

VOL. 3

NO. 34

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

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

The House met at 3.00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

Yesterday, with respect to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Port Au Port (Mr. Hodder) when the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) wanted to table information under Item (e) of the daily routine business of the House, namely, 'Answers to questions for which notice has been given,' this was a matter which I wanted to take under some consideration. I understand that the minister had given an undertaking in the Resources Committee on the estimates of his department relating to the tabling of certain information. I would think that it is perhaps more appropriate if the information should have been tabled in that committee or given to the Clerk of that committee for distribution to the members of the committee. And certainly we have had precedents in the past where this has occurred. I can only assume that 'Answers to questions for which notice has been given' technically relates to the tabling of information or the answering of questions asked orally of a minister in the House or by way of a written question placed on the Order Paper. However, the minister is certainly not precluded from making a statement on any matter in the House under 'Statements By Ministers' or is a member not precluded from asking a question either by way of notice or during Question Period.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:  
Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the recent public comments by the Teachers' Association and by the Treasury Board, would the President of the Treasury Board fill us in on what negotiations are taking place today to avoid the strike which has been threatened as a result of the government's not negotiating with the teachers in good faith?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware - and I have been out of my office for about, say, forty minutes or something like that - as far as I am aware the last meetings that took place over the dispute between government and the teachers was on Friday last when the teachers met with the conciliation officer who has been in place for some time, the conciliation officer from the Department of Labour and Manpower, and officials in Treasury Board met with the same conciliation officer. And at that time it is my understanding that the conciliation officer indicated to the teachers' representatives that government would be interested and indeed anxious to carry on further negotiations at a subsequent date. But there have not been any further meetings since Friday. Now in the meantime I think it is general knowledge that the NTA are in the process of conducting a vote in regard to the possibility of a strike. They are not saying they are going on a strike but they are conducting a vote to get a mandate if that is the decision ultimately made, and in view of that I do not think it is to be expected, if one wants to be

DR. COLLINS:

realistic and practical, it is to be expected that there would be further meetings until they completed that exercise. We have indicated - at the last meeting the conciliation officer did indicate that government is willing to discuss further at any time, but, as I say, to be realistic, I do not think it is likely that there will be discussions until the present exercise undertaken by the NTA is completed.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I wonder does the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) realize how serious this problem really is? If I understand him, what he is saying is that he is not prepared to take any initiative. It appears to me that the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) was saying yesterday that we should be taking any steps to avoid the strike, because there is no plan in effect that they are prepared to release if a strike takes place, and she is still hopeful that a strike will not take place. Now, will the President of Treasury Board indicate to this House what steps that you are prepared to take on your initiative before this becomes hard and fast on Friday when there is no other choice? I have heard from both sides now that you are prepared to continue to negotiate, which surely, you must realize, is your responsibility, it is the government's responsibility to take the action to avoid this strike. Now, are you prepared to tell this House of Assembly what action you are prepared to take today or tomorrow of an emergency nature to avoid the strike?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked me if I was aware of the seriousness

DR. COLLINS: of this situation. I will put that question down to his being a novice in this House and having no familiarity with the operation of government, but I will nevertheless answer it. I will say that I am very conscious of the seriousness of the present situation, I am very conscious of my duties, I am very conscious of my obligations and I will just leave it at that.

With regard to initiatives, the conciliation process is the essential process here and last evening discussions were held with the - last afternoon, I am sorry, not last evening, yesterday anyway, sometime yesterday, discussions were held between officials in Treasury Board and the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower as to the practicality of making some new move, and, as I have mentioned already, the practicality is that until NTA are finished their exercise they are not likely to respond to any new initiative.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering who I will ask this question to because unlike the situation with the workers at the College of Trades and Technology when they were on strike, with the teachers we have three ministers concerned, two directly, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), whereas, as I said, with the support staff of the College of Trades and Technology we simply had the President of the Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) and the Minister of Labour and Manpower. But I will put my question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower and find out, Mr. Speaker, if the minister can tell us what his position has been with respect to the teachers' strike to this point in time. Is the minister doing anything, being it is his job to bring parties together, and being the mediator or the conciliator? So I wonder what action the Minister of Labour and Manpower has taken to this point in time to avert this strike action?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will be happy to know that every possible step that could possibly be taken by the Department of Labour and Manpower and the Minister of Labour and Manpower has been taken. In other words, the process, as I have explained to the hon. member many times, has been gone through in that the teachers were granted a conciliation board, the board reported, the teachers rejected the majority report. There was a majority and a minority report. The teachers rejected the majority report and they came back to meetings at the negotiating table. They spoke -I believe- between the acceptance and rejection vote there were about seven days in between that period and when they went on their convention. And on Wednesday night, the Wednesday before Good Friday, negotiations were broken off

MR. DINN: at basically the request of the teachers because they wanted to prepare for their convention. They went to their convention and immediately upon returning from their convention they were contacted by the Department of Labour and Manpower. There were separate negotiations with Treasury Board and with the negotiating committee for the NTA. Last week, I believe last Thursday - I could be corrected, it may have been Wednesday night or it may have been early Friday morning - contact was made with the NTA and they indicated at that time their decision to take a strike vote and that there was not much sense

MR. DINN: at that point in time to continue negotiations, that they had quite a bit of work to perform, and they indicated also to us that when the strike vote was concluded that they would be willing to sit down at the table and negotiate again and we informed them at that time that we would be ready, willing at any time that they chose to sit down at the table with them and, of course, set up meetings with Treasury Board if the need arose.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister simply describes the process that would take place regardless if the minister were here or he were in Timbuktu. What I have asked the minister is as a result of the seriousness of this situation, a teachers' strike in this Province, and something that we have never had before because we have never really had a teachers' strike in this Province before, not in the strict sense of the word, so in view of the seriousness of this situation, the question was what specific steps the minister has taken since we have known that the conciliation board offer was rejected? Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister might get a chance to address that question again. I will give him that opportunity to tell the people of Newfoundland and to tell the teachers of Newfoundland just specifically what he has done outside of these normal developments that would take place if he were not around at all with respect to the collective bargaining process. What I would like for the minister to tell hon. members now is with respect to the offer of 9 per cent which the teachers have rejected, was this the initial offer made by the government or was not an offer made by the government at all?



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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member went through quite a process there. First of all, he said there was no strike in Newfoundland before of teachers. The hon. member obviously is not aware that there was a strike in 1970.

MR. LUSH: That was not a strike. (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: It was a rotating strike. It was a strike in terms of anyone who withdraws their service and, Mr. Speaker, the reason they went on strike at that point in time was that they did not have the process that they have right now of negotiating, they had absolutely no collective bargaining rights at all at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Hon. members- and the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) was in the Cabinet at the time- would not offer them, or would not give them or would not allow them to negotiate.

MR. LUSH: What (inaudible).

MR. DINN: And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but they were cajoled, they were sucked into going back to work and when they went back to work they got exactly the same offer as government had offered in the beginning. So, Mr. Speaker, the process now is a little bit different. The NTA now has a collective bargaining process which they go through and which they have gone through successfully since

MR. J. DINN: 1972, Mr. Speaker, and which they will go through successfully this time contrary to what the hon. member hopes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to what steps: As I indicated to the hon. member, every step that is possible in labour relations has been taken with respect to the teachers' negotiations and with respect to what the Department of Labour and Manpower or the minister of that department could do. There is no other minister who could do any more in the situation. A conciliation board was provided. They got every step in the negotiating process. Every single step that was requested they got, Mr. Speaker, every single step!

MR. LUSH: No, no, I deny that.

MR. J. DINN: And with respect to offers, offers were made by both sides at an independent conciliation board and that board made a report. The fact that they did not accept that report is their right. They have the right to accept or reject, they have the right to strike if they wish. That is a right that was given to them by legislation by a Tory administration of which I am proud.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). I wonder would the minister tell the House what happens in the case of somebody building a summer cottage or a summer home in a wilderness area?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: If somebody built a home, a summer home, a summer cottage in a wilderness area, what would be the procedure in getting that - would it be allowed to stay in the wilderness area or would it have to be removed from the wilderness area?

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

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I assume the member when he says 'wilderness area', means a remote area. There is only one designated wilderness area in the Province right now and that is the Avalon wilderness area and no cabins are permitted in the Avalon wilderness area. We do have a policy that was introduced last year for remote cottages as opposed to cottages or cottage sites that are accessible by road. In order to get a remote cottage, you would have to go to the Department of Forest Resources and Lands, apply at the nearest office for a remote cottage; our department would then take that application and refer it out to two or three departments, particularly Mines and Energy to see if there were any mineral problems in the area or mineral potential, particularly Wildlife to see if there were any wildlife problems in that area and, I guess, the Department of Environment and, of course, our own Department of Forest Resources and Lands. After those referrals come back to the Department of Crown Lands, then we would make a decision as to whether or not the permit is approved. If it is to be approved there are two options:

MR. POWER: If the person does not want to go through the expense of a survey, then we can give a permit to occupy for five years which saves that resident the cost of an expensive survey, especially if it is in a really remote area. If the person wishes to get a lease for fifty years, then he has to get a survey done and he can go that route.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman care to inform the House if in these remote areas that he is talking about, if, since the regulations have come into effect, people indeed were asked to remove their Summer cottages or their cabins from these areas? Could the hon. gentleman give us some idea if this has happened and how many times has it happened?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, what I just explained was the correct, legitimate procedure, the legal procedure for getting a cottage lot whether it be remote or otherwise. If a person illegally occupies Crown land, whether it be in an area of remoteness or an area that is accessible, that is still against the laws of this Province, to occupy Crown land illegally. If in such a case that is done, and in the case of remote cottages then that cabin very likely would be posted with a notification that gives the person I believe thirty or sixty days to come back to the department, and if that person has not any right to that piece of property then it might be quite possible the case would go to court and a judge would ask for removal of that cabin from that site.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. minister inform the House if to his knowledge a helicopter was used at any time to lift a Summer cottage or a cabin from one area to another, and if the hon. gentleman has knowledge of that would he provide the House with the information?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of that happening, a Summer cottage being removed by helicopter. If it has I will certainly get the information, I will check with my department, but I do not know anything about it.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: I would like to know if or when or when will the applications for big game licences be sent out this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the applications should be in the mail, I would say, by the end of next week, which would be approximately ten days. That is my information.

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

MR. HANCOCK: Could the minister indicate whether the price of big game licences has increased this year or are they the same as last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

May 6, 1981

Tape No. 1301

NM - 3

MR. ANDREWS: There will be no increase in the price of big game licences, \$25 for moose and caribou.

MR. STAGG: Very disappointed Very disappointed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is -

I want to ask a supplementary to the same minister - I think it is a known fact that the draw system and the rules and regulations surrounding big game licences have contributed to a fair amount of poaching in recent years, I want to ask the minister, are there any individual licences issued this year or are they party licences, two, and three and four?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, that is rather a complex question to answer because there is a computer involved, but basically it is my understanding that a higher priority goes to party licences. In other words, if two people apply for one licence, they would have a higher priority in receiving a particular licence in a particular area, the reason for that being that it is not the killing of the game that we consider the sport, it is the hunting and the hunting experience. So a party licence of two or three has a higher priority than the single applicant, but a single applicant could still get a licence in an area where there would not be enough applicants on a party basis.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the same minister, can he tell us how many qualified hunters or licenced hunters there are who have passed the hunter capability testing programme? How many hunters are there in the Province at the present time for this season and how many big game licences will be issued this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement and get the information for the member.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and I will try not to be too aggressive.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) more aggressive than anyone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

My question to the minister is the Newfoundland and Labrador Sheep Breeders Association had their annual meeting last night; they are a little bit upset by the decline in breeding of sheep in this Province which has dropped dramatically. There are several reasons for this. One is the government taking the pasture land in this Province and turning it over to private enterprise. As a result, this has led to a drop. Could the minister inform us whether his government now after a year has reassessed this programme of community pastures and are going to reinstate them as government-owned and operated?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

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

MR. GOUDIE:

No, Mr. Speaker. We have been monitoring the pasture programme since it was turned over to private enterprise last year, private operation. There has been no difficulty with the programme that I am aware of. Grants have been provided last year and will be again this year, equipment has been provided, and the only discussion that I was involved in in relation to pastures within any particular area was in the Victoria/Carbonear area and that was the only one that I am aware of that has had any difficulty with it, and that had to do with municipal boundaries as opposed to the actual operation of the pasture.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Then I suggest that the Sheep Breeders Association then really do not know what they are talking about, and seeing they are into the business, I would assume that they do know.

The other problem with the Sheep Breeders Association is that the government



MR. HISCOCK:

is denying veterinarian services to them and also use of the abattoir in Pleasantville. Could the minister inform us in this House if these two services are going to be re-instated and given to the Sheep Breeders Association?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any denial of veterinarian services to any particular part of the agricultural industry. We do have one difficulty with agricultural services but that is with veterinary services in this Province in that we do not have enough of them. We have a great deal of difficulty recruiting veterinarians for work in this Province. That is one aspect of it.

