpetuity regardless of the population distribution in the future. So it makes no difference whether Quebec continues to have a 25 per cent of the Canadian population or not. And we have shown in our representations, Mr. Speaker, to the federal authorities that given the present trend in population in Quebec it will be below 25 per cent in about five or six years. It has been reducing over the last four or five years at a fairly rapid rate in Canadian terms.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So that one particular principle alone, because it destroys the very thing that some of the Opposition members imply and actually said parenthetically in their remarks, and it is this, 'That we are all equal in this nation and if you accept, and we do accept and we did accept in 1949, a Canada. But we accepted a Canada and became part of a country which advocated ten equal provinces under the Constitution, under the British North America Act. And this unilateral proposal now by the Canadian federal government smacks of that and we will now have a country which will not have ten equal provinces.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that might not sound too serious if hon. members opposite and others who have studied this matter do not think about it. But when you think about it as various federal/provincial conferences are called in the future - and they are only called on large national interprovincial, national/provincial issues - we go to that conference table

PREMIER PECKFORD:

diluted in our power, make no mistake about it. There does not have to be a constitutional proposal. Like Mr. Chretien said down here when he was down speaking to one of the organizations here in St. John's a little while ago, 'Just wait, as soon as the constitution gets back we will deal with the offshore'. The power will be within the Canadian federal government and among the central provinces to wield, because of the constitutional power that they will have and the political power that they obviously now have, a lot of changes in this nation. It is no mistake and it is no accident, Mr. Speaker, that the same time as the Canadian federal government is moving unilaterally with these radical changes to the structure of Canada, that simultaneously they are moving to make major changes in energy policy, that they are moving to make major changes in finance policy, fiscal arrangements between the federal government and the provinces. It is no accident, it is part of the grand design, that one only has to look at the Prime Minister's own comments back in 1966-1967-1968 in his book, Federalism And The French Canadians, and how he wanted to see the image of this nation go. He said it all along and he continues to say exactly the same thing today.

And the question is then, Mr. Speaker- we are debating it here in this Legislature and the role of the Province of Newfoundland in the Canadian Confederation. The debate is not as hon. members have tried to paint it. One, as to whether Newfoundland remains part of the Canadian Confederation or not. The question is not that. The question is, what kind of a Canadian Confederation would be most amenable to the legitimate desires of one part of that nation? That is the question. And we are saying that the kind of constitution that the Prime Minister is proposing will not allow us to be able to reach our legitimate aspirations

PREMIER PECKFORD: in that kind of context, that it will be impossible for us to do so.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have it both ways and this is the Prime Minister's problem. At the same time as he is extracting political power from us because we are no longer equal, we are no longer one-tenth - we will be no longer one-tenth in this Confederation - at the same time as he extracts that political power from us constitutionally and in every other way, that is no good unless he can also pull off the other parts of the equation which are, ensure that the energy that is developed, especially oil and gas and non-renewable resources, is done in such a way as to give a larger share, a much larger share to the Canadian government so that they have then the economic power as well. And at the same time, they will reduce the amount that we receive in equalization and established programme funding so that the day will dawn within the

PREMIER PECKFORD: next five years when to have any meaningful changes and improvements to existing housing programmes, to existing regional disparity programmes, to existing health and higher education programmes it will be absolutely necessary for the Province, town council, whatever you want to call it, the mayor or the Premier of Newfoundland, to ensure that that money comes from the federal government.

What I say to the Prime Minister is, it is possible to continue to have a Canada that we joined in 1949 with refinements because of changing conditions, with refinements but with the same existing concepts under which we joined in 1949, which will allow both for a fair share to go into the federal coffers to continue those things which are national, and at the same time give us a chance to develop and enhance and improve and expand those programmes that are in place now on education, health, and all the rest of it.

But the Prime Minister does not want it that way. He wants to have his cake and eat it too so that he not only has greater constitutional and political power but he has the financial resources through energy policy and through a reduction in equalization so that then we are left subservient perpetually so that anything that happens is automatically to be grateful for because it has to come from their coffers and from their Treasury. Cannot the hon. members of the Opposition see that? It is not a question of Liberalism and Conservatism. It is not at all.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let me finish, you had your say, let me have mine. That is equality too.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is equality too.

Would you let me finish?

