

VOL. 1

NO. 10

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P. M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the  
hon. the Premier could inform the House to what extent he  
investigated the matter that was raised by my hon. colleague  
the member for Fogo (Mr. B. Tulk) a few days ago in connection  
with the possibility of political interference with the judiciary  
of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the Leader of the Opposition  
(Mr. Neary) is referring to an allegation by the member for  
Fogo as is related to correspondence by the Minister of  
Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan), yes, that has been fully investigated,  
Mr. Speaker, And I am pleased to indicate to the hon. House that  
in our opinion there was no interference with the judicial  
system at all. The Minister of Fisheries has made a  
complete and full statement to the people of Newfoundland  
on it, of which undoubtedly the Leader of the Opposition is aware  
that the Minister of Fisheries is contemplating taking  
additional action on his own, as it relates to the allegations  
made, that the Minister of Fisheries had written the federal  
Minister of Justice (Mr. J. Chretien) who did take action on  
the matter brought to his attention by the Minister of  
Fisheries for Newfoundland, and it was clearly and unmistakably

PREMIER PECKFORD: a matter in which there was no interference whatsoever with the normal course of justice and it was an action that was completely within the rights of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) to take.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman telling the House that telexing, wiring a judge of the court is the proper and right procedure for a minister to take? Is that what the hon. gentleman is telling the House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I never said that and the Leader of the Opposition knows that obviously it is not. The Minister of Fisheries as a member having a problem from one of his

PREMIER PECKFORD: constituents did contact the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien) in Ottawa who took appropriate action on the matter that was brought to their attention. And there was no interference with the judicial process by the Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) at all. I guess a like kind of circumstance is now before the Parliament of Canada in which the Prime Minister clearly makes a distinction on the matter with his Solicitor General who wrote on behalf of a number of constituents. The Prime Minister says that the Solicitor General, as an individual in his case - the way the Prime Minister put that circumstance - was entitled as a person, as a citizen, to make representation on behalf of his constituents to some lawyers and the documentation was tabled in the court afterwards. In this particular circumstance, it is not exactly similar, it is similar but not to the letter.

The Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland made representation on behalf of a constituent to the Minister of Justice in Ottawa. And that was a logical, reasonable thing for the member for Bonavista South to do on behalf of a constituent.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Premier explain to the House then this telex to Judge Steele that was sent on October 6. Can the hon. gentleman tell us how he can explain that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, obviously the Leader of the Opposition, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is not



MR. MORGAN:

The innuendo being left and the questions now put in the House of Assembly to the Premier is that I made direct representations to a judge of a court. The fact is that a letter was written to Mr. Chretien on behalf of a constituent on the 30th day of September, 1980, and if hon. gentlemen will think back - in fact they can look back and get verification - we had a problem with the mail service, which we have had quite frequently in Canada for the last number of years and because the letter went a number of days and the mail services were interrupted at that time. In fact I was travelling at the time on the South Coast of the Province with my colleague the member for the area in the Burgeo district. And I recall at the time calling from down in the area, as I said on Friday, and instructing my secretary because of the mail service the letter that had now gone to Mr. Chretien on behalf of a fisherman in Bonavista with a very serious problem where the federal Fisheries Department made a very serious error and paid the man \$4,000 they should never have paid him. It was their mistake. He was being taken to court, being summonsed, because of that. So I wrote Mr. Chretien and the contents of that letter was made public on Friday and is made available to hon. members of the House now. Because of the mail service I called my secretary and said, 'Send a copy of that letter by means of telegram to all parties concerned', which she did. She took the letter that was sent to Mr. Chretien three or four days before, because Mr. Chretien could not get it because of the mail service problem, a copy was sent by telegram to the fisherman in Bonavista, Mr. Calvin Whiffen, to the District Court - in this case it had to go to someone in District Court; my secretary decided to send it to District Court Judge Steele - and, of course, to Mr.

MR. MORGAN: Chretien. What was being done was as a result of the problem with the mail service. The letter tabled on Friday clearly indicated there was no copy going to the judge. It was a letter from me, from minister to minister in Ottawa, from minister to the minister, who in this case was taking the action, - Mr. Chretien, the Minister of Justice for Canada who initiated the action on behalf of his colleague the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) from that department taking action against a fisherman.

So I wrote to the federal minister as a politician to a politician, member of the House of Assembly to the member of Parliament, and minister to minister, asking him to help out with a problem where an injustice was being served on a fisherman. In fact, the correspondence was tabled and made public

MR. MORGAN: to the media, which did not seem to indicate that it was worthy of carrying, some media, especially CBC. I have no hesitation in saying that. The letter was made public, my letter to Jean Chretien on the 30th. day of September, and the reply back from Jean Chretien, the federal minister, who arranged to have the matter taken out of the courts, which he could do, I understand; at least I suppose he could, he did it anyway. Mr. Chretien interferred upon my representation, took the matter out of the courts -

MR. STAGG: Intervened.

MR. MORGAN: Intervened maybe is the right word, my lawyer friend here, my good and learned friend says intervened - he intervened on behalf of the fisherman that I had asked to have some action taken for. And he had the matter taken out of the court and arranged for correspondence to come back to me from the federal minister, which I made public as well, and asked me to indicate to the fisherman to contact his agent, the federal government's agent here in St. John's, and that was done immediately. There was no direct correspondence. My secretary merely took the letter that was sent two or three days before and because the letter could not arrive in Ottawa because of the mail strike she sent telegrams of that letter, the same content by phone to CN Telegraph and Telephone, in this case Terra Nova Tel, phoned in by telegram, the telegram went to all parties concerned, to the federal minister, and a copy going to the judge and the fisherman. And the telegram tabled in the House of Assembly, I understand it was tabled last week by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), he left the clear impression that I had made direct representation to a judge of the court, that I had interferred with the judicial system. That statement was made outside of the House of Assembly after that, and, as indicated by the Premier, because the statement was made outside the House as well as in the House, and the allegation, in my view, was





MR. HODDER: use of the services of its members. I do not think there is a case here, there is a case where any member has been impeded. Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, section 17, says, that a question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. And, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, section 19, says, that "a dispute arising between two members as to allegations of facts, does not fulfill the conditions of parliamentary privilege. Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is no point of privilege here and in particular, Mr. Speaker, I think Your Honour, after listening to the exchange between the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier, would concur, I think, that there was no inuendo. That they were just straightforward questions put to the Premier and straightforward answers.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is no point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there is very definitely a point of privilege. The allegation has been made by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the allegation is made by imputation. In the Question Period by the hon. Leader of the Opposition to the effect that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) somehow or other interferréd with the judicial system by approaching a judge. What has clearly happened, Mr. Speaker, was that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), whilst acting for one of his constituents, merely sent a wire to one of the parties to the action, i.e., the federal government and the Ministry of Justice. There is nothing wrong with that. As a matter of fact he was acting perfectly properly

MR. MARSHALL: and perfectly properly as any member should act in any case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: On the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege, on the other side of the coin the hon. member has been defamed outside the House, and that is a matter for him to take up outside, but inside this House there are privileges of members as well. And if the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to make an insinuation that the hon. member is approaching a member of the judiciary with respect to something substantial, with respect to a case and trying to interfere with the proceedings of justice, which was the tenor of the question, that was the privilege, Mr. Speaker, and indeed it was a breach of privilege. It is a very grave breach of privilege by the gentlemen on the other side of the House and in my opinion warrants an apology from the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition for injecting his little bit of poison again in trying to make his imputations through the Question Period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Let me first of all point out that statements made outside the House by any member are not considered to be questions of privileges so let us put that to rest permanently, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, there are no insinuations or accusations being made, these are merely questions that I have asked of the Premier. I think the Premier will agree from the tone of my questions that all I am doing is looking for information. There is no question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman can get as emotional as he wants and he can try to protect the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) all he wants, Mr. Speaker. Hon. gentlemen can thump their desks all they like. All we are doing is looking for -

MR. MORGAN: Innuendo again.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are merely looking for information and we would hope that the Premier will answer our questions as we put the questions to him, reasonable questions, fair, square, so that we can get information in connection with this matter.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I feel obliged that I have to respond to what the Leader of the Opposition has said in trying to establish that there is no point of privilege. Well, Mr. Speaker, when this allegation was made by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) last week, the Minister of Fisheries, when he got back into the Province - because, remember, the allegation was made while the member was away, was not in his seat to start with, it was done while he was away, while he was absent so that he could not respond. Then when the Minister of Fisheries got back he did respond, and all he did today was relate all the information that he had already made public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, all that information is public. Now if the Leader of the Opposition is only interested in asking so-called innocent questions -

MR. NEARY: Additional questions.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - same questions, Mr. Speaker, innocent questions, one would have to say all of those questions have been answered by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in his statement last Friday, so that, therefore, one has no alternative but to conclude that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in posing the questions again today is implying that actions taken by the Minister of Fisheries are not in line with the conduct of a member of the House of Assembly; otherwise, you see, Mr. Speaker, the answers given by the Minister of Fisheries on Friday would have been sufficient to satisfy the Leader of the Opposition. So that therefore, by continuing to ask the questions, he is imputing, implying that there is something wrong with the information given already by the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: To that point of privilege.

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

MR. NEARY: Let me correct these statements, Mr. Speaker. We are not implying that there is anything wrong, we are merely asking the hon. gentleman for information. That is all we are doing at this point in time, Mr. Speaker. We are not satisfied with the explanation given by the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: We want to ask the hon. gentleman additional questions in connection with this matter, and this is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Why are you not satisfied?

May 26, 1982

Tape 613

PK - 1

MR. HODDER: We will let you know in record.

SOME HON. MEMBERS Oh, oh !

MR. SPEAKER ( RUSSELL) Order, please !

MR. NEARY: And we have the right, unless they are going  
to try to muzzle us during the Question Period.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER That is exactly what  
they are doing.

MR. MORGAN: It is very serious.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we would  
hope that the Premier would willingly give us the answers to  
these fair and reasonable questions that we are putting to the  
hon. gentleman.

MR. MORGAN: That is why.

MR. MARSHALL Implication open.

MR. NEARY: No implications. No  
insinuations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair will take  
this matter under advisement and make a ruling on it at the  
earliest possible opportunity.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would  
the hon. the Premier inform the House who in the administration  
conducted this investigation? Did the hon. gentleman do it  
himself? Did the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) conduct  
the investigation? Who was it that conducted the investigation,  
who can give us some additional information in connection  
with this matter?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the

situation is, from all of the information that I have seen and the correspondence that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has provided, it seems quite clear to me after investigating and looking at all of the correspondence, that the Minister of Fisheries was trying to help his constituent in the normal course of his business as the member for Bonavista South and from what I can find out from the information there was no interference with the course of justice.

AN HON. MEMBER:

A good member.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementray, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the

hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Did the hon. the

Premier attempt to find out why the dates on the two pieces of correspondence differed? Why one, the letter was dated October 3, and the telex to Mr. Chretien dated October 3 -

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Again

the hon. gentleman is now -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order.

- is now putting forward - he is misrepresenting the facts because there was no letter sent on October 3. I said in the statement on Friday, I said earlier today in this House, the date of the letter on the letter itself was made public. It was September 30. It was not October. And because of the mail service problem at the time, because Mr. Chretien could not get the letter through the regular mail service, there had to be a telegram sent, a further correspondence went by telegram, by my secretary sending a telegram quoting the contents of the letter already gone to Mr. Chretien. There was no letter





PREMIER PECKFORD:

those already made by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), if he has additional information to provide to me or to this hon. House then the Leader of the Opposition is free to do so. Table it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Table them. Table them.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The Chair rules that there is really no point of order. However, I am very concerned about the continuing of this kind of questioning. A point of privilege has been raised which the Chair has to rule on eventually and the question seems to be carried on in the same light as the question prior to the point of privilege being raised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Is Your Honour saying that I cannot pursue this line of questioning? Perhaps Your Honour would like to take five or ten minutes to rule and then we can proceed with the questioning that I consider to be in order, Mr. Speaker. I do not understand what it is - is Your Honour telling me I can no longer pursue this line of questioning?

MR. SPEAKER: No, not at this point in time.

MR. NEARY: I cannot pursue this line of questioning?

MR. SPEAKER: No. I said that I am not cutting off the hon. member at this point in time. You may continue.

MR. NEARY: Okay, fine. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier then is aware that Mr. P. Betournay with the Department of Justice in Ottawa wired the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and acknowledged reply to his telex of October 3rd, that was the telex -

MR. MORGAN: To the federal minister.

MR. NEARY: - that was a telex to the federal minister dated October 3rd.

MR. MORGAN: Also a letter sent before that.

MR. WARREN: Listen, boy, listen.

MR. MORGAN: Innuendo. Do not twist it around.

MR. WARREN: Listen, listen.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier tell us why it took three days after - why the telex to Judge Geoffrey Steele took three additional days. The telex to Mr. Chretien was dated October 3rd, 1980 -

MR. MORGAN: No telex was sent. A telegram, I told you today in my statement to the House.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have here in front of me a copy of a telex released by the minister that says: "Mr. James Morgan, MHA, Minister of Fisheries" -

MR. MORGAN: Yes, from Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: - "I am authorized to reply to your telex of October 3rd, 1980". Now the telex that was sent to the Minister of Justice for Canada (Mr. Chretien) is dated October 3rd, and the telex to Chief Judge Geoffrey Steele is dated October 6th. Would the Premier not consider this to be peculiar -

MR. MORGAN: There was no telex to Judge Steele. Stop your lies in the House. There was no telex sent to Judge Steele, it was a telegram.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: He is upset.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Dirty innuendos.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier tell the House if he attempted to find out why there was a three day delay in the telex sent to the Minister

MR. NEARY: of Justice for Canada (Mr. Chretien)  
and the telex sent to Chief Judge Geoffrey Steele?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Leader  
of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has an allegation to make  
against the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) as it relates  
to his conduct as a

PREMIER PECKFORD:

minister or a member of this House, I would like for him to make it both inside and outside this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Everything that I have seen indicates to me that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) was not interfering with the normal course of justice and that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary), if he fails to make an allegation inside and outside this House, is trying to further defame the character and integrity of the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour knows that you cannot attach motives to what hon. members of this House try to do in the performance of their duties, as the hon. gentleman just did, Mr. Speaker. And I ask Your Honour to ask the Premier to withdraw these remarks. They are unparliamentary, completely out of order, unbecoming of the Premier. Here we are merely looking for information and asking questions.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Say it outside the House.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, we are asking questions and we are not going to be intimidated or harassed by hon. gentlemen on the other side, Mr. Speaker. And I would ask Your Honour to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

- Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour to rule on my point of privilege and ask the Premier to

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 615

MJ - 2

MR. S. NEARY:

withdraw these remarks.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If I have said anything which in any way impinges on the privileges of this House, I withdraw it unequivocally, I am not interested in trying to say something indirectly that I cannot say directly, I am not trying to impugn motives to anybody. All I am saying to the Leader of the Opposition is put up or shut up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I accept the Premier's apology and we will let it go at that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, did I understand -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Well, they can keep on defending the hon. gentleman all they want and we will keep asking why they are defending the hon. gentleman. We can keep asking the Premier that.