The abattoir in St. John's has been geared to handle hogs and to handle poultry and that has been the extent of it so far. And I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that the Sheep Breeders Association has not approached me with any of these concerns before. They may have gone through the regular channels and discussed these concerns with staff in the department, but it has certainly not been brought to my attention at this point in time. If they wish to do that then my door is always open.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River, followed by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the Sheep Breeders Association in this Province, being a Province very, very dependent upon food from outside, and that one of the few livestock that does prosper in this Province is sheep and has been an historical animal of our Province, does this Province have any programme to aid the Sheep breeders Association in particular with regard to all the federal money that is coming into the Province -

MR. HISCOCK: if it was not for the federal government with rural development, agriculture, particularly agriculture, then there would be no Department of Agriculture. Does the department and does the minister have any special programme in place or is he contemplating bringing one in to place to help the Sheep Breeders Association?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I think it is completely inaccurate to suggest -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: - there would not be an agricultural industry in this Province were it not for the federal government. We are working under a five year agreement now, approximately three years of it having expired, cost shared between DREE and the provincial government.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) Province.

MR. GOUDIE: I said cost shared, Mr. Speaker, I did not give the ratio.

The other aspect of it is that, generally speaking, the Island part of the Province is quite suitable to the raising of sheep. One of the traditional problems that sheep breeders and sheep farmers have had in this Province over the years has been the difficulty with dogs, roaming dogs in particular, and other wild animals. We do have an excellent insurance plan in place to assist sheep farmers, sheep breeders in the Province to cover them in the event of death and I think the two television stations in the Province did some fairly accurate reporting last year and years before on damage which occurs to sheep destroyed by dogs and other animals. So there are a number of programmes,

MR. GOUDIE: yes, available to sheep breeders. I have dealt with them in the years that I have been responsible as Minister of Agriculture, and we continue to work with them every day.

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

MR. HANCOCK: A supplementary to the same minister, Mr. Speaker.

I have spoken to several of the operators of those pasture lands over the last year and they have not worked out as well because there has not been enough money to operate the pasture lands the way they should be operated. I would ask the minister at this time does he anticipate seeing an increase to the operators of these pasture lands this coming year?

MR. SPEAKER: / The hon. minister.

MR. GOUDIE: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no plan right now to increase the rates. As I have said before, I am more than happy to meet with any of the groups that have a concern about the operation of the pastures, the groups operating them, to discuss rates or to discuss anything else. But as I said, the only representation made to me, other than one private discussion I have had with the hon. member who just asked the question, was from the Victoria - Carbonear area and that has been the extent of it.

The staff of the department have been monitoring the programme on paper. It has been brought to my attention that everything is operating satisfactorily. There had been some difficulty with gaining equipment, or adequate equipment to deal with

MR. GOUDIE: some of the pastures throughout the Province, and some pasture areas want to have their boundaries expanded, but these are the only problems that have been brought to my attention, certainly no question of insufficient rates.

MR. HANCOCK: A final supplementary, please.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, there were several pasture lands last year that no suitable proposal was received on, or the minister felt that the proposal received was too high or whatever, but I am wondering at this time will there be proposals put in on those pasture lands this year and will the government be looking for people to operate the pasture lands that were not operated last year? And I have two in my own district that were not, there was no suitable proposal received on them last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, we have no additional plans this year to open up extra pastures. Pastures last year which either were not applied for, or in the case where applications came in and were unsuitable -

MR. THOMS: Lamaline too.

MR. GOUDIE: Well, there were several areas, Lamaline being one of them, I suppose. I cannot remember the names of the thirty-five or thirty-six pastures that exist in the Province - have been disposed of - not disposed of - have been used in other ways and government is not considering at this point in time opening up any additional pastures, or taking any further action on pastures which had not been utilized last year.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) yields to the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
A final supplementary,  
Mr. Speaker.

Just because there was not a suitable proposal received last year does not mean there cannot be one this year, Mr. Speaker. I know on the Cape Shore, in particular, there are a lot of sheep and horses and whatever roaming at large and it is ridiculous to go over there. I was over there a couple of weeks ago -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Baa.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, all you can hear is 'baa'. - and you have to dodge those sheep on the highway to get through the settlement. Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough. The people in the communities are complaining about it. I would ask the minister at this time to look at seeing if this pasture land can be tendered on again this year and someone run the pasture land the way it should be operated.

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, what I would suggest, since there is one particular area of the Province under question here, is that the hon. member and I sit down and discuss this privately and perhaps I can get some names from him and then see what we will do from there.

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 Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. Back on December 31st, the minister announced that the craft shop in Goose Bay would be closed to the public and he also made an announcement shortly thereafter that it would open in a short period of time. Since that time we have had practically four months gone past and the craft shop is still closed. Can the minister advise when and if that craft shop will reopen?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, we indicated that as of the first of January the craft shop would close down. In actual fact, the whole operation did not close down. Craft shop outlets in the various parts of Labrador were still able to take advantage of ordering, at wholesale prices, materials for use in various coastal communities. We also indicated when we closed down the shop the first of January that the review process, the assessment of application, reviewing of these applications, submissions to government and so on, would take a certain period of time or number of weeks to implement. Just prior to the Easter break of the House, we received a report from the Northern Development division centre in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. A number of proposals have been

MR. GOUDIE: received. They have now been analyzed by the department and the department will be making recommendations within the next week or two to government at which time government will make its decision.

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

I would like to welcome to the Galleries today, on behalf of all hon. members, forty-five girls and Guiders from the 71st and 72nd St. John's Girl Guide Companies. We hope they enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to report that the Government Services Committee on the estimates -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Speak up.

MR. STAGG: Not enough volume?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will start again. It gives me great pleasure to report that the Government Services Committee on the estimates which had referred to its five departments, Head IV, Finance, Head V, Public Works and Services, Head XI, Transportation, Head XIV, Labour and Manpower, Head XVII, Municipal Affairs, have considered all these departments and has passed them without amendment. Members of the committee are the member for Terra Nova (T. Lush), the member for Kilbride (B. Aylward), the member for Conception Bay South (J. Butt), the member for Bay of Islands (L. Woodrow), the member for Carbonear (R. Moores) was a member of the committee but did not attend any meetings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 6, 1981

Tape No. 1305

EL - 3

MR. STAGG: - the member for Eagle River (E. Hiscock) attended meetings, and myself, the member for Stephenville. We will sit again on the next estimates, 1982-83.

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

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

MR. HODDER: It is my understanding - I do not have the exact reference here - that a member is not supposed to cast reflections on the presence or absence of a member in this chamber and that, Mr. Speaker, would be carried, I think, to the committees as well.

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



MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was not casting reflections on anyone. The hon. gentleman was just merely stating a fact, that was all, and/or his opinion.

AN HON. MEMBER: He had to give an honest report.

MR. MOORES: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: It seems, Mr. Speaker, that I seem to be the object and the substance of this matter. I would prefer that the matter drop. I can account for my whereabouts and I am sure that my electorate will account for it in a few years.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, I rule that there is no point of order but a difference of opinion.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, this is in answer to Question No. 57 asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on the Order Paper dated May 4, 1981. How many Newfoundlanders are currently employed on offshore oil drilling rigs? Give the total number of Newfoundlanders hired by offshore oil rigs since January 1, 1978. . Answer: Employed directly with the drilling contractors - total 422, Newfoundlanders, 263, that is at the present time now, which is sixty-two per cent, and employed directly with service contractors total 506, Newfoundlanders 351 for a total of sixty-nine per cent. Total employment, 928 at the present time, and

MR. DINN: 614 of them are Newfoundlanders, which is sixty-six per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: In 1978, before the regulations came in-record keeping and monitoring of rig employment figures began in 1979 so we do not really have the figures for 1978, but we do know that there were two rigs out there and we have no knowledge of any Newfoundlanders being on them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

MR. DINN: And prior years, of course, we had the same sort of a deal. In 1979 Newfoundlanders directly employed on rigs 420, Newfoundlanders directly employed by service contractors 302, for a total of 722, and that varied. In 1980, Newfoundlanders directly employed on rigs, total - by the way, there were 1,300 on the rigs, 783 were Newfoundlanders, which is sixty per cent, Newfoundlanders directly employed by service contractors 231 and 93 were Newfoundlanders for forty per cent, total employment 1,531; Newfoundlanders 876 which is fifty-seven per cent. And we did not count the rig, I believe it was Sedco 709, which would bring the figure up to over 900 jobs last year as was reported earlier. As of March, 1981 the total number working on the rigs was 422, Newfoundlanders 263 for sixty-three per cent. Newfoundlanders directly employed in service contracts 506, 351 Newfoundlanders, sixty-nine per cent in total employment 66. Total employment from 1978 to present-and as I said we did not have the figures for 1978 so we are talking about 1979 and 1980 - 2,212 positions. Some of these positions reflect rehires from year to year, of course, but as I indicated at the present time, 614 Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

May 6, 1981

Tape No. 1306

AH-3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):           Would one of the clerks at the  
table see this is tabled.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:                 Mr. Speaker, I have a further  
answer to the question posed by the hon. member for Lewisporte  
(Mr. White) yesterday

MR. W. MARSHALL: with respect to the Devine Advertising Company and the observations of the Public Accounts Committee because I think it is very important that I respond to this. The hon. gentleman asked a question yesterday as to whether or not I was aware that a report had been filed apparently by the RCMP six months prior to this, that this was the information that he had gotten. Subsequently, although the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) did not cast directly any imputation, in his debate yesterday the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), in saying that he did not know whether or not he presumed there was not a cover-up, gave the impression by those statements that perhaps there might have been a cover-up. So I just want to respond further to that because I have further inquired with respect to the matter and I have to report to the House that the information gained by the hon. member for Lewisporte, I do not know where he got it, but it was erroneous in that the report was filed some six months ago. It was not filed six months. The situation was that this report has been filed. It was reviewed, as is customary in matters of this nature, and further information was required, further information was sought from the RCMP, and that information is now in the process of being done. The department is awaiting the final report and the final report has to be received, of course, because both reports have to be received together. And I might also inform the House that this is not by any means an unusual procedure. The Public Prosecution Office often, very, very often -

AN HON. MEMBER: What was the date?

MR. W. MARSHALL: The exact date I cannot give you but my information is that the date when the first report was filed was within about two months and it was reviewed -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. MARSHALL: Yes. And it was further reviewed and another report was asked for. Now the reason why I give this is that this is not unusual, as I say, this is a procedure that is done, and I want to do it because I do not think that - I know the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) would not wish it because when you make allegations of - not his allegation but that of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) - it becomes rather unfortunate because it gives the appearance then that the Department of Justice in these matters is not completely aboveboard.

I can give the assurance to this House, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened is normal and usual, that the report, when it is received, will be dealt with and it will be dealt with, Mr. Speaker, in a way that is completely away from political considerations. People concerned will not be prosecuted purely for political expediency nor, if there are grounds for it, will prosecution not be laid for any political reasons.

So I want to do it because I think it is most unfair, Mr. Speaker, that a slur of this nature, however unintentional, may be cast. And I want to assure this House that this government has not been in the past, is not now and will not in the future be in the habit of being parties to any cover-ups. And the Department of Justice as administered in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is on an impartial and unbiased and reasonable basis as any Province of Canada.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further answers to questions?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter and the expression 'slurs' by the member who is not in his seat and cannot respond, slurs that were intended - I think he went out of his way yesterday not to cast any slurs and I think in the interest of clearing this up for the House, the information which the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has now given is really only going to add to the confusion. We now apparently have two reports and I would ask -

MR. CARTER: What is the point of order?

MR. STIRLING: The point of order, Mr. Speaker - I am making the point of order - is that the President of the Council accused the member, who is not in his seat, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) of casting a slur, and he went out of his way not to do that. And the minister has not added anything other than 'about two months ago' which is denying the RCMP information of six months ago - he has not given us the precise dates that the thing came in, and he has not given us the precise date when additional information was asked for. And rather than clear up the confusion, he has left confusion. And I would ask him to withdraw any comment that the member for the Straits implied any slur. He has only added to the confusion and I am afraid if we just let the matter go, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot let that statement stand that the member for this side intended any slur. So I would ask the President of the Council to withdraw that remark and be specific and give us the information.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, with respect to the information, that is not a point of order. With respect to the words

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): presumably used by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), I have no idea whether or not there was any imputation there contained in those remarks because I will have to see what the full context of the remarks are and I will have a look at Hansard and rule on it at a later time.

Further answers to questions?

The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question seven as asked by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and I herewith table it. That is the one on the abortions and hysteronomies.

MR. SPEAKER: Further answers to questions?

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) promised the House that he would bring in information on agricultural limestone at yesterday's session. I let it go yesterday and he has not brought it in today, and I would like to find out if there is any particular reason why he has not brought that contract with Mr. Maynard into the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I would have to rule there is no point of order.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to present a petition on behalf of 244 people in the town of Horwood, in the district of Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: And the petition reads as follows, the prayer, "We, the undersigned, being users of the public highway that runs from Southwest Arm in Horwood," not Southwest Arm in Bellevue district, "to Two Mile Point in the community of Horwood, and the public highroad which runs from Rogers Cove to Homes Cove, wish to express our concern and displeasure over the deplorable condition of both portions of highroad. These roads have been neglected for too long, eighteen years, by the government. We, the undersigned, are of the opinion that our tax dollars should be spent on improvements of those roads instead of other unnecessary government projects."