PREMIER PECKFORD: So it is not a question of Liberalism, Mr. Speaker, and a question of Conservatism, it is a question of the kind of Canada, it is the question of the kind of Canada. And the Prime Minister long before he got into politics, since he got into politics, is committed to a certain very narrow view of Canada, which sees a stronger, larger political force in Canada.

Now, the only way he can bring that about and sustain power is to ensure that those areas around which the federal government revolves, Ottawa, that is, Ontario and Quebec, are part with it because they have the political seats, they have the political power to sustain that vision because they are protected and they become a part of the self-interest and perpetuate themselves. That is what the Prime Minister and the Canadian Federal Government is trying to do. And the real cruel part about it, Mr. Speaker, the real cruel part about it is that at the same time as the Prime Minister is unilaterally taking that power away from a Province like ours, at the same time he is saying, 'Do not be so selfish, you cannot have 40 per cent of the revenue and only give us 25,

PREMIER PECKFORD: do not be so selfish, we will take it all and in our generosity, when we think it right, we will give some back to you, do not be so selfish'. At the same time as the Prime Minister is saying that, his other ministers are telling us that they are going to give us less money. So, they are not only taking it from us off our resources, money that we might get, existing funding is being stopped, not only through DREE but through equalization, established program funding, RCMP contract and the like, synchrolift and all the rest of it, so they are doing it both ways. Now, the Liberal party, if it wanted to try to sustain the Liberal so-called - it is not a Liberal philosophy, it is a Trudeau philosophy, it is not a Liberal philosophy, it is a Trudeau philosophy, and you are falling into a trap there, you are falling into a big trap there, it is not Liberalism, it is Trudeauism - but if the Liberal party wanted to sustain an argument against us over here, they might have an argument that an objective audience could vote fifty-fifty on - if there were one hundred in the audience - against us if they said but the federal government is saying in return for allowing the federal government to take 40 or 50 per cent of our offshore and 40 or 50 per cent of this and 100 per cent of that and all of something else and leaving us strapped of political power, in return they have said to us they are doing a deal for you, they are going to give you a, b and c to make sure you got enough for this, to make sure you got enough for that, to make sure you got enough for something else, but they are not doing that. So you have no argument, you see, you have no argument because at the same time as they are taking it politically and constitutionally so that we cannot get any revenue from offshore or from the other resources - so we are strapped

PREMIER PECKFORD: there - they are cutting us off from their largesse that we are supposed to be happy with. So we are getting knocked both ways. We are getting it directly knocked off of us now and in the future we are going to, and we are going to get it knocked off of us directly because the 17 or 20 per cent that will come to us under their regime offshore is not sufficient to do the kinds of things and to bring our level of services even up to the national average, let alone be number two or number three. So, when one looks at the future, you have to be cynical about how our role and our position, vis-a-vis the other provinces and other people in North America, is ever going to get up to the national average. You have to be cynical about it because the wheels are in motion and we sit down and we see it every day. Then I am told about - there is a multitude, a multiplicity of social programs every day that every minister here can stand up and talk about which we cannot finance which are absolutely needed. And every member on the other side deserves ten times as many million dollars as they have gotten in the last five years and most of the members on this side deserve a lot more. But even the general provincial programs of education and health, for example, which apply pretty

PREMIER PECKFORD:

evenly across the Province, are being strapped and we are not doing legitimately what we should be doing. And when you look to the future, Mr. Speaker, you see no end in sight with the kind of national programmes that are being articulated by the Prime Minister because he is hitting us on every side, both political power - resource revenues to be cut down to seventeen or twenty per cent instead of forty even though that is different than has happened in all the other provinces of Canada. And then thirdly to say to us already, through their ministers and their bureaucrats, that the new agreement - and the RCMP contract is a good example as an omen which foreshadows bad things to come, and next year, when we get into our financial arrangements, you can expect that the same things, the same level of funding is not going to be there from the federal government. Well, if they are not going to give it to us directly through money that comes from Alberta, let us have it indirectly with a larger percentage of the offshore revenue. And then we will say, "Well, fine and dandy, good, that is a good trade off, that is a good way to go". But they are not saying that, we are getting cut. And Mr. Speaker, the other thing is, the final point I will make, and a lot of politics are being played on this whole issue, a lot of politics. It said, "We have been sitting down now" - and I will end on this just to prove the point - "we have been sitting down since last October, secretly, privately, without any fanfare with the federal government on the Lower Churchill and on transmission across Quebec." Now, that is a fact, I can prove it in documentation and all the rest of it, okay? We have been sitting down, through the Prime Minister's office, through Energy Mines and Resources. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and we have been honest and straight, and time will tell in the next