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Premier tell the House if he indicated a few moments ago, if I read him properly, that the telex sent to Judge Steele was identical to the one that was sent to -

MR. MORGAN:

No telex was sent to Judge Steele.

MR. J. HODDER:

A telegram. Call it a telegram.

MR. NEARY:

Does the hon. gentleman want me to call it a telegram?

MR. MORGAN:

Telegram.

MR. NEARY:

Telegram or telex, what is the difference?

MR. MORGAN:

It was phoned in to CNT, and verified.



MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) by the way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Questions, Mr. Speaker, cannot contain imputations or accusations, And the hon. gentleman is, when he is talking about a telegram being sent to Judge Steele he is making, within the context of this Question Period, an imputation and a direct accusation. The fact of the matter is, as he knows, that what inadvertently went to the court was a copy of a telegram to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien), the Minister of Justice of Canada. There was no telegram to Judge Steele, and he keeps referring to sending a telegram to Judge Steele, and that in my view, and I would submit to Your Honour, contains an imputation and an accusation that the hon. gentleman should withdraw.

AN HON. MEMBER: Name him. Name him.

MR. MARSHALL: If the hon. gentleman wants to pursue lines of questioning like that he is perfectly entitled to do, but in the interest of the reputation of people involved he should be a little bit more concerned with the accuracy of his statements.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order or a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentlemen know that this is a matter of public record, that the telegram sent to Judge Steele can be secured, obtained from the court. It is a matter of the record of the court. It is a matter of public record. And we have a copy, Mr. Speaker, it was tabled in the House, a copy of that telegram, and hon. gentlemen cannot deny that that telegram was sent and it was addressed to Chief Judge Geoffrey L. Steele, and it was sent on October 6th., three days following a Telex sent to Mr. Chretien.

MR. MARSHALL: It was a copy.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: It was a copy.

MR. NEARY: It was a copy of what?

That is what I am asking the Premier. I merely asked the Premier Mr. Speaker, perhaps you want to rule on that alleged point of privilege first, Mr. Speaker, and then I will come back to my question again.

MR. MORGAN: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: To the point of order now on the floor, a point of order on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, it is important, if you are going to be asking questions, that you



MR. MORGAN:

ask questions based on facts that you have. And the hon. gentleman has the facts, unless he did not bother to get the facts from the press conference I held on Friday past, and I sent copies of that press conference prepared statement to all members of the House of Assembly. In that same press statement, in fact, there were attached copies of the correspondence sent to the federal minister. The fact is a letter was sent. If it were not for the mess in the mail service at the time there would have been no telegram going to Judge Steele because the letter was already sent September 30th, and the same content of the letter went to the fisherman concerned, and only the fisherman concerned. Because of the mail service, a few days after, realizing the letter would not get to the federal minister's office, a telegram was sent to the federal minister and instructions given my secretary that the copies of that correspondence would go to both parties concerned, and it went to both parties concerned, But direct representation was made on September 30th asking for a postponement of the case, made directly to the federal minister, and asking for his staff - Why would I ask the judge for his staff to contact the fisherman? That was the content of the telex that we referred to, Asking the judge for the staff of his office to contact the fisherman in Bonavista, the staff of the judge's office. How foolish, Mr. Speaker! The telegram went to the federal minister asking for his staff to contact the fisherman and to contact the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans and to arrange to have that injustice removed that was being served on that fisherman. That is what happened. So why not quote the facts and use the facts?

MR. MORGAN:

You do not want the facts.

MR. WINDSOR:

No concern for the facts.

MR. MORGAN:

You do not want the facts.

These are the facts. So what does my secretary do? She gets on the phone, naturally, and calls Terra Nova Tel and arranged a telegram to go, because I was away from the office at the time. The same thing I asked the federal minister to do on behalf of the fisherman on the 30th day of September, the very same thing I asked him to do, that same copy went to the judge here in Newfoundland asking the staff of his office to contact the fisherman and to arrange for a postponement. A letter went first, a telegram second.

Mr. Speaker, it is a clear example of the Opposition trying to weasel around and

MR. MORGAN: misrepresent the facts or take the facts and twist the facts and to try to again cast innuendo, allegation against me. I make the same statement again, Mr. Speaker. The hon.gentleman who made the allegation last week outside the House I now say the same thing, if these members of the Opposition are going to make these statements in the House, Mr. Speaker, let them make them outside the House as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear , hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to dwell on this at length, but what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is doing is he is using points of order to make Ministerial Statements in the House. Now we have a number of question that -

MR. MORGAN: You are abusing the question period.

MR. HODDER: We cannot even get out questions out. We have a number of questions that we have to ask and have yet to ask and we intend to ask them. If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) will stop abusing the rules of the House and just let us get our questions out then perhaps we will get some answers.

MR. NEARY: If he does not like the heat let him get out of the kitchen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: You won by 42 votes the last time. I will be around when you are gone.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 618

ah-2

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I refer hon. members to page 129 of the 5th edition of Beauchesne which gives a list of questions and that should not be asked and things that should not be contained in questions. I must agree that some of the questions that have been asked by hon. members to my right do seem to be a little out of order and I would caution them to maybe rephrase their questions.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. Premier a direct question. Is the letter sent to Mr. Chretien identical to the telex sent to Chief Judge Geoffery L. Steel - or telegram?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the reasonable explanations provided by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) convinced me that he had no intention, nor in fact interfered with the normal judicial process in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The time for the Question Period has expired.

MR. NEARY: Well we will go back at it tomorrow.

NOTICE OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is fair and reasonable and you know it is fair and reasonable, but you are just looking for dirt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: You are the low road.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 618

ah-3

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The Chair has recognized the  
hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that  
I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a

DR. COLLINS: Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to consider the raising of supply to be granted to Her Majesty and I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supply to Her Majesty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It being Private Members' Day, we are back to Motion No. 43. I think the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) adjourned the debate last day.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I believe the last time I was talking on this particular motion, which is a motion on unemployment, the point that I was making and which the resolution makes itself, is that we must look at all parts of this Province if we are to combat unemployment. We must especially look at the areas of high unemployment, of which there are a large number across the Province, I might add, a growing number across the Province, Mr. Speaker. And if we are to combat unemployment in the Province we must particularly - and I believe this motion in one of the Whereases points it out specifically, that we should look at the areas of high unemployment and perhaps target those areas for special programmes in conjunction with the federal and provincial governments so that these troublesome areas in the Province, once the problem is corrected, perhaps we can learn lessons and experience from those areas that would help us in areas of lesser employment.

Not, Mr. Speaker, in any way do I suggest that we should ignore certain areas, but areas of high unemployment should be targeted. Mr. Speaker, we must develop all parts of the Province where the economy is bad

May 26, 1982

Tape 619

PK - 2

MR. HODDER: because if this Province is going to be strong and economically viable in the next ten years, then we must attack the weak points. Mr. Speaker, this, in my belief, has not been done.

MR. HODDER: There was a task force report in the Roddickton area. Some of that report has been implemented but still the problem persists. The Bay d'Espoir area is another area of high unemployment. In the Bay St. George area, which is represented by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and by myself, is another troublesome area in the Province and I understand, as well, Mr. Speaker, the Coast of Labrador has large and vicious unemployment figures. But, Mr. Speaker, there has been no move by the provincial government, nothing to try to overcome or even to look at the problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the Bay St. George area, which covers the district of St. George's, the district of Stephenville and the district of Port au Port, a DREE study was done there some four or five years ago, and, to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, none of the suggestions made in that report - indeed I believe that there has been really no public discussion on that report except for the couple of times that I have mentioned it in the House of Assembly.

I would like to see the government find the reports and the studies that have been done in those parts of the Province and to look at them to see what can be done. Because, Mr. Speaker, where you have an area with a poor economy - and there are ways, whether they be through the fishery, through mining, and when there are resources in those areas - then I think it is incumbent upon the government to make sure that these resources are exploited, whether it be the fishery or whether it be mining, that they are exploited to their greatest potential.

In the past three or four years since this administration has been in power,



MR. HODDER:

I have seen a total disregard for the smaller things. It is as if their minds were beyond - I think one of our columnists, Ray Guy, says, "The one big thing". we have been forgetting about the small things. I think the last day that I spoke I mentioned examples in my own district where roads to multi-million dollar facilities, placed there by the federal government, have been impassable, where fisheries access roads - where three years ago,

MR. HODDER: two years ago there was \$35,000 in the budget for fisheries access roads across the Province where the fishery could be -

MR. MORGAN: Ask Romeo for it, boy. Ask Romeo for it.

MR. HODDER: That is the answer from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), "Ask Romeo."

MR. MORGAN: Romeo will help you.

MR. HODDER: Romeo has helped me out as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker. A number of the fisheries access roads which come under the Minister of Fisheries, when I wrote him letters he refused to do those roads, or gave excuses not to do them. I went to Small Craft Harbours and they did do them, and they did them properly.

MR. MORGAN: Want them done again.

MR. HODDER: So do not the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) talk to me about what happens with the fisheries. Because the Minister of Fisheries is the biggest disaster that ever happened to the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: I can only speak for the fisheries in my district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Because I do not know the fishery on the South Coast or on the Northeast Coast. There are members on this side of the House that do.

MR. WARREN: Watergate.

MR. HODDER: I know, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible) the Public Accounts Committee asked you to do last year.

MR. HODDER: This Minister of Fisheries will not even turn up to fishermen's meetings in the district of Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Watergate.

MR. HODDER: All he knows, Mr. Speaker, is 'blame it on Leblanc! Well, I will tell you what Leblanc did out in Port au Port: Leblanc put a \$2.5 million facility in Port au Port, but the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) cannot put a road to it. And, Mr. Speaker, that road has been so bad this year that they cannot get down there half the time. So that is what the Minister of Fisheries did.

MR. MORGAN: Look at the (inaudible) you are getting.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would not waste my time on the Minister of Fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries is a lost cause -

MR. CALLAN: Here is a summons.

MR. HODDER: - and if the Premier had any sense, regardless of his writing and his hiring practices, and his telexes to the judges, regardless of that -

MR. NEARY: And breaking the Public Tendering Act.

MR. HODDER: - and breaking the Public Tendering Act, regardless of all that I wonder why the Premier has any -

MR. NEARY: why he defends him.

MR. HODDER: - has any defence of that minister? But regardless of that, he is a terrible Minister of Fisheries. He is doing nothing. All he can do is talk and blame. But there are things that minister can do for the fisheries.

MR. WARREN You got to take the minister of fisheries  
this time.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, he seems to be a little bit touchy today, the Minister of Fisheries.

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 621

NM - 3

MR. WARREN:

Why, I wonder ?

MR. HODDER:

Because I had just referred to a road that went to a multi-million dollar facility and the minister went off his head.

MR. WARREN:

Yes. Why, I wonder ?

He is awful touchy.

MR. HODDER:

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why he is so touchy.

MR. WARREN:

What is the reason? What is the reason? Is there a Watergate cover up or what? Is there a Watergate on the go? There is a Watergate on the go, is it?

---

MR. HODDER: What is he saying?

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) your father.

MR. HODDER: What are you saying about my old man?

MR. WARREN: Must be a Watergate on the go or something.

MR. HODDER: Did you say something about my father. Did you have a comment on him?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: If you want to say it -

MR. STAGG: Are you staying with your father in St. John's?

MR. HODDER: No, I am not, I am sorry. I stay in an apartment in St. John's. Does that have something to do with my speech?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I wish to remind the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) that when he is speaking in debate he is to address the Chair.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Your Honour would instruct the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to observe the rules of the House and restrain himself while my hon. colleague is speaking.

MR. MORGAN: Now thin majority 'Neary'.

MR. NEARY: If we are going to have the rules -

MR. MORGAN: Thin majority 'Neary'.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - of the House enforced, Mr. Speaker, it is tit for tat, what applies to one side applies to the other, and I would ask Your Honour to instruct the Minister of

MR. NEARY: Fisheries to restrain himself while my hon. colleague is making his speech.

MR. MORGAN: Landslide 'Neary.'

MR. WARREN: Ah, ha. You are awful touchy.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): I wish to remind members -

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) knows full well that what he has raised is not a point of order. It is certainly not his place nor my place nor anybody else's place to direct Your Honour as to whom you should instruct to do what. I am sure Your Honour is quite capable of doing that. And that certainly is not a legitimate point of order the hon. Leader of the Opposition has raised.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: The leader has been overruled.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule that it is not a point of order but I would wish to remind hon. members on both sides of the House that when an hon. member is speaking he has the right to be heard with the silence of all other members in the House.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Since I only have about thirty seconds left I would like to say this, that I had a number of things that I wanted to say at this particular time, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to talk about Labatts and the mismanagement of that particular fiasco, and I will, Mr. Speaker. I also wanted to talk about the lack of imagination and about some of the development groups we have around this Province, including some of the Municipal Development Officers and the Rural Development policies

MR. HODDER: of this government. I wanted to talk about oil development on the West Coast and perhaps throw a few questions across to the other side as to where their aims are and what they are trying to do. But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. NEARY: The arrogant.

MR. HODDER: - because I happened to mention -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I wish to inform the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries, because he is so touchy- it is below the dignity of the minister even, behaving the way he has.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say on this resolution |

PREMIER PECKFORD: placed on the Order  
Paper by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). And I think  
it is important that we deal with this kind of resolution  
early on in the session. It is a very important resolution,  
and, I think, one that commands the attention of all hon.  
members. The resolution is:  
WHEREAS the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has the  
highest unemployment record in Canada;  
AND WHEREAS there are a number of areas in the Province where  
the unemployment figures are far beyond the Provincial average,  
let alone the national average;  
AND WHEREAS many areas of the Province depend on a single resource;  
AND WHEREAS the resources already known and available to our  
Province could, if properly developed, provide full and permanent  
employment to everyone in the growing Newfoundland and Labrador  
labour force;—a bit questionable  
BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House fully debate all aspects  
of Resource Development in the Province of Newfoundland and  
Labrador;  
AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the government target areas of  
high unemployment with a view to producing a plan for joint  
Federal/Provincial co-operation aimed at improving the economy of  
those areas and to creating long-term jobs for unemployed  
residents of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I totally, absolutely,

100 per cent endorse this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

This is a good resolution,

a fantastic resolution, and one that members on this side of  
the House fully endorse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!



PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, one part of the resolution deals with trying to target areas where there is a problem and where there is a resource. There is a lot of discussion so far today, since three o'clock, about the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), What is the Minister of Fisheries doing? He is the worst Minister of Fisheries, He is not doing his job, and all of these things. And he is not targeting and trying to help communities where there is some unemployment, get into the fishery!