I would agree with them, of course.

"The roads are in such poor condition that it is not worth the danger to our safety to drive over them except for emergencies. Every time a vehicle goes over the roads the owners face the risk of hundreds of dollars damages or the risk of destroying his or her vehicle. It is deplorable that the roads have been allowed to deteriorate to such an extent. At least with the previous Liberal Government we could have looked forward to the possibility of election pavement, such as it was."

"The time for action is now. We are not second class citizens so why should we be treated as such."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition on behalf of the people of Horwood. For too long now the road in that community, leading from that community to the main road in Gander Bay, has indeed been neglected. The people



MR. WHITE: there perhaps have been a little silent in the past but I can guarantee you that they intend to be more vocal in the future about this road. The main road from Rogers Cove to Homes Cove is on the Gander Bay Highway and the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook) knows what I am saying, when there is a great deal of pressure on to get this road upgraded and paved. Soon, maybe soon, the Fogo ferry will be diverted to Farewell, maybe, and that will put additional pressures, additional traffic on that main road and I do call upon the government, on behalf of the people of Horwood, to include in their programme this year the upgrading and paving of the Horwood Road, as well as the Rogers Cove to Homes Cove Road.

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

MR. STIRLING: I was hesitating because I assumed that somebody from the other side would certainly want to support that petition. There is a need to do something about dirt roads.

I am pleased to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague. It is not the first time that petitions of this sort have been presented. All over this Province, Mr. Speaker, all over this Province people living on dirt roads have just been not treated properly, not only in this district but every other district where there are dirt roads.

The last incident that we had was in the district of Bellevue, where people were promised action on dirt roads and yet when the budget comes down there is no promise, no indication that money is now going to be spent to do the kind of job that needs to be done all over this Province. And it is just a further indication, Mr. Speaker, a further indication of the frustrations that people all over the Province are feeling because this government

MR. STIRLING:

is just not managing our economy, just not developing the extra income that we need, and are just sitting on their hands and hoping that something is going to happen, that suddenly we will become rich.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough. These people are not being treated properly, the people in Horwood deserve better treatment, the people on dirt roads throughout this Province have just been ignored by this government. It has absolutely no priority in their thinking, they are not concerned with people issues at all. If it does not have the taste or scent of oil, not a nickle is being spent. And the money that was used to subsidize CN, just a fraction of that money could have been used to upgrade this road and pave this road as is required on dirt roads all over this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would hope, and I think it is significant that we do not have a minister left - yes, two ministers, two ministers out of the seventeen - in the House during a petition being presented in this House on behalf of people in various parts of this Province. It is an insult to the people, and it is an insult to this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Further petitions?

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

the hon. member?

Is this to the same petition,

MR. WOODROW:

A new petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A new petition, the hon. -

MR. HODDER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, something concerns me and I want to bring it to the attention of the House. I want to refer to Beauchesne, Page 103, section 316 (c). Now, the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) on a number of occasions in this House has referred to the absence of specific members of the House. Now, this particular section says: "Besides the prohibitions contained in S.O. 35, it has been sanctioned by usage that a Member, while speaking, must not refer to the presence or absence of specific Members".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I brought that point up here in the House. I was ruled against, Mr. Speaker, that there was no point of order, But I contend there was a point of order and I think it was a very serious one. Because if this is allowed to happen, then the hon. member, any member that goes to his district for a meeting, or goes anywhere else for a meeting, Mr. Speaker, or has any public business to do in his district, well, can have his name smeared and have slurs put upon his presence or absence by members opposite, and the member for Stephenville has done that on a number of occasions.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A breach of order has to be raised at the time at which it has occurred, and -

MR. HODDER: I did, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, and it was dealt with and ruled on.

MR. HODDER: Well, from now on -

MR. SPEAKER: If hon. members do not agree with a ruling, as you obviously are aware, there

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): is a procedure that can be followed. But the Chair is called upon to act in the interest of the House, to rule on points of order as they are raised. I ruled on that particular point of order. So this is not a point of order at this point.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition.

I would like first of all to read the prayer of the petition:

'We, the undersigned, support the efforts of the Western Newfoundland Historic Trust to have the Brake's property which is located in Meadows, Bay of Islands, restored and designated by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador.'

Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of a petition I presented earlier in the House and on that petition we had 226 names. We have today on this petition, Mr. Speaker, 307 names making a total of 533 names.

Mr. Speaker, since I presented the petition, I made another visit to the property in question and I must say that although the property is dilapidated, it certainly opened my eyes as to what our past has been. And this property, if restored, Mr. Speaker, will give young Canadians an idea of what mode of living our forefathers had to go through and hopefully give them an appreciation of what they have now.

I would also like to state, Mr. Speaker, that I have talked with the present Minister of Recreation and Culture and Youth (Mr. Andrews) on this and I feel sure he will give this matter his full consideration. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I have another letter here which I want to read into the record concerning the Brake property. And the letter is sent to Mr. Michel Lavaseur: 'Dear Mr. Lavaseur: I have reviewed your Canada Community Development Project application relating to the proposed restoration of the Brake property in Meadows and I am pleased to offer my support for this worthwhile project. Since the Brake property is the last mercantile premises of its kind left in the Bay of Islands area, it is well worth preserving and should prove to be a worthwhile educational experience to those visiting the site as well as an interesting tourist attraction for the region in general.'

MR. WOODROW: 'Good luck with your application and please keep me informed of your progress.' And this letter, Mr. Speaker, is signed by the former Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth, the hon. Ron Dawe.

Mr. Speaker, even after this property is bought it is going to take a lot of cash to restore it and the people concerned, those of us who are trying to get it restored, we hope to get things like Canada Works grants and whatever other means of money we have at our disposal, so I hope that we will be able to get a start on the restoration of this property, in fact, this present year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further petitions.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: This being Private Members' Day and according to Standing Order 53, I now call Motion No. 6 moved by the hon. member for Bay Verte - White Bay.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I actually ended up with two sets of notes for introducing this motion today. I had a set of notes ready yesterday but of course I had to reconsider and make another set of notes today as a result of some of the utterances and statements made in this Province yesterday by the Prime Minister of Canada.

Part of the original notes that I had made, Mr. Speaker, before I heard the words of the Prime Minister, were that I thought that this resolution, as it appears on the Order Paper, should be a resolution that could easily receive the unanimous agreement of this House. I do not believe, I do not think that anybody can say that there was anything political in the resolution in any of the Whereases, in the body of the resolution. I do not believe that anybody could say that the resolution actually took a political swipe at any particular person or party.

The resolution, as it appears on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, I believe is simply a statement of fact. There can be no disagreement with the facts, I do not think, as they are stated in the resolution on the Order Paper. The resolution, as it appears on the Order Paper, does not condemn anybody. Some might say that is wrong, it probably should, but I do not think the resolution, as it appears on the Order Paper, condemns anybody.

The resolution, I believe the way that I have drafted it, is a conciliatory resolution. It is conciliatory in tone and I believe it is conciliatory in the structure. The resolution I do not think contains any confrontation. I do not think the resolution contains any Fed bashing, which has been a very common phrase in this Province lately. The resolution contains no name

MR. RIDEOUT: calling, it contains none of those things but yet, I believe it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution has some guts to it, it has some resolve to it. I believe it is based on justice, the resolution is based on a perception of equality. The resolution is based a perception of sharing, so I do not believe that it can be said that the resolution condemns anybody or is very political in tone or structure or anything of that nature.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we look at all the clauses of the resolution because the debate hopefully will center around all of them and the first clause, "WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has a moral and legal claim to the minerals on the Continental Shelf", it is my understanding, and we will know more as the debate goes on, but it is my understanding that there is no disagreement on that in this House at this particular time.

The second clause, "AND WHEREAS the Federal Government does not recognize our claim", now, Speaker, surely there can be no disagreement with that. Everybody knows that the present Federal Government does not recognize our claim to those resources, to those minerals.



MR. RIDEOUT: "WHEREAS the Province has the regulations and expertise necessary for the wise development of such offshore minerals"-I suppose there can be some debate on that, whether the Province has the expertise available and the proper regulations in place, but I believe that by and large most people would agree that that is a reasonable statement.

"WHEREAS the Hibernia oil and gas fields can have significant negative impact on our society and our environment" - I do not believe there can be any disagreement from anybody in this House on that particular statement. I think all of us at one time or another, either here in the House-or before committees only last week when we were dealing with the Department of Mines and Energy-there was a lot of concern expressed by members on both sides of the House with the possible negative impact of that kind of development, so I do not believe there can be any disagreement on that.

"WHEREAS the Province needs revenues and jobs from offshore oil and gas to better our society"-I do not believe there can be any -

AN. HON. MEMBER: I do not particularly like  
(inaudible)

MR. RIDEOUT: Well the resolution says that there could be negative impact and I said, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any disagreement on that; it was certainly expressed in committee only last week.

"AND WHEREAS the Province needs revenues and jobs from offshore oil and gas to better our society"-I do not believe you will find very much disagreement with that.

"WHEREAS the government of this Province has shown that oil and gas development under our regulations with oil at eighty-five per cent of world prices would make us a "have " Province for three years of a twenty year

MR. RIDEOUT: development" - you know, there is not much disagreement on that. These are the facts of the matter as we have them before us and members on all sides have seen them by attending various symposiums and so on.

"WHEREAS under our regulations, 25 per cent of each dollar earned is shared with the federal government" - that is our regulations as they are right now, this day - "and thirty-five per cent goes to the companies developing the resource," which, of course, Mr. Speaker, under our current regulations leave forty per cent for the provincial share. "AND WHEREAS this percentage is reasonable and consistent with revenue sharing currently being enjoyed by other producing Provinces!" - again, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. Nobody can deny that. That is the percentage of share that other producing provinces have in place right now.

MR. STIRLING: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not have a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The member did indicate that we do not have a quorum. I will ask the clerk to count

...

Order, please! We have a quorum.

I will ask the hon. member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) to continue.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Opposition is so interested in hearing what the debate is on this the leader even decides to call a quorum call.

Now I was down to the last, "NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED," Mr. Speaker, and I was making the case that I did not believe that the resolution was provocative or confrontational in any way. And the last statement, "NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House urge the federal government to reconsider its position on offshore minerals and recognize the Province's legitimate

MR. RIDEOUT: rights to ownership and control  
of them."

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: It just says, "Reconsider and urge."  
There is no heavy, confrontational language, no heavy provocative  
language whatsoever, I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, anywhere  
in that resolution.

And these were the kind of  
introductory comments that I was prepared to make and the  
kind of speech I was prepared to make up until , of course,  
last night , and then a few other things happened to interfere  
with that process. Since I prepared those comments , Mr.  
Speaker, we have had the Prime Minister's visit, as I have  
indicated earlier, and this resolution therefore, even though  
nobody could plan for it in the beginning, is probably more  
timely now than we could have perceived back in February  
when it was first put on the Order Paper.

MR. RIDEOUT: I saw the Prime Minister on three major newscasts yesterday evening, Mr. Speaker. I saw him on C.B.C. Here and Now programme yesterday evening, I saw him on the C.T.V. Late Night News last night and I saw him on the C.B.C. National News programme even later than that again last evening. So I saw three major newscasts yesterday in which the Prime Minister spoke on various things related to the country and to the Province but one, of course, which was of special interest because of this Resolution today.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious to me, having watched those three major newscasts, that the Prime Minister of this country is a real Dr. Jekell and Mr. Hyde, there is no doubt about that. I saw him on Here and Now yesterday evening, Mr. Speaker, and the Prime Minister was the essence of compromise. He was the essence of compromise on the Here and Now programme yesterday evening. He said - and I made quotes while I was listening to him, this is one thing he said, that 'The Premier is elected to defend the interests of the people of the Province', he said that yesterday evening. And he then said - which must have made the Opposition shiver in their shoes, Mr. Speaker - that Peckford 'is doing a good job'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, that must have been something to shake some shoes on the other side. That went right out across the Province. So he was the essence of compromise. You would say that things were really rosy. Then came the news cuts last night, Mr. Speaker, cuts of the speech to that now famous fund raising dinner that some of his colleagues on the other side had some very choice words to say about yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: But there were cuts taken from that speech last night and you would never say, having watched the Here and Now programme and seeing the news cuts last night, that you were listening to the same Prime Minister talking

MR. RIDEOUT: about the same Premier. There is no way you could come to that conclusion on the Late News last night. But, Mr. Speaker, as far as this Resolution was concerned, I was more interested in what he had to say about the offshore resources. I knew more about the Late News last night, Mr. Speaker, than some hon. gentlemen on the other side. At least I got home in time enough to see it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was more interested in what he had to say about the offshore resources because of this particular Resolution today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk lately from the gentlemen on the other side about confrontation policy. Every time you hear them opening their mouths lately, you hear about confrontation policy. And they got their own brand of confrontation last night, Mr. Speaker. They got their own brand of confrontation from the Prime Minister of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: The whole nation, everybody was watching the C.T.V. National News last night; the whole nation saw last night. We saw him as Prime Minister, we saw him as leader of the federal Liberal Party, we saw him turn to the Leader of the Opposition, we saw him turn to the leader of the Liberal Party in this Province and call his name. We saw that on the C.T.V. news clip last night. He called the leader's name and he said, 'You say you own it, 'Len' and I say you do not.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: There is what we saw last night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I can only report what I saw last night -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: - and that is quote, unquote on the C.T.V. National News, 'You say you own it, 'Len' and I say you do not.' Now, the question is, Mr. Speaker, how can you compromise with that kind of attitude? How can there not be confrontation with that kind of attitude? That is the real question. And that confrontation came from none other than the friend of the gentlemen opposite. Now, I would say that after that the only course that is open to the Leader of the Opposition now is to do what he told C.B.C. radio back in February or something he was going to do, or if he ever had the chance he would do it, and that would be to bargain away for other things our right to the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, he told that, we all heard it on the news broadcast in this Province that he would be willing - what is it he said? - 'to take advantage of the offshore development, to use that as a negotiating tool rather than a declaration of war'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is what he said in the news media of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the only avenue left open to him. In other words, after what the federal leader said to him last night, the only thing you can do, Mr. Speaker, is bend over and buckle down to the federal policy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: And that was the challenge that the Prime Minister, the leader of the federal Liberal Party, issued to the Leader of the Opposition, his counterpart in this Province, who hopes to become Premier of this Province one day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, there were other

May 6, 1981

Tape 1314

EC - 4

MR. RIDEOUT: interesting things developed in  
the statements yesterday, and a vital part of this Resolution,  
Mr. Speaker,

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

A vital part of this resolution deals with revenue sharing. I want to talk about that for a while. What does the Prime Minister say about revenue sharing? We know what our regulations are. Mr. Speaker, the Opposition, for almost over a year now, have been gloating in this House and around the Province about the Prime Minister's election statement made, I believe it was in February last year when he was here in the Province, when he said that Newfoundland would get 100 per cent of the revenue until we became a 'have' Province. A lot of people, I have heard them say it here in the House, I have heard them say it publicly that they were quite happy with that, that was a good situation.