PREMIER PECKFORD: couple of weeks what the results will be, but it looks like after all of that private, no confrontation, no bad words, fair, human relationships, that we are no further ahead today than we were then, I hope I am wrong, I hope I am wrong. And I have, as a matter of fact, kept the thing quiet when the Prime Minister's Office and others wanted to politicize it. Secondly, I have written the Prime Minister a letter and I have waited on the offshore and I have waited and I have said nothing. And I have reason to say a lot today if I want to. I only hope-but I will stop on that - in your attacks on me personally as a separatist and your attacks on me personally as a confrontationist, I only hope that when the paper has to be filed and tabled on the Lower Churchill, which is very important to us, and the offshore when the Prime Minister answers, that they will show the same reasonableness and flexibility on sitting down and solving those problems as I have shown over the last six months - I will stop on that - and we will see by fact who is really holding up having

PREMIER PECKFORD: a reasonable deal so that this country can get on with some work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Grand Bank has just about five minutes.

MR. THOMS: I am just wondering if the applause was for me or the Premier, Mr. Speaker. I did not know whether to ask to be cut off or to continue.

MR. WHITE: It has to be for you.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, five minutes does not give me very long to say what one would like to say about the constitutional position at the present time, or to answer some of the things that have been said here this afternoon, particularly some of the things that have been said by the Premier of this Province (Mr. Peckford) and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry).

I would like to put a couple of things straight as far as my own position is concerned. And, Mr. Speaker, I only profess to speak for myself and to say what I can say in about three or four minutes. But I am foursquare - and I make no apologies to anybody and I guess history will either prove me right or wrong in this matter - but I am foursquare behind the efforts by the Prime Minister of this country to repatriate the constitution together with the Charter of Human Rights. I am foursquare behind the Prime Minister of Canada in that regard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: I make no apologies to anybody.

MR. TULK: We are Canadians.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, having said that I deny anybody - and it was done here again this afternoon -

MR. THOMS: on the other side to stand up and to say that the member for Grand Bank is any less a Newfoundlander because he takes that position.

MR. BARRY: Are we any less a Canadian?

MR. THOMS: No, you are not any less a Canadian.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Okay, I am not any less a Canadian and neither am I my brother's keeper. They can all speak for themselves just like I can speak for myself.

Now, my position on offshore oil and gas and what should happen in this Province has been well publicized. The press, of course, will not take it and that does not bother me. But I have sent a letter to the editors of all the newspapers in this Province and I stated my personal position on offshore oil and gas.

MR. MORGAN: They did not print any of it.

MR. THOMS: And that was printed, yes that was printed. When the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) learns to read then he will know what my position is.

MR. TULK: He is too old now, boy.

MR. THOMS: And, Mr. Speaker, my position as far as the offshore oil and gas, is not unlike the position of the Minister of Mines and Energy in this Province. It is not unlike the Premier's position. I want everything that we can get from the development of the offshore oil and gas. I want it all. Now, if somebody wants to say I

MR. L. THOMS:

am greedy because I want it all, so be it. But, Mr. Speaker, I will give you one very good reason why I want it all. It is so that the Minister of Transportation, (Mr. Dawe) for a third year in a row next year, will not be able to ignore the needs of the people of the district of Grand Bank. It is so that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), when she brings out here capital works programme, will not feel that they have to ignore the people of Grand Bank and give all the money that is being doled out by this administration to the P.C. districts. And that is what is happening. How many times have I heard how this was going to be a new, clean, moral, upstanding - that the things that happened under Joe Smallwood were not going to happen under this administration. Grand Bank is a typical example that what is happening now is exactly what happened under - it maybe what happened under other administrations. I was not in politics. Mr. Speaker, it is six o'clock and I know you have to put the question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The motion is that this House endorses the position of the government as set forth in its white paper, 'Towards the Twenty First Century - Together'. Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay', carried.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 18th. at 3:00 P.M.