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what hon. members opposite would say about what we as a government are doing to live up to this resolution through the Minister of Fisheries. Number one, there was a \$1.3 million loan guarantee for working capital to P. Janes and Sons Limited -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - affecting their operations at Hant's Harbour, Salvage, and Jackson's Arm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That seems to me like action by the Minister of Fisheries. That seems to me like targeting money from government to areas where you have a resource that can be developed. How about a \$450,000 guarantee for working capital to Greenspond Fish Producers Limited of Greenspond, in the great historic district of Bonavista North? That seems to be something that the Minister of Fisheries has done in the last two or three months. How about a total of \$5 million in equity funding and working capital provided to the Lake Group Limited affecting their operations -where? At Baine Harbour, Bide Arm, on the Great Northern Peninsula, Bonavista, Cook's Harbour on the Great Northern Peninsula, Englee, Fermeuse,

PREMIER PECKFORD: Gaultois, Grand Bank, Main Brook and Fortune. That sounds to me like action to deliver jobs to rural Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: What a Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) we have.

MR. W. CALLAN: Was this done during the election campaign?

PREMIER PECKFORD: It was done before the election campaign, long before the member for Bellevue (Mr. W. Callan) realized what was going on in relation to election campaigns.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, you ruled a few minutes ago that while a member is speaking he should be able to be heard in silence. So I will ask that the same courtesy be provided to me now from members of the Opposition, who were complaining about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Two wrongs do not make a right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: A \$150,000 loan guarantee for working capital was provided to W. J. Burton, Newfoundland Ltd., of Brig Bay, through the Minister of Fisheries, to help target and to make sure that jobs were available. A \$300,000 loan guarantee for working capital was provided to Clarenville Ocean Products Ltd. affecting their operations at Clarenville, Leading Tickles and Heart's Desire. That seems like an attempt by the government, through the Minister of Fisheries, to help rural Newfoundland and to create jobs for the Spring and Summer and Fall in the fishing industry.

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 624

MJ - 2

MR. DINN:

8,000 direct jobs.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

How about the \$150,000 loan guarantee to Petty Harbour? How about the loan guarantee to Triton Seafoods Ltd. in the great historic district to Green Bay, for example. A \$2.5 million loan guarantee to help get a stern trawler for Ocean Harvesters in Harbour Grace, which is now providing hundreds of jobs to the people of Conception Bay who hithertofore did not have jobs early in the Spring because they did not have fish into their fish plant. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) did that, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries. The much maligned Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Oh no, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to get away with that.

How about the \$3 million guarantee for working capital to John Penney and Sons in Ramea?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

How about that for a Minister of Fisheries? How about the \$150,000 loan guarantee to Eric King Fisheries Ltd. affecting their operations at Burnt Island and Codroy?

MR. DINN:

Where is Burnt Island?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Where is Burnt Island? In the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. S. Neary) district, I dare say.

MR. DAWE:

And the Minister of Fisheries knew nothing about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And in Codroy. Is that an attempt by the government to respond to this kind of resolution, Mr. Speaker? I submit to this Chambre that the Minister of Fisheries

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 624

MJ - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: as one minister in the government, who  
has gone out of his way to try to ensure that as many areas  
can be targeted as is possible, to create jobs in those areas

PREMIER PECKFORD: where there is a resource to be developed like the fishing industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: A \$250,000 loan guarantee for working capital to Tor's Cove Fisheries, done by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), a \$50,000 loan guarantee to Aquaforte, a \$2 million guarantee in loans and loan guarantees to Cape Pine Fisheries for the purchase of Newfoundland Quick Freeze plants, plants at Witless Bay, St. Bride's and Petty Harbour. Not a bad job by the Minister of Fisheries! Not a bad job! - \$695,000 in loans and loan guarantees provided to Atlantic Fisheries for the purchase of Newfoundland Quick Freeze plants at Dildo and Admiral's Beach. Not a bad job by the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker! A \$50,000 loan guarantee to the little quick freeze plant that is at Branch that is now going full blast, the \$2 million loan guarantee to National Sea Products at Burgeo to ensure the continued viability of that community which depends on a single resource, the fishery. That is a pretty good job by the Minister of Fisheries. Hermitage and Belleoram, where we put money forward, down in the Fortune - Hermitage district, a \$50,000 loan guarantee to Great Harbour Deep to keep their little plant going in Harbour Deep, a \$200,000 loan guarantee to Flower's Cove and Sandy Cove down in the Strait of Belle Isle district, down in the district of the absent member who comes every now and then to speak and to dispense his wisdom and then go off and not attend the House anymore. Sounds like a good idea, a Liberal district, Mr. Speaker. We are concerned about all districts in the Province, Liberal and P.C.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Unfortunately, of course, there are a lot more districts on this side that have to be financed than on the other side, and I dare say - somebody, a Liberal, told me this morning, "Mr. Premier, I am some glad you called the election when you did, because if you called the election today there would be nobody on the other side."

MR. DINN: That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is what a Liberal told me this morning. At 12:00 noon, a Liberal, a good, well-known Liberal

PREMIER PECKFORD:

in this Province told me that if there was an election called today there would not be anybody left over there and I would not want to see that. I would not want to see that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A \$100,000 loan guarantee for working capital was provided to Smith's Seafoods Limited of Chance Cove, in the hon. member's district over here. This hon. member over here who is always talking about what we are not doing in Liberal districts, when we have just provided \$50,000 to keep a fish plant going in Chance Cove, Mr. Speaker. So if you are going to look at this resolution with some objectivity, Mr. Speaker, you would have to say that today's Question Period and the statements made afterwards by the member for Port Au Port (Mr. Hodder) in trying to malign the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and what he is doing as the Minister of Fisheries—let me say that the Minister of Fisheries has just secured the jobs of 7,906 plant employees in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He has helped thirty-eight communities and provided over \$20 million worth of money to ensure that the inshore fishing industry in this Province is alive and well in 1982. Not bad, not bad for a Minister of Fisheries who the members on the Opposition are trying to malign. The Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, is doing his job and doing it very well on behalf of the people of his district and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Make no mistake about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the fishing industry and we are trying to deal as well as we can with that. And that \$20 million demonstrates a commitment by the Province, By the way, Mr. Speaker, a commitment by the Province that was put in place long before the federal government will ever put a dollar forward. Who put the \$5 million forward to the Lake Group? Who was it who helped the Lake group out when they were in trouble first off, an offshore fishing company? And where is most of the jurisdiction? In Ottawa with the federal government. And this poor little Province put \$5 million forward in equity to keep the Lake group going while the other people in Ottawa were procrastinating and trying to make a decision about the Lake group. That is who put it forward. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) put it forward. And now, Mr. Speaker, that is the fishing industry and we are trying to deal with it and we will continue to try and deal with it. What are we doing in other areas of the Province? In the Bay D'Espoir area, which was talked about, we began developing the Upper Salmon project. And who is getting work on the Upper Salmon project? Mr. Speaker, who is it? Are the people who are nearest to the Upper Salmon project getting the jobs or is it somebody from outside, somewhere else in the Province or somebody from the Mainland? No, Mr. Speaker, Even though hon. gentlemen on the opposite side and the Federation of Labour and others in this Province have tried to malign our internal local preference and our external local preference, the people who are getting the majority of jobs at the Upper Salmon are people in Bay D'Espoir, who are closest to that resource. That is what we are doing for Bay D'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Eighty-five per cent of them at the Upper Salmon project are people from Bay D'Espoir,



PREMIER PECKFORD

and they are working hard and doing a good job on bringing onstream a very valuable hydro resource which will help keep power rates at a lower level than if we had to go with another unit at Holyrood. That is a pretty good task, \$80 million or \$90 million going into that hydro project. And now, Mr. Speaker, we are over at Cat Arm, a very difficult terrain, difficult typography, developing a very, very major hydro resource, 110 or 120 megawatts of power, a big, big power project in which we are trying to hire people from the local area, Jackson's Arm, Sop's Arm, Pollards Point, Hampden, and The Beaches, and that area, and on out into Howley, and Deer Lake, and over into the Corner Brook area, and up to Rocky Harbour and Norris Point in the Bonne Bay area, and then across the Island as we go looking for more workers. And we will have 700 or 800 people working there this Summer or more, working on that very, very important hydro project, which, when it is all completed, is going to cost a lot of money, but which is still cheaper. It is labour intensive. We could have very well stopped the Cat Arm and taken a very short-sighted view and tried to go with coal or oil, We could have gone with oil fired which would be cheaper perhaps in the first one or two years, but over the life of the project, and for many years to come, the Cat Arm will be a valuable asset in keeping electricity prices more stable than they would otherwise be if we had to go with some alternative programme.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, in Bay d'Espoir as well, we have a FESP programme, through the Minister of Forest Resource and Lands (Mr. Power), where we are trying to weed out through silva-culture, weed out the old overmature timber and cut down the bug-infested timber, providing jobs to the people of Bay d'Espoir. I do not know how many jobs over the last few years that it has created in Bay d'Espoir,

PREMIER PECKFORD: 100 or 150 jobs.

MR. ANDREWS: 250.

PREMIER PECKFORD: 250 jobs in Bay d'Espoir, based upon a resource that is in Bay d'Espoir, like this resolution calls for. Mr. Speaker, the problem with this resolution is simply this, that the Opposition suddenly looked around the Province and saw all the wonderful things that the government was doing and made up a resolution based upon our achievements. That is what they did, Mr. Speaker. That is what they have done, made up a resolution based upon our achievements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So the long and short of it is as you look at the forest industry we are into replanting right now, planting trees. Out in my district today, in the last couple of weeks over on the West Coast, all over the Province where there is a significant forestry resource, we have people planting trees. Women, young people who are looking for jobs, providers in the family are out planting trees, some of them under contract to the Department of Forest Resources and Lands. A fantastic way to both help the resource, a renewable resource, and yet provide jobs for our people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And we have helped the paper companies in their access road programme, as has the federal government, and in their modernization programme, us and the federal government, as well, involved. And we are modernizing those plants, we are doing silva-culture, we are putting in access roads, and we are doing reforestation. And it is creating jobs in those parts of the Province where

PREMIER PECKFORD: you do have a significant forestry resource. That is not bad, Mr. Speaker, for a government, according to the Opposition, that is doing nothing. And then we announced, Mr. Speaker, before the election and during the election, a four or five phase programme to try to help economic recovery, and we reduced all the housing lots around the Province, especially in rural Newfoundland. We reduced all the housing lots to try to get them selling, so that people would build houses and buy lumber and keep the sawmillers going and keep the building material stores going. And that Housing Lot Subsidy programme is going to cost us \$2 million or \$3 million this year. It is going to cost us millions of dollars to implement that housing programme if it gets off the ground and people begin to buy these housing lots.

We have announced and put into operation - I do not know how much money it is now, close to \$30 million in water and sewer early tender calls to try to get people who are now on unemployment insurance into the labour force.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Water and sewer projects all over the Province, Mr. Speaker, \$30 million. That is in addition to the \$20 million in fishery incentives, that is in addition to the \$90 million on the Upper Salmon, that is in addition to the \$300 million at Cat Arm, that is in addition to the millions of dollars in the forestry stimulation programme. And on highways, Mr. Speaker, we are into a roads programme, an early pre-tendering roads programme which is going to involve \$20 million or \$25 million on top of all the millions I have just mentioned, which is going to create jobs in

PREMIER PECKFORD: rural Newfoundland and get some of our construction workers back to work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, when one looks around at the problem created by the federal government which is now trying to escape away from its monetary policy - it is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, what we see happening in Ottawa these days. We had Mr. MacEachen, when the Premiers were in Ottawa a number of months ago to an economic summit and they had Mr. Bouey in, and Mr. Bouey and Mr. MacEachen and Mr. Gray gave us a great lesson in Milton Friedman's monetary policy, that this had to be practiced, that this was inevitable, that we had to go along with high interest rates, we had to restrict the money supply as the chief vehicle to combat inflation and there was no other way around it. And Mr. Trudeau and Mr. MacEachen, we all argued with them. Premier Lougheed argued with them, I did, Premier Davis, that there was another way around it, and we presented our proposal. Funny thing now, this very government that has caused a lot of our economic woes and high interest rates which are stopping housing development, Mr. MacEachen now goes to Paris and the OECD and tries to lay the foundation for a flip-flop by the federal government which will occur in about August or September because they are in political trouble. So, now, they cannot do a flip-flop right away and bring interest rates down so that we can stimulate the economy directly because it would look like a real flip-flop, So what they are going to do now, of course, is gradually and gingerly move away from that monetary policy. So we will hear the Prime Minister now when he goes to Paris and other places, to the OECD meeting

PREMIER PECKFORD: next month or in July, aligning himself with Chancellor Schmidt and aligning himself with President Mitterand on this whole business of attacking Regonomics and attacking the monetary policy, come back to Canada and in August or September you will see this great flow of money and this great flip-flop by the Government of Canada to try to regain some of their political popularity by abandoning the approach that they have taken to date on monetary policy and keeping interest rates high.

If there is one single thing that is the greatest negative factor in the economy of Newfoundland and Canada today, it is high interest rates. It is the one thing that the federal government can do - has power over to do to stimulate the economy of Canada - other countries have done it, other countries have done it and done it very successfully-and allow your currency to float a little bit. There they are sacrificing millions and hundreds of millions of dollars every day to keep it up to eighty-one or eighty-two cents. What is magic about seventy-nine cents? What is magic about it? Nothing magic about it. You have to be masters of your own destiny. Schizophrenic is what the federal government are. On the one hand they are talking about a very national energy programme, 'Yankee Go Home, foreign investor go home through FIRA unless you want to go through an extensive red tape piece of business, which everybody is afraid of. On the one hand they are nationalistic. You do not have to own something to control it is my argument, you do not have to own something to control it. A parliament is all powerful and therefore it can take means that it wants to do.

And on the other hand then, on the other hand Canada says, 'we do not want to learn anything more from the United States, we have learned plenty. We want to be masters in our own house'. And so they do that

May 26, 1982

Tape 629

PK - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD: on the national energy programme, then they turn around and adopt the financial and monetary policy of the United States. So they are schizophrenic. If they are going to be consistent they should also have their OWN

PREMIER PECKFORD: fiscal and monetary policy along with their national energy programme and be truly independent of the United States. They could do it if they really wanted to but, obviously, they do not have the nerve or the gumption so to do.

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, when one looks at this resolution I am very, very proud to report to the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and to other hon. members opposite that we are putting forward \$300 to \$400 million this year to stimulate the Newfoundland economy, to try to get the old engine moving.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: More can be done, but it is out of our capacity to do, if the federal government would only agree to adopt more realistic policies in tune with Canada. You see the big problem that the federal government has is simply this, that a monetary policy can work in the United States because it is a free market economy. We do not have a free market economy as such in Canada, it is a hybrid, it is a transitional kind of thing, it is half private half public and, therefore, strict monetary policy does not work to the same extent, to the same degree, as quickly as it does in the United States, because they are a complete, free economy, and, therefore, you cannot apply then the same measures for corrective action to our economic ills as you can to the United States.