Well, last night, Mr. Speaker, we got the definition of 100 per cent. We have been saying it for some time on this side, 'What does the 100 per cent mean? 100 per cent of what?' But last night we got the definition of 100 per cent. The Prime Minister said it himself: It was 100 per cent of the 45 per cent provincial share that Alberta gets now. And, of course, that is going to be reduced now, Mr. Speaker, by the national energy policy to 43 per cent. There is nobody saying it cannot be reduced to 38 per cent next year or to 20 per cent the year after that. That is what he told us, that is what the 100 per cent means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are three things wrong with that. We get nothing extra out of this formula that he suggested while we are struggling to achieve the 'have' status, not a thing extra do we get; the equalization dollar slides away on the one side if the oil revenues come in on the other side. Alberta gets 100 per cent of their 45 per cent now, to be reduced to 43 per cent if the national energy policy comes in place.



MR. T. RIDEOUT: They get that now as of right. What are we going to get as of right if the Prime Minister has his way? The CBC did not ask him that question last night. What do we get as of right? Alberta is getting their share now. They are getting 100 per cent of their 45 per cent, which will be reduced to 43 if the national energy policy goes through. What are we going to get? That question has not been asked, that question has not been answered. So I have to say what will become of us? What will happen to us after we achieve the 'have' status? Alberta will still get their 45 per cent - they are 'have' now - or their 43 per cent, whatever it is. Once we achieve that point, are we going to be slashed in half? Are we going to be told that we cannot have that much anymore?

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of things the Prime Minister said last night have been proposed in writing to this Province. The last thing that we had in this Province was the proposed Maritime Energy Agreement and I believe that that was 1975 or 1976. There has not been any proposal in writing along the lines that he made last night. We have said, this Province has said consistently that we are prepared to share our wealth with other parts of Canada, our regulations spell it out. There have even been more liberal up to this point in time than the federal regulations. So we are prepared to share - that is not the point. We do not want to be faced with mathematical problems. It is a philosophical principle that has to be dealt with here, Mr. Speaker. And it has to be dealt with, it must be dealt with and it has not been dealt with up to this point in time. Throwing mathematical figures at us is not going to bring about any solution. There was no talk in his dissertation last night about control, no talk about

MR. T. RIDEOUT: the rate and type of development. These are questions that we cannot address and that we cannot do anything about, Mr. Speaker, unless we have the ownership of the resource. Will they suck it out as fast as they can? We do not want that to happen. Now these are questions that must be addressed and they were not addressed in the Prime Minister's statement last night.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is why the statement by the Prime Minister last night to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was so important, 'You say you own it and I do not!' In other words, 'Take us to court'. Well, if you go to court, Mr. Speaker, we may win, we may lose, I do not know. I happen to believe we have a good case from what I have seen. But other provinces of Canada did not have to go to court. Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba did not go to court in 1930, Mr. Speaker, there was a political settlement arranged, there was a political will to do it, and it was done at the time by a Liberal Government in Ottawa. Now what is the problem today? What is the problem today? The problem is not talking, Mr. Speaker. The problem is that we have not had a proposal since 1975. They have stuck to their guns, the Maritime Energy Proposal is the only one we had. We had them come down here last night, threw a bunch of mathematics at us and nobody dared ask him the question, 'What happens when you achieve 'have' status?' We know what the situation is in Alberta, they still get their 100 per cent of their 45 per cent, we know that. Does Newfoundland still

MR. RIDEOUT: get the 100 per cent of its forty-five? It might be forty-three by then, Mr. Speaker. It might be twenty by then, because of the national energy policy and because of the Frontier Oil Exploration Act that is before the House of Commons now.

This is a philosophical principle that this Province has to stand firm on. We have to stand firm on our ownership because without the ownership, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that we can manage, control the rate and type of development and thereby lessen the impacts, the negative impacts on this Province when that particular resource is gone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how there could be any political disagreement on this. The motion is a very conciliatory motion. Unfortunately I had to deal with the very provocative statements, especially the confrontation and the challenge that the Leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, the Prime Minister, threw at the Leader of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador (Mr. Stirling). Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to move the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obviously very difficult to take part in this debate on the resolution just presented by the hon. member without remembering that a year ago that hon. member was energy spokesman for this Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: One has got to remember that. (Inaudible) and I do not want either, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: I do not want either,

Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: I am not sure, I tried to make my own mind up on the hon. member's performance this past - since he crossed and joined the government. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that he feels very insignificant sitting where he is sitting. And this side of the House has made no attempts, as he knows since he crossed the House, to draw attention to the fact that he crossed, that he was a turncoat, as some people say, right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: He crossed on a phoney issue, Mr. Speaker, and he is more and more being recognized as the hon. member who crossed the House on a very phoney issue. Now, it is not our fault, it is not this side's fault, Mr. Speaker, that the member feels that he has to draw attention to himself by bringing in this kind of a resolution, a resolution that is couched in politics.

Now, let me deal with this resolution as he did, clause for clause. I am only going to pick a couple of clauses. This resolution is sloppy, badly put together, and it contains untruths.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Listen to the WHEREAS, Mr. Speaker. "AND WHEREAS the Province has the regulations" - I can accept the regulations - "and the expertise necessary for the wise development of our offshore".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege, by the invitation of the Newfoundland Government, accompanied by the Leader of the Opposition, to attend a petroleum symposium in this Province, and the expertise

MR. FLIGHT: from all over the world regarding offshore development and oil development was present. And not only, Mr. Speaker, did it become very apparent that we do not have the expertise as a Province to deal with some of the things that will have to be dealt with out there - I mean, the only expertise we have is confined to the Petroleum Directorate. Now, hon. members can take the Petroleum Directorate, the listing of the salaries, and we can look at what some of those people did prior to being appointed, and then you have to wonder whereby the expertise.

But here is the important point, Mr. Speaker: Speaker after speaker after speaker after speaker at that symposium stood up - they had no axe to grind, they were not part of Mobil, they were not representing the federal government, they were not representing the provincial government, they were people, experts, probably the greatest experts in the world, invited by the Petroleum Directorate to give their positions, to address themselves to the technical problems that we are going to face. And speaker after speaker, Mr. Speaker, got up and not only said that not only did Newfoundland not have the expertise, but the expertise might not exist in the world to bring in the offshore the way that the hon. government is saying they want to bring it in, re the pipeline concept. It might not exist in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: We have been fed, the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, for years, have been fed on the theory we are going to have a pipeline, a pipeline in. Now, Mr. Speaker, speaker after speaker stood up at the Petroleum Directorate and to a point where the Petroleum Directorate and their spokesman could

MR. FLIGHT: not take it any more -  
and Mr. Cabot Martin out of frustration had to get up  
and insult some of the experts who had come because he  
could not accept the fact of life, the fact of life  
being that either we may be prepared - and it is our  
decision and I am quite prepared to be party to  
making that decision. We are going to have to decide  
that the production of offshore is delayed by ten or  
fifteen or twenty years, or twenty-five years, to give  
us the time to develop the expertise that will allow us  
to bring that oil ashore by pipeline. And it is not  
only the ice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

member who was present at that symposium was the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), And it is not only the ice that creates a problem with the pipeline concept, it is the temperature of the water, the depth of the water. They are not convinced that that oil can be brought ashore by pipeline without having to put in pumping stations all the way. It is unbelievable the kind of a thing they might have to look at. And that expertise and that technology is not in place in the world, let alone in Newfoundland, and then a clause says, 'we have the expertise'.

So, Mr. Speaker, you know you could go on and on and take the resolution apart on that basis. But I do not intend to deal with the resolution anymore, Mr. Speaker, I intend to amend the resolution.

MR. NEARY: You do not intend to do what?

MR. FLIGHT: I do not intend to discuss the resolution as presented. I intend to amend the resolution and Mr. Speaker, I am going to move a forthright amendment in keeping with the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) that says we do not want partisan politics to get in this debate, we want to discuss the issues -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: - we want to discuss the issues as they are. And, Mr. Speaker, I hereby move, seconded by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), that the resolution be amended by deleting all the words after "whereas" and replacing them with the following:

"WHEREAS the position of the House of Assembly is that offshore mineral oil and gas resources are owned by the Province, and;  
WHEREAS the wise and controlled development of offshore resources is important to the future of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, and;

MR. FLIGHT:

"WHEREAS the Prime Minister has expressed a willingness to discuss either a political or a court settlement," and that is key, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people, a lot of Newfoundlanders across this Province last night heard -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: I do not mind the member taking a line or two out of context. But a lot of Newfoundlanders heard the Prime Minister of this country, and a lot of people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: - and it was proven less than a year ago, as the hon. member knows, that a lot of Newfoundlanders are prepared to take -

MR. MARSHALL: Finish your amendment.

MR. FLIGHT: - prepared to take the Prime Minister's word.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

AND WHEREAS -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have to ask the member if he would read the amendment so I can make a decision on whether it is in order or not.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, I will continue on with the whereases, Mr. Speaker.

AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister has expressed a willingness to discuss either a political settlement or a court settlement;  
BE IT RESOLVED THEREFORE that this House reassert its position that we own the offshore resources;  
AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the provincial government express its willingness to meet the federal government to consider a co-



MR. FLIGHT:                   operative and joint development of the offshore resources so that the controlled development can take place for the benefit of our people while the question of ownership is being resolved.

I so move, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:                On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):         May I have the amendment in writing please.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:                Mr. Speaker, that amendment is so blatantly out of order the wonder of it is that it could ever be proposed.

It is not, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:         Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:                - it is not permissible, Mr. Speaker, to negate the main motion with an amendment.

MR. MORGAN:                 Do not be so stupid, boy.

MR. MARSHALL:                You cannot, Mr. Speaker, and I quote Beauchesne, page 154, "Form and Content of Amendments".

And you will find there, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot bring in an amendment, "An amendment proposing a direct negative, though it may be covered up in verbiage, is out of order."

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman are doing with this, which is their wont because they are embarrassed by the resolution passed by the hon. member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:         Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY:                Do not be so childish. Grow up boy, grow up.

MR. MARSHALL: This is a tactic, Mr. Speaker, Instead of 'The hon. House urge the federal government to reconsider its position on offshore minerals and recognize the Province's legitimate right to ownership and control of them', it is for 'the House to reassert its right to ownership'. It has nothing to do, Mr. Speaker, with the federal government reconsidering its position on offshore. The hon. gentleman has gotten right at the nub of the problem that confronts this Province in the resolution which he has passed. The hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to try to erase it and obscure it from the minds of the public, As such they can attempt to do it but they cannot do it outside the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, and propose an amendment which so obviously in its terms negates the present motion. And let it be known that they are trying to do this, Mr. Speaker, not just as a tactic, but to try to obscure their position which is contrary to the interests of all Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: To that point of order,

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the amendment which was brought in by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), that negates the motion by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). Mr. Speaker, we sought the advice of the clerks on this and the main motion - the 'Whereases' are not as important as the main motion. The main motion of the member for Baie Verte-White Bay reads: 'BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House urge the federal government to reconsider its position on offshore minerals and recognize the Province's legitimate right to ownership and control of them'.

MR. STIRLING: We are not changing that.

MR. HODDER: We are not changing that, Mr. Speaker, we say: BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House reassert its position that we own the offshore resource. So Mr. Speaker, the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) there opposite -

MR. STIRLING: A good try 'Bill'.

MR. HODDER: - is just trying to waste the time -

MR. STIRLING: A good try.

MR. HODDER: - the twenty minutes which the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has to respond in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

To the point of order; first of all let me say that the Chair is in a little bit of a difficult situation because I think we are treading a very fine line here and it would appear, you know, at a glance that it does negate the resolution brought in by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay. However, I want to give the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans the benefit of the doubt so I will just take a very brief recess to confer with legal advice at the table on the amendment.

MR. FLIGHT: Recess does not come out of the time.

MR. SPEAKER: That is right. The recess does not come out of the time.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

Is it agreed we proceed? With respect to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (G. Flight), I would like to quote the following authorities and direct members' attention to that. I might say to hon. members at the outset of this matter, that it is one of those questions of degree which always presents a difficult problem for the Chair.

First of all, I quote Standing Order 36 which states, 'A motion may be amended by leaving out certain words, or b) by leaving out certain words in order to insert other words, or c) by inserting or adding other words.' This amendment falls into category b). Secondly, Beauchesne, Fifth edition, page 153, paragraph 425 says, 'The object of an amendment may be to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question which must, however, be relevant to the subject of the question.' It appears to me that the purpose of this amendment coincides with references in Beauchesne, that the object is to effect such alterations in the motion that could obtain the support of those who would not support it in its original form. So, it appears to me within the general principle and the purpose of the amendment as referred to specifically by Beauchesne in paragraph 425. And, finally, I quote Sir Erskine May, Parliamentary Practices, Nineteenth Edition, page 387 and I quote "The object of an amendment may be either to modify a question in such a way as to increase its acceptability, or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative to the original question.

The latter purpose may be effected by moving to omit all or most of the words of the question

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): after the first word and to substitute in their place other words of a different import. In that case the debate that follows is not restricted to the amendment, but includes the purpose both of the amendment and of the motion, both matters being under consideration of the House as an alternative proposition.' Thus, having considered the matter, I rule that the amendment of the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (G. Flight) is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans has about eighteen minutes.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me in the little time that is left, get to the nub of the matter. There is something I want to say here. And I want to put aside once and for all the ownership - the contest of ownership. Mr. Speaker, this Opposition stands four square on ownership. We own the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, accepts the concept that we own the offshore. The Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador accepts the concept that we own the offshore.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, let us not waste time in this House any more determining the position of the Opposition. We own the offshore. And the hon. member is right, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition last night told the Prime Minister that we own the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, I do not particularly care - and I am speaking for this Opposition - I do not particularly care at this stage what the position of the federal government is on offshore. Everybody has positions on everything. Our position is we own the offshore, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And here is where this Province is being led down the drain, Mr. Speaker, and here is where there may be a terrible injustice being perpetrated on the people of this Province by the present administration. We also know, and more and more Newfoundlanders are getting to realize, that if the ownership was resolved tomorrow, if there was a resolution of the ownership tomorrow in this Province's favour, that you would then have to go into a joint agreement. We would have to develop that offshore jointly with Ottawa even with the ownership resolved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we just saw something a few days ago that indicated to the people of this Province whether we should or should not have - we have hung our hats on the success of that offshore. We saw a budget, Mr. Speaker, that told the people very plainly -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: - that the only way we can address the needs of the people of this Province, the only way we can maintain basic services in this Province, the only way we can maintain our roads, is if we get the revenue from offshore.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Well, whether he likes it or lumps it, the Premier has hung the financial credibility of this

MR. FLIGHT: Province on offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be a salvation, there can only be a salvation one way, it has to be developed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: We have to have the revenue from that offshore. If we are in a position, Mr. Speaker, if the government thinks - and I can see myself concurring - if the government thinks that we can say to Mobil, 'Look, go away and come back twenty-five years from now because we have all the money we want to run our Province, we can provide the water and sewer services, the oil will not spoil, leave it there; we do not agree with Trudeau, we do not agree with you; go away until the political atmosphere in this country changes twenty-five years from now' - now if we can say that to our people, then I would say, to hell with Mobil, to hell with the federal government. But we cannot and that budget of a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, told the story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: The government's dealing with the workers in the Trade School told the story.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to the people of this Province and the members of this House of Assembly -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - is that we have to have a negotiated settlement on the offshore. Now, what is wrong, Mr. Speaker? I challenge the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) when he stands next Wednesday to tell me what is wrong with this: Had that oil been discovered on the Gaff Topsails, Mr. Speaker, there would have been none of this political kerfuffle this past five years. If that oil was discovered on the Gaff Topsails we would have gone into

MR. FLIGHT: development. All the constitutional arrangements governing royalties and governing profit sharing would have been in place. I challenge any member on the opposite side to tell me, had that oil been found at the Gaff Topsails, would we have gone through what we are going through? Well, Trudeau has said to the 500,000 Newfoundlanders last night that you can have control of the offshore; we will treat it the same as if it was on land, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trudeau said that you can have control of the offshore, develop the offshore, have the same profit sharing on the offshore as if it was developed on land. Now, how can the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) go back to Baie Verte? How can he stand up in LaScie and convince the people of LaScie that we can get any better deal on oil than if it were on land? Well, let us put away the rest, let us put away the political nonsense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in this Province. And it is happening more and more, and you would be surprised how the attitude has changed in the past six months, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: There is a real concern because of the fed bashing. Because of the confrontation stance of this government, Mobil may indeed be looking at putting an infrastructure in Halifax, they may indeed be gearing up to be in a position to control the development or to invest their money, they may indeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us assume -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: We would not make a fool of the fisheries.



May 6, 1981

Tape 1320

EC - 4

MR. FLIGHT: Could I have order, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MOORES: We would not make a mess of the Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, let us go out and ask the people of Newfoundland - again I go back to the old theory, Mr. Sneaker, who cares, who will care? The Petroleum Directorate has told us that based on their projected level of yearly production, based on the known reserves, the oil would only last in Hibernia for twenty years. Only three of those twenty we will not have to get equalization for. Now, who in Newfoundland cares, Mr. Speaker, whether we own the offshore after all the oil is gone? Who cares whether we own a piece of real estate 200 miles offshore under 4,000 or 5,000 feet of water? The concern of the average Newfoundlander in this Province, Mr. Speaker, is that this government negotiate and develop that offshore in a way where the financial benefits, every last cent, accrues to Newfoundland, and they could not care less about the ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: And there is evidence, Mr. Speaker, there is evidence that this is not happening. There is evidence every day, and more and more people - the business community of this Province and this city, Mr. Speaker, is becoming more and more nervous about the way that this government is dealing with the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FLIGHT: More and more they see the possibility of the profits that they want to make being made in Halifax. And let me say something else, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in anyone's mind who attended that symposium and listened to the experts of the world, that the production method out there is going to be by tanker. There will be no pipeline come ashore to bring that oil ashore, unless we are in a position to put off production for twenty-five years. Are we? Are we in a position to put off the production for twenty-five years? If we are not we are going to produce it from the wellhead by tanker. And if the government is capable of bringing Come By Chance into production, we can use 100,000 barrels a day. The other 100,000 barrels a day is going to head to the Eastern Seaboard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, tell me, can that operation be done, can that kind of production programme be done from Halifax? Can it or can it not? Can it be done from Halifax or can it not? Mobil has put \$450 million already into exploration, untold billions, Mr. Speaker, in order to get into production. Do you think they are so stupid, do you think the people of Newfoundland have no respect for a company like Mobil or a company like Abitibi-Price or any of the major companies? Do you think the people with that company are not as smart as some of the ministry over there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FLIGHT: Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that while they watch the petty politics, the purely petty politics - the Premier believes and his members believe that he has an issue that they can win an election on, and they can wipe out the Opposition? Well, Mr. Speaker, he had better start doing some polling - use the offshore and ask the people out there in Lewisporte and in St. Anthony

MR. FLIGHT: and in Deer Lake and in Badger what they think, what they want from their offshore, Mr. Speaker. And there is a real danger, Mr. Speaker -

DR. COLLINS: Very much like the Upper Churchill.

MR. FLIGHT: The Lower Churchill is a good example. This government, Mr. Speaker, hoodwinked the people of this Province for nine years on the Lower Churchill, wasted billions of dollars -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: - hundreds of millions of dollars, Mr. Speaker, and hoodwinked for purely partisan reasons and are still doing it, and what did they find out, Mr. Speaker? They found out they did not have the money, the expertise, the political will or anything else to develop the Lower Churchill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FLIGHT: So what did they do? What did they do a year ago? They went to Ottawa, cap in hand, Mr. Speaker, to use an old phrase, cap in hand, and said, We want to develop the Lower Churchill, we recognize we can only do it with your support, with your expertise, with your kind of support. And we drew up LCDC, a great corporation that one day may develop the Lower Churchill. But who made it possible, Mr. Speaker? Is that concept not workable with the offshore? Would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) not be prepared to have a 51/49 controlling interest by way of making all the decisions like LCDC? No.

MR. MOORES: Yes or no.

MR. FLIGHT: You can do it with the Lower Churchill, you cannot do it on the offshore? Do you know why you cannot do it on the offshore? What would this Premier have done, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MOORES: No, that is not what he meant.

MR. FLIGHT: We found out five years ago that there was oil out there. Well, this Province has been here for 400. We have had prime ministers who had to cope with managing this Province. What would Brian Peckford, having assumed the leadership from Frank Moores, what would he have done if there was no offshore out there? We would still have had to have lived as a Province. What would he have done? What issue would he have hung his hat on? How would he have maintained the services, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible) going to Ottawa with your tin cup.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, the Premier and every one -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - of his quislings believes in their hearts that they have an issue, a political issue that they can win an election on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: But, Mr. Speaker -

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no agreement.  
The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I only have a few moments, I deserve to be heard in silence, On the opposite side I do not expect to be understood but at least to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment which has been allowed as, Your Honour in his wisdom has allowed it -

MR. STIRLING: Questioning the Speaker now.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I am not questioning the Speaker.  
It is a marvellous ruling that the Speaker - the Speaker always

MR. MARSHALL: makes good rulings, the Speaker always makes a good decision but I am so happy that Your Honour in your wisdom has seen fit to allow the amendment because it allows the Opposition once again to embarrass themselves on a very basic issue before the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman there opposite in his remarks -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) last night in your (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: - and I do not propose to deal at great length with them, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MARSHALL: 'What they want to do, the hon. gentlemen there opposite, they want to say, 'We own the offshore and we just want to leave it at that, we believe we own the offshore.' Now, that is what he said. Is he prepared, are he and the members of the Opposition prepared to go to Ottawa and say to the federal government, Because we own the offshore we want the same rights from the offshore as Manitoba got in 1930, Saskatchewan got in 1930, as Quebec after Confederation when it did half of its territory? Would they go to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and say they are going to disassociate themselves -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - from the federal party if they do not stand for the proper position for the development of Newfoundland? What the hon. gentleman wants to do, he proposes a programme, Mr. Speaker, the same type of programme that they had before, that is the give-it-away programme and the programme which is going to put ourselves down the road to disaster and make ourselves tenants in the -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible)  
last night than you have in the last five years.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I ask -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - tenants in our own land as we have been in the case of the Upper Churchill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to address myself to the main resolution, which I am permitted to do, and I want to first of all congratulate the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) for bringing in this resolution and particularly congratulate the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) for the fine speech

MR. MARSHALL: which he made in the House this afternoon. More than any person in this Province, Mr. Speaker, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has shown where he stands on this issue, where he stands as a Newfoundlander. He had the courage of his convictions, Mr. Speaker, to make the stand which he took and he took the stand. If other Newfoundlanders in the Liberal party would take stands similar to that - I am not suggesting they come over here, Mr. Speaker, because we are very choosy, but if the hon. gentlemen would take stands which are similar to the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), we would have a united Newfoundland on this and we would be much further ahead in the development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, let it be understood on this matter which is before us and which is very topical today, that the position of this government has always been that the appropriate means of resolving the offshore dispute is through the constitutional process. In order to implement the constitutional process, Mr. Speaker, there obviously have to be discussions, so the hon. House is well aware of the fact that this government is quite prepared at any time to have discussions toward resolution of this matter by a constitutional process and that this is the only acceptable manner to this government. The route of court is not acceptable, as has been threatened to us. Now, when we say discussions, I want to make it quite plain, when we say discussions we are not willing to negotiate in the way that the hon. gentlemen there opposite want to negotiate. We are not prepared, Mr. Speaker, when there is any blood in this government or any breath, to negotiate away inherent rights basic to Newfoundlanders. And we cannot afford to do that, Mr. Speaker, anymore than

MR. MARSHALL: we can afford to negotiate the volume of oxygen that we breathe every day, that we require. And the analogy, Mr. Speaker, is exactly the same because this is what this Province requires and this Province is prepared at all times, has been ready, willing and able to discuss matters leading to a constitutional resolution of this matter but certainly is not willing, Mr. Speaker, to negotiate away the inherent rights of the people of this Province that the hon. gentlemen - I do not say they are anxious to, but they would in their own ingrained stupidity, as they have shown by the amendment that they have led into this House, Mr. Speaker. And I will tell you why, I will give you one of the reasons why we are not prepared to negotiate and what we mean by negotiating away things. We are not prepared, Mr. Speaker, to see the Province of Newfoundland in the years to come, the Island of Newfoundland become like Bell Island was. We know what happened on Bell Island, Mr. Speaker. The directors of DOSCO at the time, spurred on by the shareholders of DOSCO at the time, took as much as they possibly could as quickly as they could, realized what profits were there and they left, as the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) knows, they left a very unfortunate if not a disastrous situation behind them. There was, Mr. Speaker, no



MR. W. MARSHALL:

control, the shareholders of Dosco, Mr. Speaker, that is what resulted. Now, what is going to happen here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I only have the allotted time, hon. members can get in the debate if they wish to.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen here if we start negotiating away basic rights such as ownership and control? What will happen is the rate of development will be set by the federal government. That is, in effect, what will happen. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a fact of life that the majority shareholders in Canada are Ontario and Quebec. Quebec has seventy-five seats, Ontario has in excess of eighty-five, I believe. So they have by far the majority of seats in this country.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is obviously in their interests, it is in their interests, Mr. Speaker, to exploit that resource. If we take the conditions of the present day it is obviously in their interests to exploit this resource as quickly as they possibly can. Because, understandably, the people of Ontario and the people in Quebec are interested in maintaining the way of their industrial life which is, Mr. Speaker, directly dependent nowadays on matters like oil and gas.