So it is time for the federal government to get its house in order to do the kinds of measures that we are trying to do down here so that we can further stimulate the economy and get people back to work. We are doing our part, Mr. Speaker, and tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow keeps on this petty pace from day to day and all our yesterdays. Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members will see and the people of Newfoundland

PREMIER PECKFORD: will see how responsible and active, innovative and creative we are in continuing to do more things than we have done today to stimulate the economy of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

Before I recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I would like to welcome to our galleries ten Library Assistants from the Stella Maris Central High School of Trepassey with their teacher, and a good friend of mine, Mr. Ted Winters, from the district of St. Mary's - The Capes, the home town of the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on this resolution which really focuses attention on unemployment throughout the Province. The government has not seen fit to introduce the debate on unemployment in this House which is reaching record proportions throughout the Province. So the responsibility for getting this subject on the floor for debate in this House rested with the Opposition. It took an Opposition member to bring in a resolution focusing attention on unemployment, which is one of the most serious problems we have in Newfoundland at the present time.



MR. S. NEARY:

Now, one would have thought then, if the Premier saw fit to get into a debate on a private member's resolution, that he would have offered something constructive to the debate, that he would have held out some hope for the people in this Province who are unemployed, especially young people between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five. The bulk of the unemployed in this Province are young people, young Newfoundlanders, young men and women between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five. Almost sixty percent of those unemployed in Newfoundland at the present time are between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five. Right at the tender years in their lives, Mr. Speaker, when they should be working and getting trained for their future, they are unemployed, they cannot find jobs. Students who will be looking for jobs this year, the ones that I have talked to, who came to see me, are panic-stricken, they are desperate for employment to try to work their way through university. But, Mr. Speaker, instead of getting an inspirational address from the hon. the Premier, instead of the Premier taking advantage of the situation to lay out the provincial government plans for development in the Province to create jobs and to reduce unemployment, what did he do? The hon. gentleman outlined what I could only term as a mad hatter's policy for future development in this Province. It had all the logic of a mad hatter. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman also took advantage of his few remarks to try to heap some praise on the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) for all the loans and all the guarantees that the government have had to give out in the last year in order to keep some of the fish plants afloat in this Province. And the hon. the Premier passed a remark, with tongue in cheek, that the Minister of Fisheries had targeted the areas that needed help. Mr. Speaker, even a

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 632

NM - 1

MR. NEARY: Kindergarden student in this Province knows that the fishery is in such a mess -

MR. MORGAN: Romeo does not know it.

MR. NEARY: - in such a mess as a result, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the mad hatter policy of this government.

MR. MORGAN: Romeo does not know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask for the protection of the Chair?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Protection of the Chair, you need some protection from your friends in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the mad hatter policy of this administration, the fishery, which is the backbone of the economy of Newfoundland is in a horrible mess. And the reason it is in a horrible mess, Mr. Speaker, is because the government has no policy, no provincial policy. Forget what Ottawa can do, Ottawa is responsible for the fish when it is in the water. When the fish is landed on the wharf, on land, on dry land, it becomes the sole responsibility of the provincial government.

MR. TOBIN: We give it all to Ottawa and they keep giving it away.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. TOBIN: Ottawa keeps giving it away.

MR. NEARY:  
put ashore it is -

Mr. Speaker, when the fish is

MR. MORGAN:  
keeps giving it away.

We do not get the fish, Ottawa

MR. NEARY:  
becomes the responsibility of the provincial government. Now, Mr. Speaker, where are the problems in the fishery today? Where are the problems? I ask the hon. gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey), where are the problems? The number one problem with the Newfoundland fishery, and I am sure my hon. friend is aware of this, the number one problem is marketing. Is marketing a federal responsibility? I ask the hon. gentleman to answer me truthfully.

- when it is put on land it

MR. MORGAN:  
to get personal.

You do not have any reason

MR. NEARY:  
one problem and has been the number one problem for a long time, is marketing a federal or a provincial responsibility? I do not hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) interrupting me now, Mr. Speaker.

Is marketing, which is the number

MR. MORGAN:  
direction from Ottawa.

Both. Both hopefully. We get

MR. NEARY:  
Mr. Speaker, and what has this administration done about the marketing of our Newfoundland fish? The hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

It is a provincial responsibility,

MR. MORGAN:

How about yesterday?

MR. NEARY:  
got aboard of a plane -

- the hon. Minister of Fisheries

MR. MORGAN:

I came from Ottawa yesterday.

MR. NEARY:

- the hon. Minister of Fisheries

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 632

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: got aboard of a plane -

MR. MORGAN: Boston next week.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have  
the protection of the Chair?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister  
of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), here is his contribution to  
marketing Newfoundland fish, The hon. Minister of Fisheries  
announced about two months ago that he was going to Boston and  
New York to find markets for Newfoundland fish.

MR. MORGAN: Two months ago? That was ten  
months ago that was done.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman  
made no mention that he was going to Jamaica, that was not  
mentioned in his news release at all. But when it was reported  
to me that he was in Jamaica -

MR. CALLAN: Name him.

MR. NEARY: - when he came back he changed  
his tune -

MR. MORGAN: No, not Jamaica, Porto Rico.  
Get your facts straight now.

MR. NEARY: - and said he had gone to the

MR. NEARY:

West Indies. Mr. Speaker, and the other thing that the hon. gentleman did to try to market Newfoundland fish was to do something that the fish processors on the Southwest Coast have been doing for the last fifteen or twenty years, and that is to persuade Air Canada to fly Newfoundland fish to Los Angeles, to California and to markets on the Mainland and in the United States. The fish processors on the Southwest have been doing that for at least fifteen years. The only problem, Mr. Speaker, with it was that Air Canada would not give them a special rate. That was the problem. The markets were there. The fish processors on the Southwest Coast knew the markets were there and have known it for fifteen or twenty years, so the minister was of no help there. And the other day he was up in Montreal or Toronto somewhere going around hobnobbing with the hotel maitre d's promoting fish as a food. Mr. Speaker, you may as well take a pebble and fly out in the mid-Atlantic and drop a little pebble down in the middle of the ocean as to do what the hon. gentleman did last week and did again yesterday.

So, Mr. Speaker, what have they done about our marketing problem? They have done nothing, zilch, the number one problem, provincial responsibility, provincial jurisdiction.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Wardon!

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) that is far enough.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the new members of this House should learn a little courtesy and a little respect.

AN HON. MEMBER: Boy we never had much example from across the way.

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 633

ah-2

MR. SPEAKER ( Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they will learn  
in due course. They will learn.

MR. CALLAN: They are lucky to be here.

MR. NEARY: They will learn, Mr. Speaker,  
that that kind of a remark , that kind of chaw, can only  
get them in trouble. It can only get them in trouble,  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: They did not get here on their  
own merit -

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, what has  
to happen -

MR. CALLAN: - they got here on the Premier's coattails.

MR. NEARY: Could I have the protection  
of the Chair?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what has to happen  
in the marketing of fish, of Newfoundland fish? Well,  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly what has to happen  
but I will say this, that it will take a major reform  
in the marketing of Newfoundland fish to make it a success.  
There is one of two things that has to happen, Mr. Speaker,  
and the union, the Fishermen's Union have been advocating  
this, and some of the fish trades have been advocating it  
and it is this , Mr. Speaker, that we have to have a  
marketing agency not only for saltfish like the Canadian  
Saltfish Corporation, we have to have a marketing  
agency for all the other produce of the sea

MR. NEARY: and that can be done either by the provincial government setting up their own agency or the provincial government co-operating with the federal government in asking to have the terms of reference of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation amended so that the Canadian Saltfish Corporation will be expanded to include all produce of the sea. It will take, Mr. Speaker, that kind of a Liberal reform in order to successfully market the produce of the seas around our coast.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the government are not going to do that. They are quite happy and content to sit back and let fish plant processors who are in difficulty, in trouble - target it alright; they come in on their hands and knees begging for a loan or a guarantee or a handout to keep them afloat. Mr. Speaker, it is like sticking your finger in the dyke, that is all it is. It is only patchwork, it is only patching up the fishery. They have no policy, they are just merely using the band - aid treatment and they are bailing out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me remind hon. gentlemen in this House that back in 1964 or 1965 I think it was, every fish plant in Newfoundland went bankrupt, every one, and the government of the day bailed them out. Any government worth its salt, any government, Liberal, Tory, N.D.P., any government worth its salt would bail out a fish plant if it were in trouble.

MR. MORGAN: The feds would not do it.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. WALSH: What is wrong with the feds?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon.

gentleman says, "What is wrong with the feds?"

Mr. Speaker, it is not a federal - the hon. gentleman was not listening to me. When the fish comes ashore it is a provincial responsibility; processing licences is a provincial responsibility. Does the hon. gentleman understand that? Keeping these plants going is a provincial responsibility. So, Mr. Speaker, this is their philosophy. Their policy is to wait until plants get in trouble and they have to come to the government begging for a few dollars to keep them afloat, to keep them solvent, to keep them from being forced into bankruptcy and being forced to close their doors. That is the policy of this government. That is the policy, sit back and wait. Mr. Speaker, every processor that came to the Newfoundland Government came looking to be bailed out. Not one came and said, Look, we want to expand, give us a few dollars to help us out, we want to diversify the industry. None of that. They would have been



MR. NEARY: forced into receivership or into bankruptcy, if they did not get bailed out by the Newfoundland Government. And any government worth its salt would do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would not get up and pound my chest if I was the Premier over that kind of a policy. Sit back and wait -

MR. HODDER: The fact there is no quality control comes under the Provincial Government.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Another thing that comes under the provincial government by the way controlled jurisdiction, is quality control. Another big problem.

MR. HODDER: That is why the fish plants are in such hard shape.

MR. NEARY: Another big problem in the market.

MR. WARREN: They do not understand what it means.

MR. TORIN: You can only speak from your own seat.

MR. HODDER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: But any way, Mr. Speaker, that is only one point, but a very important point.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the fishery in this Province is the backbone of our economy, and in the last ten years it has been grossly neglected. You could almost charge the government with criminal negligence.

MR. WARREN: ∴ Chaos! Chaos!

MR. NEARY: Causing chaos in the fishery in this Province.

I was hoping today when the Premier got up that he would outline some positive plan for the future development of the fishery, some positive plan for

MR. NEARY: the future development of sawmills in this Province, some future plans for the development of the forest industry in this Province.

MR. WARREN: He does not have any.

MR. NEARY: Some future plans for the mineral industry in this Province, some future plans about the development of the Lower Churchill. Mr. Speaker, this House has now been open two weeks or longer and not a word about the Lower Churchill; whether it is going to go ahead, whether the cost has escalated beyond our wildest imagination and it is not feasible to develop. Not a sound, not a word not a tittle.

MR. WARREN: Not a word about Labrador.

MR. NEARY: Not a word about Labrador at all, so far in this session of the House. Not a word, Mr. Speaker.

You would have thought that the Premier today leaping into the debate on a Private Member's resolution, which is again unusual, Mr. Speaker, to see the Premier and ministers - usually Private Members' Day is left for Private Members' resolutions and backbenchers on the government side to speak and outline their position on certain policies. That is the whole idea of Private Members' Day, but here we have the Premier and ministers hogging Private Members' Day. Hogging it, taking up the time of the House outlining their mad hatter policy for the development of this Province.

MR. WARREN: All he did today was defend the minister. Why would he defend the minister today, I wonder?

MR. NEARY: Well, we will come to that. We will deal with that later, why the Premier is defending the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. NEARY : Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder then, with this mad hatter policy, that back in 1972, ten years ago, the unemployment rate in this province was 9.7 per cent - 9.7 ten years ago.

MR. WARREN : For 1972?

MR. NEARY 1972. What is it today, Mr. Speaker ? Just listen. Ten years under a Tory regime - 1982, 17.0 per cents.

MR. WARREN: Doubled. Wow!

MR. NEARY Practially doubled. The unemployment has gone up in this Province by 100 per cent in ten years or less and not a word of hope today offered to the unemployed in this Province by the hon. the Premier who spends all his time talking about oil. He dreams oil, he has oil on the brain, he eats oil. That is all he can think about, oil, and neglect every other phase and part of our economy, every other industry in Newfoundland neglected beyond words. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment since 1972, when it was 9.7 per cent - just following the change of government from Liberal to Tory, was 9.7 per cent at the time, it is now 17.0 per cent, practially doubled.

MR. WARREN 95 per cent.

MR. NEARY And, Mr. Speaker, I would say that that is a very conservative figure, with a small 'c'. I would think it is much higher than that. My own opinion is that unemployment in this Province at the present time is running around 35 to 40 per cent. And so, Mr. Speaker, I think it is shameful for the Premier to get up and put on such a display, on his mad hatter policy, this afternoon on the future development of this Province. It is an insult

MR. NEARY: to our unemployed. And, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, I will predict tomorrow - the hon gentleman wound up by saying, 'Wait now until we hear the Budget Speech tomorrow'. I predict, Mr. Speaker, there will be nothing in that Budget that will stimulate the economy there will be nothing in it that will satisfy Christine Fagan of the Board of Trade, or business and industry, or the construction worker, or the contractors in this Province. What we have now - the pre-tendering - what we have we have. There will be no stimulus in that Budget, Mr. Speaker. there will be increases in taxes, they will sock it to the consumer. You talk about your hard-times Budget in Quebec, we have not seen anything yet.

MR. DINN

What would you do?

MR. NEARY:

the economy.

I would do something to stimulate

MR. WALSH

Like what?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not the government. Look, I keep reminding hon. members over there, Mr. Speaker, that I have occupied every seat in this hon. House except one, and I have my eye on that one.

MR. WARREN: And you are going to get it, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I have my eye on it, and, Mr. Speaker, if hon. gentlemen keep tormenting me and tempting me, I might - I like this job. This is a great job. It is the best job I have ever had, certainly it is the best paid job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, I have not, as Joey thinks, lost my ambition and I have my eye on that seat. And if I am tempted I may just stay on, I may just hang on to this job, Mr. Speaker, and then go after the big one.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear! Right on!

MR. NEARY: And I can guarantee you this, Mr. Speaker, that if I do the hon. gentleman will know he was in an election.

MR. WARREN: Yes, sir. Right on!

MR. NEARY: It will be fought on our issues and not on the hon. gentleman's issues, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR: It will be a long time before you will be Premier, and then some.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, we may have to wait for future debates to make some of the other points that I wanted to make this afternoon, we only have twenty minutes in this debate, but, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, that my heart goes out, and the hearts of all the members on this side of the House go

MR. NEARY: out to the unemployed in this Province, to the young Newfoundlanders who cannot find jobs, young men and women between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five who represent 60 per cent of the unemployed in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, they can try all they want to blame it on the high interest rates and to blame it on Ottawa, but, Mr. Speaker, the situation in Newfoundland is much worse than it should be for the simple reason the provincial government have abdicated their responsibility and are not doing their job.

I do not expect the provincial government to cure all the economic woes of Newfoundland, but, Mr. Speaker, I expect the provincial government to do its part. And I repeat again, the situation in Newfoundland is much worse than it should be. It could be better, and there could be more people working if the provincial government was on the ball and did their job, Mr. Speaker, as they are expected to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Before recognizing the next speaker I would like to welcome to the gallery Dr. Haire and Mr. Davis from the University of Tasmania and Australia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I would also like to welcome to the gallery Mayor George Doyle and a delegation from the St. Lawrence town council from the Grand Bank district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

If I could, Mr.