So, Mr. Speaker, what will happen if this Province has not got control? You can believe you me it will be that the rate of development will be determined - Now this is just one instance - the rate of development will be determined by the federal government. The federal government, obviously, is going to respond, as we have seen in the past, to the majority shareholders, as it were, in the

MR. W. MARSHALL: Canadian nation, that is Ontario and Quebec, and they will take the resource as fast as they can without - now they will have some heed certainly to this Province, they have to, sort of like a patronizing heed as they have shown in the past towards people who they regard as perpetual recipients of welfare. They will have a certain regard, they are not completely heartless that way, but their main concern has got to be, Mr. Speaker, those seats in Ontario and Quebec. And the hon. gentlemen there opposite know that I speak the truth and that is one of the major, major problems.

We are not going to create another Bell Island in the Province of Newfoundland. We are not going to put the Province of Newfoundland as another Bell Island. I am giving an example of what happens. The hon. gentleman full knows what the situation is. So that is one of the major reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we must have - now we must have control of our destiny and at the same time, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: - at the same time, apart from the revenues as members of the Canadian nation, of course we will share. And I bitterly resent the accusations made from time to time by the Right Honourable gentleman, the present Prime Minister of Canada, insinuating that this Province and these people are not willing to share. They share, Mr. Speaker, and they have shared amply over the years. They are sharing every year to the tune of \$500, now \$600 million from the Upper Churchill resources that go into the Province of Quebec. And here again we are prevented from going through the Province of Quebec. Why? We are part of the Canadian nation. The same thing is going to happen. We are prevented from going through the Province of Quebec because the Province of Quebec has seventy-five seats. And the federal government

MR. W. MARSHALL: is not going to jeopardize its position there. I mean, it is a fact of life.

Now, we are willing to share.

I was somewhat amused yesterday to see the Prime Minister on Here and Now. As I saw him, he was talking about the share of the federal government being 10 per cent in Alberta and they were trying to get it up to 11 per cent or 12 per cent or 13 per cent. Well, Mr. Speaker, under our regulations, with us having ownership and control, the share which the federal government will have will be 25 per cent. So all he has to do, Mr. Speaker, all he has to do, if he does not wish to have the battle he has with Alberta, is just give us the oil and gas and we will give him 25 per cent. We are quite prepared to share. We are prepared to share Mr. Speaker, but we are not prepared, when we realize that the Government of Canada, which is our federal government, is dictated to now, as it has been since 1867, be it Liberal, be it Tory or whatever shape it may be - we are not in this Province ever again going to have our destiny dictated by the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec which is what is going to happen if the hon. gentlemen there opposite have their way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Ah, now, the hon. gentleman loves that.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSAHLL: I will get on to the separatist-

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - in the middle, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, you respond to people - well, I will not say it. You do not respond to people - really you should not say with people you have contempt for you do not respond to so I will not say it. But I do not have contempt for the hon. gentleman personally, but I do have contempt, extreme contempt for his ideas, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is all they can say. The move made by the hon. the Prime Minister yesterday

MR. MARSHALL: when he was speaking, the move -  
he said 'negotiate or take it to court'. With the will-  
ing concurrence of the members opposite they would have  
us negotiate and negotiate it all the way and I say there is  
a marked distinction between discussions and negotiations  
of basic, inherent rights. But let us take the matter of  
court. The hon. gentlemen there opposite have said from  
time to time -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: - the hon. gentlemen there opposite  
have said from time to time, their statements yesterday were  
consistent. " We believe we own the offshore but we should  
take it to court". We believe, Mr. Speaker, instead of that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - Mr. Speaker, we believe instead  
of that, that ownership and control of

MR. MARSHALL: our resources, which are the resources under the seabed and belong to this Province, that they should be, even if it is necessary, which apparently it is, that the Federal Government should confirm them simply by passing legislation in the same way they were prepared to pass legislation for the benefit of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and Quebec, And the wonder of it is, Mr. Speaker, that they will not do that. Now, why will they not do it? And let us not be deluded. The fact of the matter is, and the reason why they will not do it is because we have seven seats, Quebec has seventy-five seats, Ontario has eighty-five seats.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact of life but we should not, Mr. Speaker, be treated -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: Is there any reason that the hon. gentlemen there opposite can tell us why we have to be treated any differently than the other provinces of Canada have in the historical makeup of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to restrain himself.

MR. MARSHALL: We have always, Mr. Speaker, as I say, been willing to talk and discuss. But we will never in this government, while there is any breath to breathe in it or any integrity in it, and there will be until the day it goes, which will be a long period of time, we are not willing to negotiate away inherent, basic rights basic to the survival of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and the economic and social welfare.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I look at and I do not desire to get on with the statements that the hon. the Prime Minister comes down here-and the hon. gentlemen there opposite would like to characterize it as being a holding out of the olive branch and maybe it is, but if the Right Honourable gentleman, the Prime Minister of Canada wishes to take a different tack than he has taken in the past, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the most appropriate means of doing that is by communicating from the head of the national government to the head of the provincial government and not to a meeting of party hacks which was financed by the contractors who are supporting the Liberal Party.

And , Mr. Speaker, when you come down to it, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear that 'Morgan'.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: I do not see, Mr. Speaker, any evidence from what the hon. the Prime Minister has said, any evidence of any conciliatory manner. I have heard it reported, although I did not listen, Mr. Speaker, to what he said, I am not in the habit of wanting to particularly spend my evenings listening to a speech by the hon. gentleman, but when he gets on the - when he is reported on the public airwaves of this Province as calling his counterpart power hungry, I guess we know Mr. Speaker, who is in a confrontational position.

I do not think that there was any more cynical statement that has ever been made by a leader of the federal government than what was reported by the hon. Leader when he said, ' if the Premier wants to put his power through Quebec, let him string lines through Quebec', or words to that effect. I believe that is what he is quoted as saying.

MR. MARSHALL: That, Mr. Speaker, is a statement of extreme cynicism. It does not, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: It does not indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, a statement of a man who is of a conciliatory nature who wishes to, in his words, negotiate, we say discuss in good faith to give the people of this Province the same rights as they have in other provinces. It does not indicate—and what about that particular situation, Mr. Speaker? Where do the Opposition stand on that? That is a national disgrace, the very fact that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien), the other day when he was down, stated that there could be no power corridor through Quebec until we had an agreement. Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been presented to the Federal Government a letter of intent from the Power Authority, State of New York, and what is happening, Mr. Speaker, with respect to all of this? It all translates very sadly back once again to the position where we have only seven seats in the central government and Ontario and Quebec are pulling the strings or boarding up the boundaries or whatever have you. And it is rather unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, when one gets up on this side and speaks for provincial rights - from time to time the hon. gentlemen there opposite, the only solace they have is to say, anti-confederate, against Confederation and all of these particular things.

Mr. Speaker, we are as much Canadians as the hon. gentlemen there opposite, would that the hon. gentlemen there opposite were as much Newfoundlanders and exhibited that they were as much Newfoundlanders as the gentlemen on this side.

MR. MARSHALL: I had somebody, Mr. Speaker, just say to me yesterday that he had voted Liberal on several occasions, he is an independent voter, but he said he does not, he cannot see with the stand of the Provincial Liberal Party with respect to our offshore resources, how he could ever call himself a Newfoundlander and cast a ballot for them again while they maintain their present position.

And that is it, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. gentlemen want to say that we are



MR. MARSHALL: anti-Confederate-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: -I would like to turn it around on a positive basis and say it is time for the hon. gentlemen to be pro-Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and to be for Newfoundland and at the same time they can be for Canada. But believe you me, Mr. Speaker, let me say this in closing, number one, this government has always believed that the constitutional process is the manner for the resolution of this particular matter.

The fact of the matter is that the federal government is attempting - there is no little significance to the fact that the Right Honourable Prime Minister yesterday on TV mentioned the SIU case. I am sure he is too busy to know all of the labour relations matters that are before the courts from time to time. So we know what the hon. gentleman there opposite, what their intent is. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we believe discussion, number one, we believe through the constitutional process that this matter should be resolved, and, Mr. Speaker, the way in which this particular matter has been addressed by the hon. gentlemen there opposite certainly leaves them lacking now as never before.

Because we have only seven seats in Ottawa, we require, need the support of all Newfoundlanders in this great matter which is so vital to our economic and social well being. We do not require weasle words which come from the Opposition, as they come, we do not - Mr. Speaker, to hear of them getting up at their do last night, which, as I say, was paid for by

MR. MARSHALL: those contractors who were their friends -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentlemen said they were their contractors, were their friends, who were bound and determined to get them back into power in the hopes that they will get such things as the Public Tender Act, and what have you, amended. But to see, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders getting up and applauding a spectacle like that makes one wonder how they got the gaul to reside in this Province, let alone purport to attempt to represent the interests of Newfoundlanders.

If the hon. gentlemen there opposite want to represent the interests of Newfoundlanders, let them take a stand for Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, let them take a stand for Newfoundland so that we can do something to counteract the fact that we have only seven seats in Ottawa as apart from the two Central provinces of Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is our position. I congratulate the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) again. I say that there should be a statue erected to the man, that the man has the courage of his convictions to do what he did and to take the stand he did. I know that he represents the views of most Newfoundlanders. If a few party hacks on the Liberal side of the House, and who are outside, who can afford these plush \$300 dinners would adopt the same attitude, Mr. Speaker, we would have a better Newfoundland not just for the present but for future generations yet to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Eagle River.

The hon. the member for

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the amendment of this resolution: "BE IT RESOLVED that the House reassert its position that we own the offshore rights".

It was former Premier Smallwood who had two professors from the university - who put a plaque out on the Grand Banks. The first drilling on the Grand Banks came under the Smallwood administration. The \$450 million that was being drilled by Mobil out there as a result of Hibernia, is a result of the federal Liberal Government initiative and tax incentives which allowed Mobil Oil to write that off.

So I would say, Mr. Speaker, to this House and to the people of this Province, as much as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) and the government members, and the private members would like to think, we have no intentions of selling out our birth-right, and we have no intentions of giving away any of our resources.

For the past ten years - they got in, and they got in power from the point of view that the government was going bankrupt. We had \$800 million debt, and we had twenty-three years of a Liberal government and service. After ten years we have now \$3.2 billion, Mr. Speaker, and they know, the government know and the people know, and now are beginning to realize around this Province that this government is continually turning around and saying, 'We cannot do anything because Ottawa will not give us anything'. Yet, sixty cents of every dollar comes from

MR. HISCOCK: Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

And I am rather concerned that this government continues to not only bash the federal government, but bash anybody who has an opinion opposite from themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) just mentioned, and turned about and said, 'The gaul', for these 350 or 400 people to get up and applaud the Prime Minister of Canada, not even Newfoundlanders, the nerve to live in the Province. As I said, and I said it before, this government has a very close streak of Fascism in it and if it were allowed to - rampant. And the members of the government, the private members, Mr. Speaker, have their duty to turn around and keep a restraint on this House Leader and also upon the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I want

MR. HISCOCK:

to get to more detailed things about this resolution. And with regard to the amount of income coming from Ottawa, do they not realize the amount of money that it takes to run this Province? Do they not realize that the majority of things that are done in this Province are the result of the federal government? Do they not realize that in Labrador, Mr. Speaker, here we have a road, a coastal Labrador road? The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) turned around and said that if we are going to solve the problem of the jurisdiction it is not going to be done by the courts, it is going to be by the constitution consultation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this question, how come the Premier of the Province

can fly up to Ottawa, be available to the national press and give his views on the Quebec referendum? Now, that the Premier is elected again in Quebec -

MR. HANCOCK: He was upset (inaudible) a breakdown.

MR. HISCOCK: - not only turn around and say that, but now compliment the Government of Quebec on the re-election of the Parti Quebecois and Mr. Levesque. Here we are a government supporting, even though they got re-elected as most people say on good government, they got elected on promises and never be so naïve as to think that they did not get elected on other than promises.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: But here is a PQ government that claims Labrador as part of their own province, and here we have a government and a Premier supporting and saying we are glad to have him back in the Canadian fold.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Relevance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK:

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the offshore development -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

- we need consultation in this Province and we have not had consultation with our own unions, we have not had consultation with the fish companies, we have not had consultation with the provinces, and we do not have consultation with the Prime Minister or with the minister.

Mr. Peckford again, our Premier, was up in Ottawa with regard to the Premiers, to try to come up with an amending formula. And today the headline in the paper is, 'The Premiers are now rowing over the amending formula! They cannot agree among themselves. And I would like to turn around and ask this House, when he was up in Ottawa for the second and third time, did he call up the federal minister and say, 'I am in Ottawa, let us get together and talk about the genuine concerns of this Province. Let us talk about getting this coastal Labrador DREE agreement signed. Let us talk about getting the roads agreement signed'?

MR. HANCOCK:

(Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker, and the reason why is that this government wants to go another year or another year and a half fed bashing, and then they will go back to the Province and ask for a mandate from the people of this Province, and ask to be given it on what thing? - oh, the Liberals, what are the Liberals known for? Selling down the birthright, giving away resources, giving away the Upper Churchill, giving away Hibernia, giving away this. And I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, as much as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) would like to think, there are only three members over on this side who were in Mr. Smallwood's

MR. HISCOCK: administration. And I would like to go on record now as seeing the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) read the booklet of the 333. I am proud of what Smallwood did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: I am proud of what Smallwood did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: I am a product of Smallwood. I am in this House because of the education policies of Smallwood, and most people are in this House, and most people are in this Province, having the advancement of what Smallwood did. And to turn around and think that we are going to deny our birthright and what - as much as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) would like to think, Mr. Speaker, with regards to this resolution, it was in a resolution like this that the Premier asked the Prime Minister of Canada to make sure that we were a dominion. And if we have a unique case in the Canadian law, not like B.C., if we have it and the Premier of Newfoundland is hanging his hat on it, it is not because the member for Baie-Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) is bringing in a resolution saying, 'reassert', we are having it from the point of view that our former Premier Smallwood had the foresight to realize, to make sure that we were a country before we went back into it, Mr. Speaker, and that is what our case rests on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: But with regard to it, only three people were in the Cabinet of Mr. Smallwood. And this government after ten years continually, continually shirks its responsibility about roads, and about schools, and puts a tax on the gas of this Province.

MR. HANCOCK: True, true.

MR. HISCOCK: - of twenty-two cents and now indexing.

MR. THOMS: No, no. It is 22 per cent.

MR. HISCOCK: 22 per cent tax, and the federal government only has seven cents on it.

I would say to this House, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: - and to the people, when this government gets up and talks about it, what do they turn around and say, 'Oh, we cannot do anything because of



MR. HISCOCK:

Ottawa'. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, listening to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) today -

MR. THOMS: Sock it to him!

MR. HISCOCK: - when I asked for a list from the Minister of Transportation, in Air Services, who was using the government Air Services and who was on them and the dates and where they were going, could we get that?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. HISCOCK: No, that was the fault of the federal government. You know, everything is the fault of the federal government, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: With regard, Mr. Speaker, to Hibernia, we hear about Hibernia but I want to talk about the offshore drilling off Labrador. I was amazed, absolutely amazed and appalled when we were in Committee with the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) when the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) ended up asking the question, Do we have a nerve centre for pollution, do we have a centre of control where the federal government can go to it, the coast guard, the Fisheries Department can go to it, the Environment, Mines and Energy and Development? Do we have anybody co-ordinating a possible oil spill, particularly with regard to Labrador because of the icebergs? No, Mr. Speaker. He even had the gall to even admit that he did not even know what the Minister of Fisheries was doing. And here we have a new Minister of Environment, Mr. Speaker, and if there is ever going to be any spill, we are depending upon the good grace, Mr. Speaker, of the oil companies to make sure that they have enough equipment, make sure they follow the government's strong, strong regulations and make sure that everything is carried out.

MR. HISCOCK: I would say, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough that this government is giving up its responsibility to make sure we have proper protection of our fisheries. Our fisheries and our Northern cod and our Grand Bank cod are going to be here long after, long after this oil is gone. And do we have a contingency plan? No. Did the media come down with their video equipment? No. They had nothing - the amazing thing about our Social Services, here is this administration that is more concerned - the budget, I think, was described, if I am not correct, a budget with conscience -

AN HON. MEMBER: A social budget.

MR. HISCOCK: - a social budget. And here we have the trend of the eighties, here we had all the Social Services Department, Education, Health, Social Services and that. Did we have any visual media down there? No. When we asked the questions about the environment, was anybody doing that and checking that? No, and I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this House and the media are neglecting their responsibility. I do realize that it is very hard for them to cover all the meetings, it is impossible, so much so, Mr. Speaker, that we should not have all three of them running simultaneously, together.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to these things - but I want to ask the member from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) who said if we go to Ottawa we would go to Ottawa with a tin cup in hand, tin cup in hand. I would ask you, the member from Placentia, Mr. Speaker, if I may, when former Premier Moores went to Ottawa did he go with a tin cup in hand? Did he go down on his hands and knees and crawl and beg for every cent? I would say, Mr. Speaker, he did not. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, when we got the \$100 million for CN for the new boat, the ferry on the Strait,

MR. HISCOCK: and we are getting the \$47 million for a road -for the Forestry Agreement and \$40 million for the upgrading of Bonne Bay and we are getting the \$50 million for the ice core at the university, and we are getting at some other things, did the Premier of this Province today, Mr. Peckford, go with cap in hand? He never even went with cap in hand, he never even sent a telegram. Whatever came it came as a result of our five MPs in Ottawa fighting for us, that is how we ended up getting it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: I would say, Mr. Speaker, if it was not for having our federal minister in Ottawa - and there are many people in this Province who may disagree with me now - I would say now and I would say it officially, thank God, thank God we have the Minister of National Revenue in the federal Cabinet representing Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador because it is taking a slow time to get off the ground but more will be done under his term for Labrador and it will probably mean Labrador staying as part of this Province than if he was not. Because I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if we had Mr. John Crosbie or Mr. Jim McGrath in the Cabinet -

MR. WHITE: The Righteous Brothers.

MR. HISCOCK: - the Righteous Brothers as they are called - I tell you

MR. HISCOCK: not very much attention would be given to Labrador. Here we are - the provincial Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) cannot even maintain a maintenance crew-and we are asking for \$28 million to do the road. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is a great inequality when it comes to this government looking towards Labrador asking for the road from - and probably will mean the re-election of the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) - asking for the road from Churchill Falls to Labrador City, the federal government.

As was said to me today by a person from my district and the Chairman of the Transportation Committee down there and a Chamber of Commerce, why go through Newfoundland? Why have Newfoundland as a brokerage house and why have them negotiate when Ottawa is doing everything? So I would say to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), if we are going to go to Ottawa, tin cup in hand, all I would say from Labrador's point of view, thank God we have a tin cup because we would not even have that, Mr. Speaker.

But I want to, if I may, just for one brief while talk about the rate of development and the federal government is going to control the rate of development and that the provincial government will lose control. I would say to this House, Mr. Speaker, the rate of development will be decided by the international business community by way of the multi-nationals and that we, as a Province, have to put all our restraints upon them and jointly with the federal government. Both of us have to work together because they can actually topple the federal government with their spending. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, if this government-because the President of the Privy Council already showed, he has so much malice the word Liberal, my dear, when he uses the word - he cannot use it, he cannot actually use the word 'Liberal'. Even when he ever thinks of the word he probably cringes and goes to

MR. HISCOCK: purgatory and comes back a dozen times, Mr. Speaker. It is impossible for him to think of that word.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And because of his malice towards the Liberal Party I will go as far as to say, it is going to stop the development of co-operation. Because we have a Liberal government in Ottawa I would say now, Mr. Speaker, I would much rather have control and development with a federal government, not a Liberal government a federal government, whether they are NDP or whether they are Conservative, I would rather make sure that we keep more money in this country of Canada instead of letting it go to Japan or to the States or to England, having a joint co-operation with the national government of our country than giving it to some multi-national company and letting them grow bigger and bigger and bigger. But no, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - because it is a Liberal government, no we are not going to do the same thing as LCDC. We cannot have that joint co-operation, you know.

MR. WHITE: They did not get along with the Tories either.

MR. HISCOCK: Not only did not get along with the Tories, they cannot get along with anybody. And as the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) said, production will start when Peckford goes and that is what is going to happen in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And as the Prime Minister said last night, the Prime Minister stated last night, he will give us 100 per cent control of the offshore as if it is in the center of Buchans - is that center enough for you? - or Grand Falls. And when that does actually happen through negotiation, the constitutional negotiation, as he President

MR. HISCOCK: of the Privy Council said, when you do we will probably get between 43 and 45 per cent of the revenue and even under the Petroleum Directorate and even under provincial guidelines we will only get 40 per cent. So, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - we are actually turning around and getting more from the federal government than even on our best Cabinets and on our best Leo Barrys and our best people in trying to negotiate this.

MR. WHITE: More under federal.

MR. HISCOCK: More under the federal than ever before. But I would only say this, Mr. Speaker - and I will say it again and I want to close off my statement - I am quite pleased and proud of my background in the Liberal Party and the Smallwood years. It is only now that we are getting away from them that we are actually realizing how much he actually did. And after ten years - the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) got up today and said, 'Look, when you were a government' - ten years ago he talked about labour legislation. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there has got to be some progress. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, if this government has a social conscience and a social budget, the next piece of legislation that will come before this House is outlawing scabs, Mr. Speaker, outlawing scabs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, if we were the government that would have been done long ago. And if the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) wants to open his mouth, he should never open his mouth again until he gets up and announces that piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the federal government and the attitude that this government is taking towards it, we cannot take the attitude of total confrontation between them. We cannot, Mr. Speaker. If we continue - we are not in Russia -

AN HON. MEMBER: Even the (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: - we are not in Communist China, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely impossible to turn around and live in a federation when you are totally disagreeing. If I am correct, after almost two and a half years, there has been no negotiation face to face with any minister and our national minister, there has been no face to face negotiation between the Premier and the federal Prime Minister, none whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: And I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, we are getting a lot of things but we would get a lot more, Mr. Speaker, not because Ottawa is denying us anything it is only doing it because they do not know any other tactic.

And in cluing up, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say this that before the government goes up and backs the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) and condemns everything, learn two words, co-operation. Think about it, sleep on it, and try to -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a hyphenated word.

MR. HISCOCK: It is a hyphenated word, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very, very important for the betterment of this Province, and if I may just have a second or a minute, Mr. Speaker, long after all of us are dead and gone and our contribution to this Province, Mr. Speaker, it is very, very important that we put politics over and above this, and I can tell you this and I can tell the President of the Privy Council, nobody will be selling down my birthright, nobody will be turning around and giving away the resources as long as I have anything to do in my own party and caucus.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to that it is very, very important that we put politics above this and do not turn around and say to half our population because you vote Liberal you leave the Island and go to the Funks or go, go, go somewhere else, Mr. Speaker, we are part of this Province. And if the government had its way it would have no opposition. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it will not be too long before this Opposition will be over there -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: - and the government will be over here,

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, never have we heard so much from such a small fellow and so little said as the last speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: So I will refrain from any comments, Mr. Speaker, on the last speaker who just sat down because he did



MR. MORGAN: not say anything.

MR. MORGAN: But let us look at what happened yesterday in relation to this now amended resolution before the House. Yesterday we saw a man come to St. John's -

AN HON. MEMBER: How did he get here?

MR. MORGAN: - maybe two or three times he has come here in the last - what? - fifteen years.

AN HON. MEMBER: I say fifteen years.

MR. MORGAN: A man who is the Prime Minister of our country, an honourable man, a man with great respect.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. MORGAN: But a man that has ignored -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - 65 per cent of all Canadians, a man who has recently ignored eight provinces and their wishes.

MR. STAGG: Now you are talking.

MR. MORGAN: He is standing up in a dictatorial way as the Prime Minister of a country.

MR. STAGG: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: And wherever I travelled the last number of months across Canada, it has been said the Prime Minister is standing up and saying, What do I care? I am the Prime Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: But I am not running again, so what do I care. I am going to do all kinds of things I want to do.

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

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. BAIRD): A point of order, the hon. Opposition House Leader.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the minister is not being relevant. The minister is now referring to the

MR. HODDER: Prime Minister in his negotiations with the Province whereas this resolution, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MORGAN: I know.