Speaker, with the permission of the hon. member and the permission of the House, I would like to be able to propose - and with the leave of the Opposition since it is Private Members Day, and with, I hope, their co-operation which we always get - propose

MR. MARSHALL: the Standing Committees  
of the House, we need.

MR. NEARY: It is time for you.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, with leave,  
and with the co-operation of the Opposition I move,  
Mr. Speaker, that the Government services comprise:

the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross)  
the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. McLennon)  
the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews)  
the hon. the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward)  
the hon. the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow)  
the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock)  
the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

On the Resource

Policy Committee:

the hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart)  
the hon. the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson)  
the hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin)  
the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid)  
the hon. the member for Bay de Verde (Mr. J. Reid)  
the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan)  
the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

On the Social Services

Committee:

the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter)  
the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)  
the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder)  
the hon. the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird)  
the hon. the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey)  
the hon. the member for St. Mary's- The Capes (Mr. Hearn)  
the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond)



MR. MARSHALL:

And for the Public

Accounts Committee, Mr. Speaker:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) who, as a result of his name appearing first, of course, will be Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, and is the nominee of the Opposition.

the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)

the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush)

the hon. the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird)

the hon. the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin)

the hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach)

the hon. the member for St. Marys'-The Capes (Mr. Hearn)

On motion, and seconded

by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), the above members constitute and form the Standing Committees on the Government Services Committee, the Social Services Committee, the Resource Committee and the Public Accounts Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for

the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, may I

first of all congratulate all hon. members on their election victories on April 6th. I would especially like to thank the people of Bay of Islands district for the vote of confidence that they placed in me.

They, like Newfoundlanders and Labradorians everywhere, stood united with the united message for our Premier and Progressive Conservative Government. They stood up and were counted, determined in their will that right and justice shall prevail, that we must receive a just return from our offshore resources.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, the people

of our Province have served notice that the days of  
sellouts and giveaways for short-term gain are over,  
that this time we shall not squander our greatest  
opportunity, that we will accept nothing less than a  
fair and reasonable settlement of our offshore

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 639

MJ - 1

MR. L. WOODROW: oil and gas resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: With the tremendous mandate afforded us on April 6th comes a tremendous responsibility and challenge as well. However, Mr. Speaker, as I ponder the caliber and determination of my colleagues, I have no doubt whatsoever that the challenge will be met in a responsible and just manner. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - in the best interest of our people and Province.

Mr. Speaker, I probably should say a word to the new members. I would like to say to them that this is the people's House. They have been elected by the people of their districts and they have every right, Mr. Speaker, to feel at home in this House and to speak out for their constituents and for their Province whenever they feel like doing so. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush) for bringing this very important private members' motion before this House of Assembly. Without doubt, Mr. Speaker, job creation and the economy are two concerns facing governments throughout the world, Canada and the Province of Newfoundland being no exception, therefore, I would lend my full support to this resolution and toward any efforts aimed at job creation and an improvement in our economy. Mr. Speaker, this private member's motion has two major thrusts aimed at alleviating the present unemployment problem, resource development and joint federal / provincial co-operation. These are hardly fresh ideas or new directions, particularly the commitment to resource development which is the basic founding policy of this administration

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 639

MJ - 2

MR. L. WOODROW: and will continue to be so.  
However, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the second thrust, joint  
federal / provincial co-operation, suffice it to say, Mr.  
Speaker, that we wil continue to seek that very elusive  
objective which is so necessary for economic growth and  
perhaps, more importantly, for a strong, united Canada.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that there is still time for this joint federal/provincial co-operation to be generated, but sometimes I am not optimistic.

Not so long ago, we heard Prime Minister Trudeau sound the battle cry that co-operative federalism was dead, that we were embarking on our own federal/provincial 'cold war', if you will. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add here that last October, I think it was October 15th or around the 19th, I attended the first Parliamentary French Conference in Ottawa. That is where I got some of those buttons, by the way. And we had an hour in the House of Commons; and at that particular time, I think it was the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), I am almost certain, he was asking a question of the Prime Minister. And I have never in all my days seen anybody so arrogant as the present Prime Minister of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: A great statesman, yes, intelligent, but for a man to be so arrogant to the people of Canada, it was something that I could hardly stomach. Probably that is the reason why we have so many ills today. Because the gentleman wants to cure the debt of Canada which happened over years and years - he wants to cure that in one year. Mr. Speaker, if you have a cut finger you cannot cure it overnight, it takes weeks and months maybe.

Then Mr. Lalonde was on the media sounding the threat that if Newfoundland did not run back to the table and sign the so-called Nova Scotia deal, then we as people could not even expect equal treatment, that our arrangements would be substantially worse. What arrogance!

MR. WOODROW: This position has not changed despite the clear, unified voice that our people sent to Ottawa on April 6, 1982, this year. Mr. Speaker, this is a clear indication of the present state of federal/provincial relations, when the federal government chooses to ignore 61 per cent of our people, chooses to ignore our just and reasonable proposals on the offshore resource.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, we hear of separatist movements in Quebec and Western Canada, we hear of mega projects falling by the wayside, business bankruptcies on a daily basis, homeowners losing homes. Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. Surely if ever there was a time for provincial / federal co-operation, of pulling our oars together, now is the time.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful but not too optimistic that a new spirit of federalism will be forthcoming, especially with the present Prime Minister of Canada. Any one who followed our ten premiers at the first Ministers Conference on the economy was shocked and dismayed that despite their passionate pleas to lower interest rates, our Prime Minister and our Federal Finance Minister (MacEachen) simply threw up their hands and refused. Despite the pleas of Canadians from coast to coast, the federal government refuses to abandon its ruthless budget, and its interest rate policy which is destroying the economic and social fabric of this great country of Canada.

When discussing unemployment or the economy, statistics seem to be the focal point, the debating platform to illustrate how serious the situation has become. However, Mr. Speaker, statistics have their phases. How many lives, families, futures, dreams have fallen by the wayside in the wake of the present economic circumstances? This is the real tragedy of unemployment, and fractional improvements are worsening. Our adjusted or non-adjusted figures cannot mask this social tragedy now robbing the very hope of many Canadians.

If Canadians were not busy simply surviving in today's economic climate. There would be an uprising, there would be a revolt. Their energies have, however, been directed towards keeping body and soul together,





MR. WOODROW: This is why we have reached crisis proportions, this is why party politics have to be pushed aside for the common good. And this is where the five Liberal members in Ottawa should join this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - come out and speak and stand up; not like what we saw in today's paper, two members refused to do so.

MS VERGE: What about Mr. Tobin?

MR. WOODROW: Let me tell you about Mr. Tobin. I sent Mr. Tobin a telegram about two weeks ago -

MR. SIMMONS: Brian Tobin?

MR. WOODROW: Yes - about the pilfering of lobsters in the Woods Island area, my people in the Bay of Islands. I have not received a word yet in reply. And also a copy was sent to the Minister of Revenue (Mr. Rompkey).

MS VERGE: What about the offshore?  
What has he said on the offshore?

MR. WOODROW: The offshore, Mr. Speaker. I heard him on radio the other morning and he certainly has not gone along with what is in the interests of this Province, I can assure you.

MR. BAIRD: He turned it around.

MR. WOODROW: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, Canada Works projects are not the answer. They offer individuals little pride and independence and the various projects are oftentimes of little long-term benefit to the communities involved.

MR. WOODROW: I just want to have a word on this, a little word off the cuff. I have had several in my district, and I have heard foremen say that we can only expect 50 per cent production from our employees because there is no incentive, taking home a miserly \$115 or \$125 a week, Mr. Speaker, we have to do what we, as a people, understand and do best. And what do we know is best for us? Work in resource-based industries. The fisheries: I heard the hon. the Premier mention what was done in the fisheries over the past five or six months. If that is not real progress, what is progress? The forestry, home industries and so on: This is why, Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased to hear the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) outline a very progressive programme centered around resource projects and federal/provincial co-operation, and I would certainly congratulate the minister for the hard work and thought which obviously went into its formulation.

MR. L. WOODROW: I believe that the minister stated there were some 132 prioritized resource-based projects to be allocated in various priority areas, determined through federal consultations.

MR. NEARY: Why did they do it, the federal government?

MR. WOODROW: I will come to that point in a minute. The opportunity was there to make a meaningful dent in unemployment while providing long-term resource-based facilities and improvements. What this nation is all about. Well, Mr. Speaker, a change of government and attitude in Ottawa scuttled the program as the hon. Lloyd Axworthy, the Minister of Unemployment and immigration at the time, decided to return to the Canada Works Projects.

MR. LUSH: That is all these community development work programmes.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, right. Mr. Speaker, there are some very good Canada Works Projects. I refer to a wharf especially, built in my district in the community of York Harbour, when the federal government had turned it down. The old wharf was gone, worn out, they were not going to replace it I had to get a petition from the people and send it to them I got them to realize that this wharf was needed not only for the fishermen, Mr. Speaker, but it was needed also for the tourist trade which is becoming very important in my district. Be that as it may, I still support this very important private member's motion. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we have taken a number of measures to stimulate employment, and while much has been done, much needs to be done. If the federal government recognizes our legitimate claim over the development of the offshore, jobs could begin tomorrow, over and above the numbers working now as a result of local preference regulations put in place by the provincial government. If the

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 643

MJ - 2

MR. L WOODROW: federal government ended its policy  
of fisheries resource give-aways and trade-offs, increased  
fish produce could be handled and processed

MR. WOODROW: at our plants which have been fully supported by our provincial Department of Fisheries . Increased local processing is a necessity, Mr. Speaker, and this is an area where provincial/federal co-operation could play a major role in job creation.

Mr. Speaker, I will not need my twenty-five minutes, I do not think.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks by saying that this government is addressing the problem of unemployment in a determined, meaningful way. We are doing this in spite of the federal policy rather than along with it. Provincial job creation in housing, transportation, fisheries, forestry, offshore and mining sectors is having a noticeable, positive result. And also the Premier mentioned earlier the projects like Cat Arm in Bay d'Espoir and what have you -

MR. SIMMS Burgeo and Ramea.

MR. WOODROW: - Burgeo and Ramea and the like.

However, with a more sensitive, co-operative policy shift in Canada, I feel that even greater job opportunities could be created in our Province in the resource-based area. This, after all, is what Canada is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I state again that I am hopeful and I would like, in fact, to say optimistic that the co-operation may yet be realized, that this co-operation may yet be realized. Time is running out and that is why I support the urgency of this timely resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, I must say first, first be I sit down, I would like to thank the members of the House for being so kind, for letting me speak with silence. And I do hope that all of us -

AN HON. MEMBER: A good speech.

MR. WOODROW: - no matter what, in fact, our allegiance is - I think first of all we are here, we are sent here by the people of our districts, and they have in us, they have confidence in us, and I hope that all of us will do our best for our Province and will be worthy of the trust that the people of the various districts placed in us when they elected us on April 6th of this year.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, before I get into the resolution that has been put on the Order Paper by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), let me congratulate the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow). I may not agree with him, but certainly his arguments are well put.

MR. WOODROW: It is hard to disagree.

MR. TULK: It may not be hard to disagree, Mr. Speaker, but his arguments are well put and it is a pleasure listening to him. I want first of all, Mr. Speaker, to say to the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) that perhaps his resolution is well put and perhaps the most important resolution to come into the House. He points out in his speech and in his resolution that perhaps this is one of the most important resolutions and a matter of grave importance to this Province. There can be no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker, it is the singular most important issue in Newfoundland today, the matter of unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, in his first whereas he says, "Whereas the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador has the highest unemployment record in Canada." And, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about that, because if you look at the April statistics for unemployment in this country we see that the unemployment rate in Newfoundland, the actual unemployment rate as given by Statistics Canada, is 17.1 per cent. The adjusted rate is 15.4, and the unemployment figure for Canada as a whole is hovering around the 9 per cent mark. So, Mr. Speaker, we are practically double, the unemployment rate in this Province is practically double what it is in the rest of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland today according to the latest statistics, there is a

MR. TULK:

labour force of 210,000

people, a labour force of 210,000 - unemployed 36,000.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is with a participation rate,

people looking for work in this Province, of 50.5 per

cent. In other words, only 50.5 per cent of the people,

50 per cent approximately, of the people in this Province

are looking for work and we have 36,000 unemployed. Mr.

Speaker, 50 per cent of our people have given up looking

for work. Why? The answer is obvious. There is no work

for most people in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look

again at that participation rate, 50 per cent, and our

statistics show an unemployment rate of 17 per cent.



MR. TULK: The actual figure of people who are not working in this Province and perhaps should be working, is somewhere around, perhaps, 74,000 for an unemployment rate of 34 or 35 per cent. So actually the unemployment rate should be 35 per cent instead of 17.1 or 15.4 per cent. Mr. Speaker, that is approximately one-third of our people who are capable of working and are unemployed. Those are the real unemployment figures, one-third of our labour force unemployed. Mr. Speaker, the unemployment figures in this Province have reached close to depression standards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second WHEREAS put forward in the resolution by my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) reads: "and; WHEREAS there are a number of areas in the Province where the unemployment figures are far beyond the provincial average". Mr. Speaker, we have in Newfoundland the worst unemployment rate in Canada and yet the regional figures for April, if you look at the regional figures for April, five distinct regions in this Province for April, you will see that the actual rate of unemployment in the Avalon region is 14.1 per cent, region two, which includes the Burin Peninsula and the South Coast is 16.1 per cent, region three, the West Coast, the Northern Peninsula and Labrador is 21.5 per cent, region four, Central and the Southeast Coast of Newfoundland, 20.2 per cent, region five, St. John's, 11.8 per cent. Mr. Speaker, these are the actual rates. If you look at our participation rate again, then perhaps those figures should read somewhere around 28, 32, 42 per cent. In the region, Mr. Speaker, that encompasses my district, in April - 40 per cent, 22 per cent across this Province.

MR. TULK: We have the worst unemployment rate in Canada and, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that certain regions of this Province have reached depression proportions.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the worst. The worst is that year after year the unemployment figures in this Province are increasing. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) in

MR. TULK: his usual eloquent fashion pointed out the other day -

MR. STAGG: Inimitable.

MR. TULK: The man is good at words. The exact word to describe the member for Terra Nova, I agree in his usual eloquent fashion, Mr. Speaker, pointed out that over the last ten year period unemployment in this province has practically doubled. It has gone Mr. Speaker, from 8 per cent in April 1972, to 15.4 per cent in 1982.

MR. STAGG: What about the participation rate?

MR. TULK: Participation rate in this Province is 50.5 per cent adjusted to 53.5 per cent. That was April. Canada as a whole was 63 per cent.

MR. STAGG: That came from Quebec.

MR. TULK: It must. It came from the same place I guess. Mr. Speaker, that unemployment rate is getting worse every year. Mr. Speaker, those are the statistics. Those are the raw figures. Mr. Speaker, they do not tell the real story. The real story, Mr. Speaker, is found among our people. When you go out as a member of the House of Assembly and walk in and find a person without a job, a person who has been employed all his life, and suddenly he does not have a job -

MR. STAGG: Are we the authors of our own misfortunes or do we have something to blame it on?

MR. TULK: -- he finds himself, Mr. Speaker, without the standard of living that he had. He finds himself at a lower standard of living. Mr. Speaker, the number of social problems that are being caused in Newfoundland as a result of that, the number of family problems, Mr. Speaker, are rising every day. It is one of the worst things that a member of this House has to do, I suggest.

MR. STAGG: We have heard the symptoms, now tell us about the cure.

MR. TULK: The cure, Mr. Speaker,

May 26, 1982

Tape 647

TM - 2

MR. TULK: is to take members  
of the House of Assembly like the member for Stephenville,  
out of here -

MR. WARREN: Yes, that would do it.

MR. TULK: - and put somebody in  
who has some concern, perhaps, for the Province.

MR. HODDER: Maybe Stephenville  
made a mistake.

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 648

RA - 1

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, the worst frustration.

MR. STAGG: Not all of them.

MR. TULK: The toddler from Stephenville is up, the toddler from Stephenville is down. He toddles right along. Mr. Speaker, those people that you find in your district will, in many cases in frustration and with a great deal of loss of pride, perhaps turn to his member. And the frustration obviously for the member is that there is, in many cases, no help because there are just no jobs available.

MR. BARRY: Just give us five minutes on Northern cod stocks and the way the feds are handling them.

MR. TULK: Just be quiet. I will give you five minutes on Northern cod stocks in a few minutes.

MR. BARRY: I would like to hear what you think about the representative (inaudible).

MR. HODDER: He has already told you that.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, that is the real - He could not understand that.

MR. HODDER: He could not understand it, put it in baby talk.

MR. TULK: That is the real tragedy, the real tragedy, the sapping of our independent spirit as a people. That is the real problem, that of unemployment in this Province. Mr. Speaker, what has this government done? What has this government done? Oh, 'It is Canada-wide'. 'Unemployment is Canada-wide'. Agreed, Mr. Speaker, it is North America -

MR. TULK: wide. It is widespread throughout the Western World. Perhaps it is a whole world problem. Or they will look and say 'Oh, it is Ottawa and the high interest rates'. Mr. Speaker, I agree that interest rates obviously affect the employment record of this Province. Then they go on - but they fail to point out that interest rates in Canada perhaps are tied to the U.S. rates. 'The federal government should do more', is their cry. That is why I disagree with my friend from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow). Now, Mr. Speaker, let us ask this government one question. Let us agree with them on all those things - hypothetically agree with them. It is a world-wide problem. It is a North American problem. It is a Canadian problem. Let us agree with them on all that. The federal government should do more. Oh, it is a problem for the federal government. Where does that leave them? Where does that leave them? Is that an excuse? Can they throw in the towel? The answer is no. The answer is no. This government has a responsibility as well as the other government in Canada to the unemployment record. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to rural development.

MR. TULK: Yesterday, the member for Twillingate (Ms. Reid) who is no doubt sincere, but she can not get away with it, Mr. Speaker, she just can not be allowed to get away with it. She spoke of Canada Works or, as a lot of people call them, Community Development Programmes. She called them make work projects, and indeed they are. But she got up and she cast all kinds of doubts about the worth of those programmes. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to her that in the job that she held before she came to this House, that that was probably one of her prime concerns, to get some of those from the federal government. I would suggest that to her.

MR. NEARY: The federal government paid 90 per cent of the cost of hiring her.

MR. TULK: But she said no, that she could only think of one that was worth anything - very few, worthwhile, long-term projects. Mr. Speaker, there are many cases in the member's district, where without the help of Canada Works Programmes some of her people would not yet have water and sewer, at least water. And there are many places where some of her own fishermen would not have wharves if they had to wait for this crowd on the other side of the House to give it to them.

MR. WARREN: She would not be here today.

MR. TULK: No, she probably would not.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. TULK: She probably would not.

MR. WARREN: That is how she got here, through Canada Works.

MR. TULK: Short-term employment, she said, short-term employment,

MR. STAGG: The hon. member is a LIP project.

MR. NEARY: Go back to your seat, boy.

MR. TULK: -low pay. The toddler. He toddles back and forth. Low pay. Sure it is low pay. We know that, Mr. Speaker, we know that the hon. member is

MR. TULK: partially right. But she does not give the whole picture. Why are those Canada Community Development Projects there in the first place? Why? The answer is simple, the answer is simple. What else is there? May I ask the member for Twillingate (Ms, Reid) one question? For the people in her district who are unemployed, what else is there for them to do? She wants to do away with them.

What is she going to do?

MR. BAIRD:

Ask it while she is here.

MR TULK:

I can not help that. Go out

and get her, go out and get her.

MR. NEARY:

It is not our fault if members

are not in the House.

MR. TULK:

You write it down,

and take it out her, then you will serve some useful purpose.

Now come on. What else is there for those people who are unemployed in the district?

MR. NEARY:

He is of no use to this house.

MR. TULK:

The answer is absolutely -

no, no. He is good. He is amusing.



MR. NEARY: So he is amusing, eh?

MR. TULK: Yes. I had him over here yesterday, I had to flick him back again.

MR. NEARY: Just like an old stoke.

MR. TULK: Yes. We had him over here and we said 'No, we cannot take you, go on back. They kicked him out of all those offices

MR. NEARY: He sits there in the corner like a yellow mangey dog.

MR. TULK: Not mangey. You cannot call him a mangey dog.

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible), Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing for the people in her district to do. Mr. Speaker, I found it a little bit amusing, too, when she got up and talked about Rural Development Associations. Rural Development Associations, I found that amusing. The member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid), was a co-ordinator of one of those development associations, and I understand she was a good one.

MR. SIMMS: Excellent, excellent!

MR. TULK: I understand that she was a good one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Let us hope she is as good a member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Let us hope she is as permanent in this position as she was in that one. I doubt that, but let us hope that she is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: A good co-ordinator, Mr. Speaker. And the Rural Development Organizations, if let alone

MR. NEARY: They can not get their act together.

MR. TULK: If let alone, Rural Development Organizations may be good organizations. Mr. Speaker, she did not stand up and say who paid her salary for the past number of years.

MR. NEARY: 90 per cent by Ottawa or a 100, which?

MR. TULK: Who paid her salary? Who pays the salaries of all co-ordinators?

MR. NEARY: Ottawa.

MR. TULK: She did not say that, She did not say who funds them. She did not say who pays the salaries. No, not at all.

MR. NEARY: No, it is the taxpayers of Canada.

MR. TULK: But the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that 90 per cent of the funds for Rural Development Associations -

MR. STAGG: Ottawa has done something good.

MR. TULK: Just be quiet now. Just be quiet. If you got a question now, wait until I am finished and then I will answer it. Unlike, getting answers from that side, you can get some from over here. Who pays the salaries of co-ordinators? The federal government does, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, one other question - Where do you usually find, this is no reflection on the minister, Mr. Speaker, none at all, because I suspect that the rest of the crew over there keeps their fingers on the purse strings. Where do they usually find problems? Where do they usually find problems, obstacles to any projects they have to put forward? From this government. The answer is from this government. More bureaucracy and red tape, and more lack of funds in this government, Mr. Speaker, than you would believe. Now, Mr. Speaker, the federal government supports Rural Development Associations, pays for them. Funding is about to run out. I would hope that the Minister can twist the arms of that crew over there -

MR. NEARY: They got to change their philosophy.

MR. TULK: - enough. If he cannot get the money from the federal government, I would hope he could twist their arms on

May 26, 1982

Tape No . 650

PS - 3

MR. TULK: that side of the House enough so that he will  
will get the funds for the Rural Development Associations, so  
we can keep employing good co-ordinators like the member for  
Twillingate ( Mrs. Reid ).

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Keep it going, keep the Rural  
Development going. Keep it going yourselves.

MR. GOUDIE: They are sponsored through Development.

MR. NEARY: You are going to keep it going yourselves?

MR. TULK: You are going to keep it going.

MR. NEARY: You will need no assistance from  
Ottawa.

MR. TULK: Welcome News .

MR. S. NEARY You will not need help from Ottawa?

MR. B. TULK Well, you do not need any?

MR. GOUDIE The agreement expires at the end of March 1983.

MR. TULK That is right.

MR. NEARY And you will keep it going on your own?

MR. GOUDIE If the federal government does not agree, we will have to keep them going on our own.

MR. TULK Good, excellent !

MR. NEARY And you will finance it 100 per cent.

MR. TULK We will see that happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS Hear, hear !

MR. TULK Mr. Speaker, we have another one over here, can we give him the flick over there again.

MR. NEARY That one looks like an informer.

MR. TOBIN I must say it is the first time that side looked good.

MR. TULK He is siding with good, yes, he is over here. The greatest opportunity for employment in this province, Mr. Speaker, is the fishery. I want to come back to the member for Stephenville ( Mr. Stagg ) over there. We had no problems, as I said yesterday evening. He may have been asleep, he may not have understood it, but I want to repeat it for him again. We have no problems at all -

MR. NEARY Do you have to dignify him by recognizing him ?

MR. TULK - agreeing that the federal government should not give the Russians the quotas that they are giving them. As a matter of fact, we say that they should not give them any.

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 651

MLeP - 2

MR. WARREN

Not one fish.

MR. TULK

Now have you got it?

MR. WARREN

Not one thing.

MR. NEARY

Not a sculpin, not a flounder.

MR. TULK

But Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY

Not a silver hake, or

anything else.

MR. TULK

Mr. Speaker, the minister, the minister in this province - the irony of the position is that you have got the member of Stephenville ( Mr . Stagg) saying one thing and the Minister of Fisheries in this Province ( Mr. Morgan) saying something else, standing up and saying.

MR. STAGG

You would not give them any.

MR. TULK

Oh yes, there are certain kinds.

MR. NEARY

And the non-members are always saying something different.

MR. TULK

There are certain kinds that we will give them, certain kinds of fish that we will give them. Those that are surplus. Mr. Speaker, what is surplus?

MR. NEARY

Nothing.

MR. TULK

Nothing. There is no fish surplus in this province.

MR. NEARY

Give our fishermen the catching capability.

MR. TULK

Give them the catching capability.

MR. STAGG

I agree with that.

MR. TULK

Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY

Slimy scalupins are the only thing surplus on that side of the House.

MR. STAGG

If ever I were in Opposition

(Inaudible)

MR. TULK

If you were where?

ay 26, 1982

Tape No. 651

MLeP - 3

MR. TULK That is the tactic you would use?

MR. STAGG Yes, indeed.

MR. TULK Is it a good tactic for Newfoundland?

Is it good strategy for Newfoundland?

MR. STAGG Yes, a good strategy for Newfoundland.

MR. TULK Well that is what is required,  
regardless of where you are.

MR. STAGG That is the first time you have ever  
said that.

MR. TULK Oh ! This is the third or fourth  
time Mr. Speaker,

MR. STAGG Third or fourth time you are doing  
well -

MR. NEARY Right, boy. I guarantee you he is a  
good debater.

MR. STAGG - since you moved up to the front  
benches.

MR. TULK Mr. Speaker, I was saying to the  
member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren ) today that I wish  
we had all our seats put together so I could get behind that  
crew over there and we would be like a family. And we would  
take on the bullies from the other side. No problem, Mr. Speaker,  
we would take them on. Mr. Speaker, I think my time has expired.  
I would like to say to the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush)  
that when the time comes, certainly we on this side will  
support this most important resolution and ask that crew over  
there to not be like seals, but get up and do the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS Hear, hear !

MR. SPEAKER (Russell) The hon. member for Conception  
Bay South.

MR. J. BUTT I too would like to have a few words on this  
very important resolution put forward by the hon. member for  
Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and I agree with the member

MR. BUTT:

for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) in that unemployment is not just a disease that is here in Newfoundland, but also in Canada and indeed the industrialized world. I believe that high interest rates are the root of a lot of the problems with unemployment. High interest rates are causing a lot of small businesses to go bottom up, putting a large employer in this Province and in this country, a large employer of people, people who employ ten and twenty people, high interest rates are putting them out of business. High interest rates have cut the legs out from under the construction industry. High interest rates have stopped people from building houses, office buildings, schools, you name it. It has hurt the trade union people, the plumbers, pipe fitters and electricians. There are hundreds of them out on the street. High interest rates have done that.

Now I realize that we may contribute in a small way to high interest rates. But really high interest rates, the root of that problem is with the federal government. As the Premier (Mr. Peckford) pointed out earlier, we have addressed ourself to the high unemployment problem here in this Province. If you listened to the Throne Speech, in order to address this very serious problem we had a series of early tenders which were called - it is on page 7 in the Throne Speech - early tenders called in housing, in transportation, building lot subsidies, support of

MR. BUTT: fish plants. And of course the position and the funding that was put forward by the Department of Fisheries this year indicates how much that particular department has addressed itself to the unemployment situation. Early tendering, as well, in Municipal Affairs, particularly in water and sewer projects which are not really high profile things but very necessary and very essential in many communities, Conception Bay South, of course, being one of them. A \$1.4 million contract which was just awarded, by the way, in Paradise, will supply people with vital jobs that are required at this time.

I am also happy to say that in the very near future, as well, there will be an additional \$3 million for water and sewer projects in the town of Conception Bay South.

MR. STAGG: I think we should have an investigation on that.

MR. BUTT: The fisheries, the monies put forward, some \$20 million in guaranteed loans, have provided somewhere in the order of 8,000 jobs which would otherwise be lost if it was not for that department, headed up by my hon. colleague for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

Highway spending, as well, will provide very essential jobs to people who are presently unemployed. But the key to it, as I see it, is an negotiated settlement for the offshore oil. Now, what would that do? I mean, we all realize that directly, people who would be involved in the offshore oil, it would not create all that many jobs. But what would it do if we had a settlement? What would it do, for example, for the people of Conception Bay South



MR. BUTT: an area that has tremendous potential for offshore development? I could see numerous people being employed at Octagon Pond, for example, in the heavy industrial park that is proposed for there. The pre-engineering and design is already completed on that. I could see a lot of people employed at Long Pond. Now granted that will not take place until St. John's is busting at the seams, but Long Pond is an auxiliary port to the port of St. John's. All these things would employ people. Seal Cove as well, I might add, is earmarked as a preferred site. And there, once again, we could have a lot of people employed. The monies generated from that, from offshore oil -

MR. BAIRD: (inaudible) grants

MR. BUTT: No. The monies generated from offshore oil, for example, could enable this Province to develop projects like the Lower Churchill which right now is stagnated, it is stopped because this Province cannot undertake or underwrite the costs.

MR. NEARY: Ottawa offered the Province help, financial help but they would not take it.

MR. BUTT: This Province could underwrite the costs of the Lower Churchill on its own if we had the offshore oil, if we had it.

MR. STAGG: That should be done by laser beam.

MR. NEARY: Ottawa offered to help.

MR. BUTT: That is so important. I hear so many members say that the offshore oil would only employ a couple of hundred people. But the spinoff from it, I mean you could have a buoyant economy. There would be a housing boom, offices. The infrastructure going up to accommodate that kind of development would all be labour intensive in road building, office buildings, as I have said before. If you want to bring it back one step further, it

MR. BUTT: would certainly help the resource people in sawmills, operating sawmills and so on in the Province.