MR. HODDER: - let me find it now, Mr. Speaker, - this resolution says that: BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the federal government to reconsider its position on offshore minerals and recognize the Province's legitimate right to ownership and the control of them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) has been wasting the

MR. HODDER: time of the House. He has been talking about the Prime Minister in relation to the negotiations which are going on between the provinces on other matters. He has been using the time of the House to reflect on the Prime Minister's visit to Newfoundland without specifying to the House, Mr. Speaker, what the Prime Minister came here to do or what the Prime Minister said as regards to this particular bill. So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the minister is not being relevant and it is clearly stated in the rules, Mr. Speaker, that the speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HODDER: - must be speaking relevant to the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, while relevancy is hard to define, the member must be given the benefit of the doubt.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the third whereas in the amended motion now before the House, "WHEREAS the Prime Minister", and the Prime Minister is a man who says, 'I do not care, I am Pierre, and I can do as I please across Canada.' And he told 65 per cent of all Canadians, he told them that no longer than a few months ago. The Prime Minister, in his arrogance, decided to ignore the wishes of 65 per cent of all Canadians. He decided to ignore the wishes of eight provinces in our country of Canada, our Confederation. That same man came to our Province yesterday and he came here under a program, a Rent a Liberal Program. A Rent a Liberal Program is the program it is known as to raise funds across the nation. So under the Rent a Liberal Program the question now is I want to pose, if the man was rented yesterday for a

MR. MORGAN: purpose I wonder who is going to pay for the rental. I sincerely hope it is not the taxpayers of our country, I sincerely hope not. I sincerely hope they did not arrange to fly him in from Ottawa yesterday, fly him in from Ottawa yesterday at the taxpayers' expense, I sincerely hope not, to come in here and to play partisan politics. I sincerely hope not.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the comments as to how the Prime Minister got here and what the Prime Minister was doing here have to do with the motion that is before the House right now?

I just heard Mr. Speaker rule that the member should be relevant to the debate and urged him to confine his remarks to the motion and, Mr. Speaker, the member has persisted in -

MR. STIRLING: He ignored the Speaker's ruling.

MR. HODDER: - and ignored the Speaker's ruling and persisted in doing the same thing. Now, Mr. Speaker, we want to hear -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - what the member has to say about this particular motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To the point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: I would suggest that the hon. gentlemen can take part in debate the same as I am doing now, so they can get up and speak when the time comes around. I will not speak too long, I am only going to speak for a few minutes. But I will say that this same gentleman who came yesterday - now, we have been charged by the Opposition members in the past number of months of bashing Ottawa.

May 6, 1981

Tape No. 1330

GS - 3

MR. MORGAN: We are bashing Ottawa, there is too much confrontation and what better example of confrontation than last night, last night where the Prime Minister says, 'Len, Len, Len, who is Len, Len who, Len who, Len, Len? Oh, Len Stirling.' That is the man he was referring to. The hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition. He says, 'Len, you are wrong, I am right, you are wrong, I am right, you are wrong'. That is what he told him  
for all the people of Newfoundland to understand. He says, 'No, Len, you are wrong, Newfoundland does not own the offshore oil and gas, we do, we do'.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much 'Jim' I appreciate it.

MR. MORGAN: - the question mark now is that - I asked the question across the House this afternoon when members were speaking - if they think we are in a confrontation position with Ottawa over defending our resources, <sup>my</sup> question now is, what is the purpose of this resolution this afternoon?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman last night was made a shame of over at the so-called rent a Liberal affair, and the people of Newfoundland now know that if this man was now Premier of the Province - God forbid if he was - but if he was Premier of the Province that Pierre Trudeau, the Prime Minister of the country would say to him the same thing as he is now saying to us the government here. He is not saying that we will settle this issue by means of negotiation. He is not saying we will settle this by means of constitutional discussion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, what he is saying is his only belief is there is only one means of settling this dispute and that is, let it go to the courts. That is the Prime Minister's position. It was said a while ago and it is now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - it is now the same position.

And if we are going to concede to that, my question again is why should we concede to that when back in the days of the last Prime Minister, although it was short as it was, we all agree,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: -and when we had two ministers from our Province, again short as it was, in Ottawa, it took that Prime Minister only a very short period of time to recognize that Newfoundland owned the resources. That is the big difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: It took him a very short period of time -

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - a very short period of time to understand that Newfoundland does own its offshore resources and the revenues from them. So, why, Mr. Speaker, why should we now agree to the kind of resolution put forward by the Opposition, that we have to sit down and work out a joint development of the offshore resources? That is the bottom line of the resolution, the bottom line of it.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible), Jim of all people. (Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Every member has the right to be heard in silence. I would ask the Opposition members to please refrain themselves.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) ejaculations on our part.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will say this once more. Mr. Speaker, I am asking you in the Chair, Your Honour, to give protection to any member of this House when he is on his feet speaking and I ask for it now and I ask for it sincerely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask for it, I ask for protection of the Chair.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: We are prodding you.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - the hon. gentleman for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) yesterday afternoon prodded himself, prodded himself almost out of his seat down in the Straits of Belle Isle, almost out of his seat. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Opposition recognize now that what they stood for back in this House of Assembly no longer six months ago, last Fall - they stood then, they were for controlling the offshore development. And they said - and Hansard will prove me correct - they said a number of times, 'Ownership is not a big question. Ownership is not the big issue. It is the control of the development.' Now they are trying to say that they have changed that. They have changed that now and the position is they are in favour of ownership and they believe in ownership because they know that the government's position was right from the beginning, that we should have the ownership of the offshore oil and gas as was portrayed by the Prime Minister of the country of Canada to this Province by Mr. Joe Clark as Prime Minister.



AN HON. MEMBER: Joe who?

MR. MORGAN: The Opposition now know that the Government of Canada then was right, and Government of Newfoundland today is right? And now that has been changed.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: But still, and I commend the hon. gentleman for last night's performance, although it was rather embarrassing to him, when he stood up and said, I do believe that we own the offshore oil and gas in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: I commend the hon. gentleman for that. Commend him for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: But at the same time it was embarrassing to him because Newfoundland was led to believe by the same hon. gentleman - if I was the Premier of Newfoundland - now I would work out a deal with the Prime Minister, and I would arrange for him to concede, yes, you do have some good indications there that you have some control, you have some ownership,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - and we can work out a deal.

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: But what did he say? He said, 'Len', you are wrong. You are wrong, 'Len'. You are wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: You may think you own the offshore oil and gas, but we know different. We know different. And our position is that you do not own that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: If the question is not the ownership, as the resolution is pointing out here for the Opposition, and control of development, the point made by my colleague, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), then I am convinced today that if the federal government did have control over development, if they did, we would not be able to protect Newfoundland's most important industry, the one that we have now, not the one potentially oil and gas, but the fishing industry.

MR. HANCOCK: But why do you say that?

MR. MORGAN: Because they would arrange developments -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. BAIRD): Order!

MR. MORGAN: - to carry out such a fast manner because of the pressures not only in Canada but throughout the world, the energy needs of the world, because of that pressure -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: - and because of -

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - the sudden urgency of Canada to become self-sufficient in the production of oil and gas, because of the urgent need in the part of the present government in Ottawa to become self-sufficient, that there would be a mad rush out there at the Hibernia field and they would support that mad rush to get that oil and gas out of the ground, out of the bottom of the ocean, get it out. And that is what is so scaring about all of this. It comes down to a point where the federal government would and could possibly control the rate of development and the overall development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: In my discussions to date with the people who have expressed concern over what possible effects it will have on the fishing industry, there is not one bit of evidence to show that the federal government have done anything to date, have developed or formulated any kind of regulations or potential legislation to bring into effect in this Province to protect the fishing industry. Not one bit of evidence to show proof of that.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: Now, that is a clear indication there is nothing to protect the fishing industry, all they talked about so far is compensation, get the fishermen out of the boats and compensate them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Not true.

MR. MORGAN: That is all they have been talking about in Ottawa.

MR. TULK: It is not true.

MR. MORGAN : And, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to -

MR. HANCOCK: That is what is wrong with the fisheries now.

MR. MORGAN: And if I say a statement this afternoon, maybe the Premier will not like what I say, but I am going to say it, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Be careful! Be careful!

MR. STIRLING: Let us hear it.

MR. MORGAN: - that I would rather see no development in Hibernia, none whatsoever if it means any adverse effect in our most important industry, the fishing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And the Opposition today, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition this afternoon -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. SIMMS):

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, may I

have the protection of the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

This afternoon, Mr.

Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mockery.

MR. MORGAN: This afternoon one of the speakers speaking, I assume, for his party, pointed out that this government would not allow the tanking off, would not allow the tanking off of the oil and gas at the wellhead. It was mentioned by one of the Opposition, I think it was the member from Exploits, or from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), and that we should go ahead and start production of the oil and gas by means of that. Now, that is a clear example of giving away of some of the great potential from the oil and gas development. If we are not going to look at and analyze the possible effects and benefits of having pipelines to our shore, to onshore facilities, if we are not going to analyze the possible benefits by means of bringing in the natural gas from out there as well, if we are not going to do that, if we are going to suddenly say to the oil companies, Mobil and others, 'Go ahead and extract the oil and gas at the wellhead, tank it off and take it away, and we will get our revenues and leave it at that', now that is the official position of the Liberal Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: 'We want action now', that is what they are saying.

MR. HODDER: That is your position, that is your position.

MR. MORGAN: And we are saying -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order.

MR. MORGAN: - and we are saying, we are saying,  
Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - we are saying, Mr. Speaker, that this Province is determined not to give away any part of that resource out there. We are determined to stand by - given by a former Prime Minister of Canada, of our country, who we believe in as part of Confederation, that we do own the offshore oil and gas and we do not have to go with cap in hand and bow down to the present Prime Minister and say, 'Mr. Trudeau, please, please, please, please help us develop the offshore oil and gas'. And last night on television and last night at the Arts and Culture Centre he was saying to us Newfoundlanders, 'Now you come bend down to us now Newfoundland. Now, Mr. Peckford, do not be so brash, Mr. Peckford, do not be attacking Ottawa so much, Mr. Peckford, do not be doing that, be a good boy now, and listen to Mr. Trudeau here now'. That is the style, that is the dictatorial style of the Prime Minister of the country today, and it is unfortunate, very unfortunate. We are determined, Mr. Speaker, because if I thought that the present Premier bent to that man we have today in power in Ottawa in that kind of a threat on Newfoundlanders, I would not be part of his government.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, seeing that it is six o'clock I would adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member adjourns the debate.

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

' I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 6, 1981

*Tabled by Mr. Minister of Labour, Moncton, 6 May, '81.*

Answer to Question No. <sup>S7</sup> 157 asked by Mr. Neary (LaPoile) on Order, Paper dated 4 May, 1981.

Question:

- (a) How many Newfoundlanders are currently employed on offshore oil drilling rigs?
- (b) Give the total number of Newfoundlanders hired by offshore oil rigs since January 1, 1978.

Answer:

- (a) Employed directly with drilling contractors:

<u>Total</u>	<u>Nfld.</u>	<u>%</u>
422	263	62%

Employed directly with service contractors:

<u>Total</u>	<u>Nfld.</u>	<u>%</u>
506	351	69%

TOTAL EMPLOYMENT	928	614	66%
------------------	-----	-----	-----

- (b) 1978 - Records keeping and monitoring of rig employment figures began early 1979, therefore, as a result no figures are available for 1978.

1979 - Newfoundlanders directly employed on rigs	-	420
Newfoundlanders directly employed by service contractors	-	302
TOTAL EMPLOYMENT:		722

<u>1980</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>NFLD.</u>	<u>%</u>
Nfldrs. directly employed on rigs -	1300	783	60%
Nfldrs. directly employed by service contractors -	231	93	40%
TOTAL EMPLOYMENT:	1531	876	57%
<u>MARCH 1981</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>NFLD.</u>	<u>%</u>
Nfldrs. directly employed on rigs -	422	263	62%



<u>MARCH, 1981</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>NFLD.</u>	<u>%</u>
Nfldrs. directly employed by service contractors -	506	351	69%
TOTAL EMPLOYMENT:	928	614	66%

Total Employment from 1978 to present: - 2212 positions

Some of these positions reflect rehires from year to year.

QUESTION #7 (March, 1981)

*Tabled by Minister  
of Health, 6 May, '81*

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) What is the total number of abortions or hysterotomies performed in the Province since January 1, 1980 to date?
- (b) What number of these abortions or hysterotomies were performed in each of the following hospitals for this time period:

St. Clare's Mercy Hospital  
Grace General Hospital  
Health Sciences Complex?

- (c) What has been the cost of these abortions or hysterotomies to the taxpayers of this Province through M.C.P. and what proportion of the cost went to (a) specialists (gynecologists, obstetricians, etc.) (b) cost of surgeons, and (c) cost of special medication and other incidental expenses?

ANSWER

- (a) Reporting is given for the calendar year, 1980

Abortions -	475
Hysterotomies -	<u>13</u>
TOTAL	<u>488</u>

- (b) St. Clare's Mercy Hospital - NIL  
Grace General Hospital - 1  
Health Sciences Centre - 450

- (c) Because physicians have up to three months to present their invoices to M.C.P., there is a 90 day lag on the production of realistic statistics; hence, September 30, 1980 figures became available in late January, 1981, but December 30, 1980 figures will not be available until late April, 1981.

Cost to M.C.P. paid up to January 30, 1981 for services performed January 1, 1980 to September 30, 1980 are:

- (a) specialists (obstetricians, gynecologists)  
number of procedures - 320                      Cost \$21,566.25  
anaesthesists                                      Cost \$ 2,692.30

- (b) surgeons NIL
- (c) Special medication and other incidental expenses are not payable by M.C.P.

H.W. HOUSE, M.H.A.  
Minister of Health

April 8, 1981