So, I think the key to the unemployment situation is getting a negotiated settlement.

MR. NEARY: A negotiated settlement, now you are talking.

MR. BUTT: Yes, oh yes. I mean, I believe in a negotiated settlement. But how can we have a negotiated settlement when our counterparts in Ottawa will not agree to look at a very reasonable proposal put forward by this Province?

MR. NEARY: Would the provincial government withdraw their court case if Ottawa withdrew their court case?

MR. BUTT: Well, you know, you better put that question to the -

MR. NEARY: But you do not know. First thing (inaudible) you do not know the answer.

MR. STAGG: We would withdraw all court cases, withdraw all court cases if we could get a settlement.

MR. BUTT: I would think so, yes.

MR. NEARY: You would think so.

MR. BUTT: We want a negotiated settlement, let there be no doubt in your mind. We want a negotiated settlement.

MR. NEARY: Can we accept that as an announcement to Canada?

MR. BUTT: A negotiated settlement is the Canadian way, it is the Newfoundland way.

MR. NEARY: We agree with that -

MR. BUTT: But right now, you see, like back in 1979, and I realize the hon. member probably did not realize, he is not a member any more, but the former Leader of the Opposition (Mr. W. Rowe) or the outhouse Leader of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BUTT: - I am sure now, he did not realize the mistake that he made, the blunder that he made when he put out the cry to bring 'Don' home. Because when he brought 'Don' home, you see, he left us no one in Ottawa to negotiate a deal.

MR. TULK: When he brought him home we knew what we wanted him to do.

MR. BUTT: We brought 'Don' home, minister who had clout, a minister who had clout, a negotiator, a diplomat. But now we have a cloutless minister, if that is the word, a weak minister, as the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) agreed with the other day.

MR. WARREN: You have a sense of humour, I did not realize that before.

May 26, 1982

Tape No. 655

RA - 2

MR. BUTT: Oh, yes. But, now we have very little, it is wrong to say no representation but very little representation in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Cabinet material.

MR. BUTT: That is very important. When the cry went out to bring 'Don' home, you left us no one in Ottawa. Now we have no one there really to -

MR. TULK: Issue an ultimatum and you will be in the Cabinet.

MR. BUTT: - carry the load for this Province. You know, we have been let down terribly. I mean, all of this reflects back on unemployment.

MR. BUTT: And, I mean, I agree with the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), employment is a terrible disease. I can imagine how it affects people socially. If they are unemployed. A person who is unemployed, if he has a family, it must be a terrible thing. I was never unemployed myself, but I can imagine. I know a lot of people who are unemployed. As a matter of fact, every day I have numerous calls from people who are seeking employment.

MR. TULK: You cannot even get a job for your brother-in-law. I am ashamed of you.

MR. BUTT: Well, my brother-in-law is not a constituent of mine and my constituents come first. That is why I am going to be here for quite some time.

MR. TULK: Are you sure about that?

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, this terrible disease that is crippling this country and indeed this Province, can be addressed in certain ways. I mean, as a provincial government, a small province, a poor province, resource rich but poor,

MR. BUTT: We can only do so much to try to cure some of the unemployment ills. But we need co-operation from the federal government to solve this very great problem that we have.

MR. TULK: You should vote for the resolution.

MR. BUTT: And we need a strong voice in Ottawa to do that. And I would suggest that the next time Mr. Trudeau decides to go to the polls, we will have a strong voice in Ottawa because, indeed, at that time we will probably have Mr. Crosbie and Mr. McGrath back in the Cabinet, where they rightfully belong, in a Conservative Government.

Mr. Speaker, just simply in closing I want to say to the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) that I will certainly be supporting his very important resolution. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Aylward): The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say I have to take issue with the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) because he stole all my lines. I was here making notes before he spoke and obviously he was looking over my shoulder, taking notes, looking at these scribbles which are hard to read now. It is quite a tribute to his eyesight, the fact that he could read these things.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution put forward by the member for Terra Nova is a good resolution. It is one of the resolutions -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am going to continue to speak in coherent sentences even though no one can hear me. I have a job hearing myself.

MR. TULK: Well, that will be the first time.

MR. STAGG: This is a very good resolution put forward by the member for Terra Nova. And I understand

MR. STAGG: his debate on the subject was noteworthy as well. It was basically a non-partisan statement, which is also unusual for the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). Because he usually starts off in a non-partisan manner but he works himself into a frenzy and he gets carried away.

I would like to direct myself to several areas that we have been dealing with in considerable detail, and we have been highlighting in this session of the House of Assembly, that is, how do we

MR. STAGG: do away with this unemployment disease that we have in the Province, and what can we as legislators direct ourselves to? And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that we have, in the past couple of weeks come a long way as far as the standard of debate in this House of Assembly is concerned. We have made significant strides as far as being unanimous on a number of very critical matters for this Province. For instance, last week on Private Members Day, in effect it was probably the most noteworthy debate that we have ever had in the House of Assembly within recent years. It was one of the best sessions for debate that I have ever experienced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Here, here!

MR. STAGG: Excellent speeches on both sides and people spoke from the heart. And we dealt with an issue of vital significance to the people of the Province. The issue that we were dealing with at that time highlighted the problems that we are having as a government in dealing with our federal counterparts. Now, we are very repetitive on this. Everybody on this side who gets up and speaks cannot avoid mentioning the fact that we have severe and critical difficulties in managing our resources because of interference, or lack of co-operation with our federal counterparts. In that regard, I must say that hon. members opposite have not acted in the manner to which they had become accustomed; i.e. to oppose vociferously and loudly and lengthily any resolutions that emanated from this side that would be critical of their federal counterparts. It is quite obvious that in the last election, the federal people really did not care about their provincial colleagues and I expect

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not believe it!

MR. STAGG: that is correct. They did not care about them.

May 26, 1982

Tape 657

TM - 2

MR. BAIRD: You mean Brian Tobin  
did not care about them?

MR. STAGG: Well, Brian Tobin, the  
member for Humber - Port au Port - St. Barbe came down  
because -

MR. BAIRD: He has never been in his  
seat.

MR. STAGG: - he sees the election as  
the harbinger of things to come. And, I must say, in that  
regard he was quite correct.



MR. STAGG: It is coming events casting their shadow in Humber-Port Au Port-St. Barbe. But other Liberal members of the House of Commons were not quite as active as he was. And I must say that hon. members opposite have been taking a very provocative stance with regard to their federal counterparts. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) looks at me with an incredulous look on his face. The Minister of Fisheries has been away for a couple of days. And during that couple of days there has been a magnificent transformation in the members on the Opposition side. They have actually supported a very reasonable stance taken by people on our side. And last Wednesday the unanimous resolution which was passed in this House of Assembly which, in effect, condemned the arbitrary and unCanadian act of the federal Liberals, i.e. Mr. Chretien, Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Lalonde, is something which will go down in history as being one of the major accomplishments of this Thirty-Ninth General Assembly, the fact that on this critical issue, this issue that is of vital importance to all of the people in the Province, there was unanimity in the House.

Now there was a resolution proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) but it was not a particularly serious-amendment rather, proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. When that was voted down as it quite rightly should have been, the Opposition voted unanimously with the government, although I do not think they were all there at the time. And I think when the vote was counted - because we did have a Division on that particular issue, Mr. Speaker. Granted it was one o'clock in the morning but there were significant -

MR. NEARY: No, it was not deliberate.

MR. STAGG: It was not deliberate. I hope it was not deliberate because at least one key spokesman,

MR. STAGG: a person who could be of key importance to our fight to get our resources - there is one member of the Opposition who formerly held a very high position there that I would like to see come out in strong support of the Province's position and not equivocate and obfuscate and try to detract from our position. And I think all hon. members here know of whom I speak. I am waiting for the day when that hon. gentleman -

MR. NEARY: That gentleman was at the caucus when we took the position.

MR. STAGG: Yes, I realize he was at the caucus, and silence is acquiescence and all

may 26, 1982

Tape 659

JC - 1

MR. STAGG: this sort of thing, but the hon.  
gentleman to whom I refer-

MR. TULK: He was in caucus.

MR. STAGG: Well, as far as I am concerned,  
in the debate he was silent.

MR. TULK: No. He spoke out.

MR. STAGG: In the debate he was silent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh,

MR. STAGG: He spoke for twenty minutes and  
said nothing.

MR. NEARY: Go away boy.

MR. STAGG: He basically equivocated. I am  
speaking of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts),  
of course.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: That is the member that I wished  
would come out in firm support, firm and strong support of the  
province's position and, also, in the same breath, in the same  
breath, condemn the people in Ottawa for the way they have conducted  
themselves.

MR. NEARY: You will get my support, if you  
want it.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, the other  
significant disclosure in this section of the House of Assembly,  
was a disclosure made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)  
on May 14, 1982, when he indicated that the federal government  
had made a secret deal with the Russians, and they had given, given

May 26, 1982

Tape 659

JC - 2

MR. STAGG: 232.5 million pounds of fish to the Russians.

MR. TULK: How much?

MR. STAGG: 232.5 million pounds of fish

MR. TULK: 232.5 million pounds?

MR. STAGG: Million pounds, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: And it is something that was done surreptitiously. It was covertly done.

MR. TULK: How much cod was in it?

MR. STAGG: I am not sure how much cod was in it but there were 10,500 metric tons of caplin. This, of course, is a food fish for the cod. That is how our fisherman think anyway, and I suppose they know it better than anyone else.

They have condemned the action and that is something that received a certain amount of play in the media. And I must say that in this regard the media were quite fair and objective in their reporting. I hope that they maintain and persevere in the kind of investigative reporting that was done for them, in this case by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who through his sources -

MR. TULK: Oh, come on. Are you picking on the media?

MR. STAGG: Who released it? Who released it? The minister of Fisheries released it and the media picked it up. It is the sort of thing that one would expect the media to find out, rather than doting and waiting on someone to hand it to them on a silver platter.

MR. WALSH: You usually hear the Opposition bragging about it.

MR. STAGG: That is something that I hope that the media will listen to. And that they will get out and do a little investigative reporting on matters of vital concern to the province i.e. the poor utilization of the fish stocks off our east coast.

MAY 26, 1982

Tape 659

JC - 3

MR. STAGG:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have all dealt with in detail, and we will continue to deal with, the problem that we have with our offshore oil resource, that surround it. that surround it. There is a lot of

MR. STAGG: confusion on the subject, a lot of it deliberately planted there by people who really do not support the Province in its position. We have people within the Province who are acting against us, in that regard, and in many cases the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: I must say I am doing an excellent job here, Mr. Speaker, speaking while there are two or three other conversations going on. I must commend myself for it. Because it is the sort of thing that you can carry on to some extent, but it is a little bit irritating to have it happen continuously, especially when what you are saying is so significant, and is so vital to the well being of the Province. Now, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) wants us to fully debate all aspects of resource development in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I think that is what we are doing in this House of Assembly in this session. This, even though we will not set aside a specific debate for it, this is part of the continuing debate. Every day during the Question Period I commend hon. members opposite to ask questions that are concerned with resource development and not, as they did today, take up the whole Question Period with points of order, points of privilege, and matters that really do not pertain to the resource development of the Province. So, it is sort of a defeatist strategy that hon. members opposite have developed, at least today. I hope that it will not continue too long. And 'be it further resolved' says the member for Terra Nova, 'that the government target areas of high unemployment with a view to producing a plan for joint federal provincial co-operation aimed at improving the economy of those areas and to create long-term jobs for unemployed residents in this Province.' Well again, Mr. Speaker, I can only commend hon. gentlemen to the course they so wisely began last week. They began a course of agreeing with the initiatives taken by the

MR. STAGG: government on critical issues. And getting over the partisan aspects of it, and we will both have our partisan remarks in making the debate, but on the major issues, the big picture so to speak, we will be in agreement with one another. And we have been encouraged by this constructive attitude on the part of the Opposition. I do not know if it can continue, I do not know if it will continue, but it certainly augers well for us in the future. As far as offshore oil development is concerned,

MR. STAGG: the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) dealt with it at some length. It is being put down in some areas as a method of just raising revenue for the Province. But, Mr. Speaker, it is something that is of genuine concern and will be -

MR. TULK: You are supposed to take a picture of the Premier with you before you go into -

MR. STAGG: What are you saying?

MR. NEARY: How many times a day do you kiss the Premier's picture?

MR. STAGG: I turned it back. I turned it around.

MR. TULK: When you kiss it at least ten times a day, then you will get in Cabinet.

MR. STAGG: The hon. gentlemen do not care about the points that I am making with regard to resource development for the Province. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) makes a very good resolution. I am up supporting him, saying that the hon. members opposite are making good points in debate, and all they want to do is they want to point ridicule or ridiculous statements over at me. And they hope that I stand up here and make a fool of myself.

MR. BAIRD: Never!

MR. STAGG: Yes, they are hoping that I will not change my style.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the offshore oil development is a genuine development for the Province that will bring thousands of jobs in very short order. Now, the proposal that hon. gentlemen opposite did not read is called a proposal for settlement and it was presented in Montreal on January 25, 1982. It is a very good proposal. It is a Canadian proposal. And I forgive hon. gentlemen opposite for not reading it, because they had other issues on their minds when it was released. And after the election



MR. STAGG: was over, they were in a state of shock and did not bother to read it anyway. But now we are here and we are dealing with matters that will project themselves over the next four years. And we are talking about the establishment of a true partnership between Ottawa and Newfoundland, the establishment of a true partnership between Ottawa and St. John's or the federal government and our provincial government. There is nothing in the way of that happening. Our Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) will in very short order travel to Ottawa and meet on neutral ground or travel to Cape Chidley, or he might even go up and find it at the North Pole or wherever.

MR. F. STAGG: He would go anywhere at any time to initial, sign, seal and deliver an agreement that would be consistent with this proposal for settlement that was made on the 25th of January. Now, I would suggest to hon. members opposite that what they should do, what they should do, number one, is they should read it, or they should read the so-called executive summary that is only four or five pages long and deals with the highlights of it. And each of them should write a letter, correspond to their federal member or to the Prime Minister and get a lot of media play out of it, in the same way that one of their former colleagues did, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms). Unfortunately he got defeated anyway, but he must have gotten defeated for reasons other than the stand he took on the offshore. He did not support us on the Constitution. But, this is what I would suggest that hon. members opposite do. And it is a legitimate political maneuver on their part and it will be supportive, very much supportive-

MR. TULK: Ah, boy, kiss the picture and get in Cabinet.

MR. STAGG: -of the position which they took last week. And we can then get around to the fighting of these battles against the evils that were so eloquently pointed out by the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) when he spoke earlier. As a matter of fact, I must commend the member for Bay of Islands on his excellent speech. It was an emotional response. The hon. member has a district in which many of the problems that were highlighted by him are in profusion. So the establishment of a true partnership between Ottawa and Newfoundland is a definite possibility. We are within a hair's breadth -

MR. STAGG: of bringing that about, all it requires is an exercise in statesmanship on the part of the federal government. We have gone our miles. We have derogated from our previous position which may have been considered to be inflexible, which may have been considered to be one that was out of step with reality when we were looking for and said we would have total ownership, nothing but total ownership, ownership and control. Well, we stepped back a long way from that in this proposal and I commended it to hon. gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: I too will be supporting the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I was about to remind the hon. member that he now take his seat as his time has expired. If the hon. member speaks now, he closes the debate. The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: I want to thank the hon. members for participating in this debate. I want to say first of all, Mr. Speaker, that I was disappointed

MR. T. LUSH with the debate, not with its quality or its level, disappointed with the fact that government members did not understand the essence of the resolution. They did not understand, Sir, what it was all about.

MR. TULK All they can do is smirk.

MR. LUSH I want to thank the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) for saying that I made a non-partisan speech last week. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was it.

Mr. HODDER That is always the case.

MR. LUSH It was meant to be a non-partisan resolution,

MR. TULK It is.

MR. LUSH It was not meant to condemn the federal government or the provincial government, it was meant to be a non-partisan resolution. But how does one remain non-partisan when the members on the government side became very partisan? I want to say, Mr. Speaker, the speeches this afternoon were very good, and in that respect

MR. TULK Except the Premiers.

MR. LUSH with the exception of the Premiers is right. The previous speakers, the heavyweights, all were partisan, they took it as an opportunity to whip the federal government -

MR. TULK You are scared them away.

MR. LUSH - to take a strip out of the federal government, the Minister of Labour and Manpower, the Minister of Social Services. I do not know whether the hon. the government House Leader spoke or not, but if he spoke you can be sure he was partisan.

MR. TULK Oh, naturally.

MR. LUSH I do not recall whether he spoke or not. But, Mr. Speaker, that was the situation. Members this afternoon, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

MR. LUSH were not all that bad, they gave good speech this afternoon, but the Premier, Mr. Speaker, the Premier became very partisan and tried to defend the indefensible.

MR. TULK Do you not think the member for Bay of Islands ( Mr. Woodrow ) should be a parliamentary secretary.

MR. LUSH Oh, most certainly. He gave a marvelous speech, I do want to allude to one word he used a little later, but it was a marvelous speech. But the Premier, Mr. Speaker, the Premier tried to defend the indefensible. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, tried to defend an unemployment rate of 15.4 per cent.

MR. TULK Really! That high.

MR. LUSH Just imagine the people of this Province hearing that the Premier tried to defend an unemployment rate of 15.4 per cent. The Premier me of a student who, after writing an IQ test and got 50 said he was proud he passed. That certainly demonstrated what the Premier is saying about his government's failure with respect to developing the economy of this Province and with respect to doing something with the unemployment problem that we presently face. The member for Conception Bay South (Mr .Butt) mentioned that most people, or a lot of people he heard the comment that a lot of people thought the offshore oil development

MR. LUSH: was not going to do much for the Province, that people were talking about a couple of hundred jobs. Now I do not know where the member heard that. He certainly never heard me say that. And I do not think anybody on this side of the House ever suggested that offshore oil development was going to mean as little as 200 jobs. What we said was that it was not going to be the panacea of this Province, that it was not going to solve all the economic woes. Indeed, the experts have said that with the largest oil well in the world today the most that we could look forward to is about 7,000 jobs, and that is counting the spinoff benefits.

MR. NEARY: And he is telling us how there are 1500 maximum. At least 1500 jobs.

MR. LUSH: Yes. Well, the experts who measure the multiplier effect and all this sort of thing, all the spinoff, say, 'With a very large well there would be a maximum of 7,000 jobs'. So, Mr. Speaker, that in itself will demonstrate how far we are going to be away then from giving all the people employment in this Province.

But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker. That is not to take away from the oil development, it is just to keep members' feet opposite on the ground, and to ensure that they do not feel that once we get the oil, once we start getting revenue from the offshore oil that we have arrived at the new Jerusalem, or that we have arrived at the Promised Land. There is still a lot to be done.

Mr. Speaker, that was the essence of this resolution. First of all, that we recognize that there is a problem. First of all, that we recognize that unemployment is a problem in this Province. Because in order to solve a problem we must first of all recognize that

MR. LUSH: there is a problem. And if people go on with the ostrich in the sand approach, that there is no problem, suggesting that there is no problem, then we will never solve it. Mr. Speaker, hon. members must realize that with unemployment rate of 15.4 per cent, cent, it is one of the greatest problems that we have today. It is a disgrace. It is a provincial disgrace, it is a national disgrace. And, Mr. Speaker, this resolution was aimed at, directed at, discussing that problem, recognizing that problem but going further than the problem, Mr. Speaker, to discuss all aspects of resource development, to discuss what are the possibilities of developing the resources that we now have while we are waiting for the offshore oil, while we are waiting to get the corridor rights through Quebec, or the rights to wield our power on the existing power lines, while we are waiting for these major developments which will mean a lot to this Province. We realize that. But this resolution was asking to discuss all aspects

MR. LUSH:

of our natural resources, to delineate what resources we have, to outline Mr. Speaker, what potential we have. Are we developing our Forestry resource to its maximum potential? Are we developing the Agricultural resource to its maximum potential? Are we developing our people resource to their maximum potential? None of these things were ever mentioned. That was the idea of the resolution, to talk about what the potential was, what potential this Province has in these areas of resource development. And then, Mr. Speaker, having done that, having discussed that, having outlined what the possibilities were, now to develop an employment strategy for this Province and then, Mr. Speaker, to submit that employment strategy to the Federal Government to see in what areas they could assist us. because as we have said on this side, we realize that in order to develop this Province economically, in order to provide jobs for our people, we are going to have to have assistance from Ottawa, from the Federal Government. But no, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way it turned out. I would have thought that the Premier when he stood in his place today, would have come up with that employment strategy, to say, "This is the employment strategy that we are advancing to the Federal Government," and looking for the support of hon. members on this side of the House. But no, Mr. Speaker, there was nothing but to lay blame on Ottawa. The Premier waxed eloquent about the national and the international monetary system, trying to prove to us that he knew the names of all the heads of Western Governments in the world, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Mitterand, and Mrs. Thatcher.

MR. NEARY:

That is right!



MR. LUSH: - and all of these -  
And to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Canada was the only country in the Western World having economic problems. That was the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, And the Premier had all the solutions just to reduce the high interest rates, and blamed it all on Canada. He did not speak about the United States. He did not speak about the high interest rates there.

MR. NEARY: The most powerful country in the world today.

MR. LUSH: Just Canada. Blamed it all on Canada Mr. Speaker. But at the same token, to say how good he was doing. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the people of this Province are very happy with an unemployment rate of 15.4 per cent.

MR. NEARY: He looked like the fellow in Argentina.

MR. LUSH: I do not believe that the people of this Province are very happy about the 15.4 percent unemployment. And they are certainly not going to be happy with the lack of practical suggestions and the lack of action that appeared to come out of this debate. Mr. Speaker, I expected, as I said, that the Premier would have come forward today with the employment strategy, to say, " This is what we are going to present to the Federal Government.

MR. LUSH: This is the plan that we have, this is the strategy." But no, Mr. Speaker, it was to defend the indefensible. It was to take the ostrich in the sand approach. That is what it was, Mr. Speaker, that is what it was. But, Mr. Speaker, this resolution was meant, as I said, to discuss the problem, to recognize the problem, to discuss the resources, the potential of the resources in this Province, and from there, to develop an employment strategy. That was the purpose of it. But, Mr. Speaker, sad to say, that that did not result.

Mr. Speaker, I get amused, really amused by the government members getting up and gloating on their victory. I have been in this House now for seven years and I do not believe I have ever heard before members talking about what majority a certain member won by.

MR. NEARY: That is right. They want a dictatorship.

MR. LUSH: The hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) has been talking about the Prime Minister, talking about the man's arrogance. Well, there is nothing - arrogance has been demonstrated in this House since we have opened, in the highest form, by hon. members boasting over their victory and talking about the lack of majority on this side. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have never known when a majority was important. I never knew that a majority was important. I think it is like a hockey game -

MR. NEARY: That is right. In the NHL the Stanley Cup has been won by one goal in overtime

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, it shows their arrogance. And I am warning hon. members now, the people of this Province are not -

MR. NEARY: No, semi-finals.

MR. LUSH: It shows their arrogance.

I want to suggest to them, Mr. Speaker, I do not think their victory or their margins had anything to do with their personal popular vote. I do not think they should get carried away with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Obviously the hon. member lacks material. He is not being relevant to his own resolution. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we call it six o'clock because the hon. member obviously has nothing to say and he is speaking in irrelevancies.

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

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that there is no point of order, that the hon. gentleman is just merely trying to stall for time. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: One more honourable than the other.

MR. SPEAKER: I have to agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that there is no point of order.

MR. LUSH: As a matter of fact - thank you, Mr. Speaker - I thought I was alluding to some points made by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) because I very clearly remember his talking about the election and the great victory, Mr. Speaker. But the point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I would want them to know that they should at least be aware that

MR. LUSH: it might not have been a case of personal popularity in all cases, that they won with such a overwhelming majority. But their arrogance, Mr. Speaker, over the thing is showing and the people of Newfoundland are, of course, beginning to see it. It is odd, you know, the Premier said that he spoke to a prominent Liberal today who said, "That if the election were held today, there would not be one member left on this side." And it is strange that I talked to a prominent Tory yesterday who told me just the opposite.

MR. NEARY: There is only one member left (inaudible)

MR. LUSH: I spoke to a prominent Tory yesterday, who told me just the opposite,, and said if the election were held now, boy -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: It is funny. So I wanted to, I certainly wanted to again warn -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: I wanted to warn hon. members about their arrogance. I just wanted to warn hon. members about their arrogance, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the government would come in here with their plans today. That they would have talked about their plans for forestry, that they would have talked about their plans for agriculture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

MR. LUSH: Forestry, Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that they would come in with a plan for small sawmill operators.

MR. NEARY: : Right on!

MR. LUSH: That is what I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker. One of the most neglected groups in this province. A group that is discriminated against more than any other group of workers throughout Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Right On.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, if the government were concerned about forestry, they would give the small sawmill operators the same benefits, and the same advantages, that accrue to fishermen of this province. Mr. Speaker, the small sawmill operators in this province can be equated to the inshore fishery. It is family operations. But, Mr. Speaker, they have got a lot going against them. They do not get the same benefits. They got to pay the 11 per cent sales tax on all equipment they purchase, fishermen do not. Why did not the government come in today, or maybe they will tomorrow and say they are going to eliminate the 11 per cent sales tax, as it applies to small sawmill operators, with respect to the purchase of equipment and goods used in their business, the same privilege that fishermen have? What is the difference, Mr. Speaker? They are both involved, they are both involved in the primary resources of this Province.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that is the kind of measures that the government would have come in with as a result of this resolution. I would have hoped, Mr. Speaker, that they would have said now that a logger will get marked gas, the same as the fishermen get it. " But no, Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) would have said that they were going to get U.I.C. benefits for loggers, in the same way that fishermen qualify. Just pointing out some iniquities, Mr. Speaker, just pointing some iniquities with respect to the forest industry and how the government is not doing their job to help, Mr. Speaker,

MR. T. LUSH: to help develop the small sawmill industry in this Province. A group, Mr. Speaker, that is discriminated against more than any other group of workers in this Province, the small sawmill operators. And I am not talking about your federal jurisdiction, I am talking about things the Province can do, things that the Province can do to make this industry more viable, things this Province can do to make the products, to make the lumber -

MR. NEARY: They have abdicated their responsibility.

MR. LUSH: - that these people produce more competitive.

MR. WALSH: (Inaudible)

MR. LUSH: Remove that SSA tax, Mr. Speaker, from the purchase of equipment and material with respect to small sawmill operators. Remove their royalties. They have to pay a royalty, Mr. Speaker. The companies do not pay a royalty. These small sawmill operators pay royalties. They are the only primary producers in the country that have to pay for what they are doing.

MR. BAIRD: In the country?

MR. LUSH: Yes, in the country. Farmers do not pay for extracting goods or products from the ground. Fishermen do not pay for extracting fish from the waters.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. LUSH: But these small sawmill operators pay royalties, it is a stumpage fee, pay for cutting a tree.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: No wonder, Mr. Speaker, we cannot compete with the rest of the maritime provinces, no wonder we cannot compete.

MR. NEARY: The spruce budworm, they cannot even deal with that.

MR. LUSH: Remove the royalties, remove the SSA tax. These are a couple of things, Mr. Speaker. Workers' Compensation. Workers' Compensation. It cost an employer \$585 to pay for the compensation of one man per year, \$585. So, Mr. Speaker, with fishermen it is a universal thing at no direct cost to the fishermen, workers' Compensation. But with the logger, with the small sawmill operator, the small time logger, Mr. Speaker, he gets none of those benefits. And nobody begrudges the benefits to the fishermen. What we are saying is equal treatment -

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. LUSH: - for people engaged in the primary producing of this Province, Mr. Speaker. And I wish I had the time, I wish I had the time to go on, to talk about what can be done in agriculture. I have just touched a small segment of the forest industry.

MR. NEARY: If you bring it out, you will beat that crowd over there anytime.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there was a Royal Commission that suggested that we should do away with the small sawmill operators, the push bench saw out fit to do away with it. In my district alone

MR. LUSH In my district alone last year, or on the Bonavista Peninsula, 7,000,000 board feet produced, 7,000,000 board feet of lumber produced on the Bonavista Peninsula by these small saw mills, 7,000,000 board feet. Mr. Speaker, it is a major industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that it looks like the government did not recognize the problem, and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, that we did not get into the discussion of our resources, what potential we have, what is the potential of resources in this province, can we develop our agriculture in a much more effective way. And I am sure hon. members would agree the government have a policy of self-sufficiency or self-reliance in agriculture. But, Mr. Speaker, we are far from it, we are far from it. And what is the government's plan. What are their plans to ensure that we reach this goal of self-sufficiency within the next few months, within the next year or so? What is their policy? We hear them giving lip service to it, Mr. Speaker, but we have not been given the plan, we have not been given the plan of how they plan to arrive there. Why, they will not even build roads for farmers in my area. And people must realize that roads are very important when a person is into farming, when a person is into agriculture, to help him to get his produce to the market as cheaply as possible so that he can bring in fertilizer very cheaply. But, Mr. Speaker, there has never been a move by the government opposite to pave roads or to even upgrade them, so that these farmers, the largest farming area in the province, so that these farmers can operate in as cheap a way as possible to make their operations



MR LUSH economically viable, Mr. Speaker,  
I think I demonstrated beyond any doubt the room for improvement  
with respect to resource development in this province and I  
am sorry that the government did not discuss - it in that light.  
I am sorry that they did not advance or did not present an  
employment strategy for the people of this province so that we  
can get our 36,000 Newfoundlanders who want to work, so that  
we can get them back in the labour force to be productive  
and dignified individuals, the way they should be. Thank You,  
Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, Hear !

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

Is the House ready for the

question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question. Question.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the  
motion 'Aye'. Those against 'Nay'. In my opinion the  
'Ayes' have it.

It now being six o'clock I  
leave the Chair until tomorrow at three of the clock.