

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here we are, day two in this part of the session of the House of Assembly, and no statement forthcoming yet on the state of the economy, or on the financial mess that this administration has gotten this Province into.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. Does the hon. Premier not think that it is important, as a matter of fact it is a matter of life and death that a statement on the precise financial condition of this Province should be made immediately if for no other reason than to reassure the people who loan money to this Province that the financial situation in this Province is not going to collapse completely? And, Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman not think that it is important that a statement be made on the economy and on the financial mess that the administration has created in order to reassure investors who are looking at this Province for investment? And also, Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman not think that it is important enough to make a statement so that people will not be left hanging, suspended in mid-air, people on welfare, people who are sick, people who are frightened that they may lose their jobs? Mr. Speaker, does the hon. gentleman not think that the statement should have been made yesterday but, since this is day two, a statement should be made at once on the state of the economy of this Province and the financial mess that this administration has gotten us into?

November 9, 1982

Tape 2080

NM - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I expect that that was a question,

Mr. Speaker.

Yes, I think it is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely essential. I think that the government is under severe scrutiny to come up with a financial statement, an economic statement as soon as it can, and as soon as it can, Mr. Speaker, will be early next week.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We have indicated already to the people of Newfoundland that if present trends continue for the next six months in the way they have in the last three especially, then we will be facing a deficit situation, and every single province of Canada and the federal government are facing similar revenue short falls from what they had predicted, every single jurisdiction in Canada. Not only that -

MR. CALLAN: You told us that yesterday.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well obviously you did not hear it. And not only that, even in the United States the Congress and the executive debate over what the latest deficit forecasts are. It is worldwide, and it is Canadian-wide to bring it back home. So I think it is absolutely imperative that the government provide a statement to this hon. House. And we indicated before the House even opened that when it did open we would provide such a statement. We are, Mr. Speaker, as we have indicated to the press, and to the people of Newfoundland through the press, that we will be making such a statement to the House. We realize what will happen over the next six months if no action is taken and so, therefore, being the responsible managers that we are, we have gone back to all departments of government, we have gone back to all the agencies and Crown corporations and said, 'Now here is what is going to happen if present trends continue, and therefore we want you to start looking at ways of cutting your expenditures, look at ways of revenue generation, and be ready to come in under a plan of action on a schedule which will see a statement to the hon. House early next week.' And so we have made that clear, Mr. Speaker, so, yes, I agree wholeheartedly with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that there should be a statement

PREMIER PECKFORD: and there will be one at the earliest opportunity. The earliest opportunity to do it in a businesslike fashion, after having gone back to all the departments, will be early next week. But I reiterate again, Mr. Speaker, for the record that the allegation by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that we have put this Province in a financial mess is completely erroneous, completely incorrect, he cannot substantiate it. I went through the figures yesterday for all the provinces and for the federal government and when the Leader of the Opposition talks about everybody hanging on a thread and all the rest of it, the federal government went from a projected deficit of somewhere around \$10 billion to \$23 billion before they even made any report to the House of Commons or to the people of the country. So if we had to go by our so-called national government then we would not be giving a statement yet and would not be giving it for some time.

So, Mr. Speaker, yes, I wholeheartedly agree with the Leader of the Opposition. As a matter of fact, what it comes down to is that the Leader of the Opposition agrees with us because, before the House opened, we indicated that we would be going back to all the departments and after that was done that we would, after the House opened, be issuing a statement to the House. So we are glad

PREMIER PECKFORD: that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has taken a cue from the government and that as we have said a week or two ago, we will be making a statement to the House of Assembly.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate indeed that the hon. the Premier, such a well-meaning fellow, does not understand; he does not seem to understand how the system works. And in his answer that he just gave the House, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was trying to be humorous on what we consider to be a very serious matter, possibly the collapse of the financial situation in this Province. It could very easily lead to that. The hon. gentleman told us that every single government in Canada has that problem and the Government of Canada itself has it. That is true. We are not saying that the administration is totally to blame for this financial mess we have, but 50 per cent of the blame must go on the hon. gentleman for mismanagement, extravagance and waste over the last couple of years. At least the other provinces are up front and when they saw that a deficit was occurring, they immediately took steps to try to remedy the situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has known since June of this year, just a few weeks after they brought down a budget in this House the hon. gentleman knew we were headed for a deficit. He confirmed that in the House yesterday.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: While it is refreshing, Mr. Speaker, to hear today the hon. gentleman thinks we are

MR. MARSHALL: only 50 per cent responsible, the hon. gentleman is still making a speech and this is the Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I repeat what I mentioned yesterday, that the Question Period is only thirty minutes and I am sure hon. members to my right have lots of questions. I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) if he would be more specific with his question.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am not pressing the hon. gentleman so hard is because, as I said, he does not seem to understand how serious the situation is and what remedies have to be taken to reassure and restore confidence, especially as far as the borrowing of this Province is concerned.

Now, would the hon. gentleman tell the House what advice he has received on these matters from the government's fiscal agents? And would the hon. gentleman also go a step further and tell the House if he is prepared to lay on the table of this House any recommendations, letters or any memos between the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the government's fiscal agents on this \$70 million deficit?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all let me deal with the extravagance. I indicated yesterday to the hon. House and I indicate again today that it was not on the management of the expenditures where the deficit arose. And you would need, in order to have extravagance, in order for the allegation of extravagance to be upheld, in order for that to be a valid allegation one would need to be able to prove that in the management of the expenditures that somehow the government was way off base. In actuality we are not off base on our expenditures, so there is no extravagance. The point of the matter is that revenue has been down from the federal government sources, that they predict and the money that they give us, both. They give us money both through EPF, through equalization, and they predict the corporation income tax and personal income tax. And on the corporation income tax they were out somewhere around \$20 million, they were out \$6 million on equalization, and \$20 million on EPF. That is just for starters. The rest of the money is where the prediction on RST, Retail Sales Tax, and other like taxes in the Province did not measure up to what was expected earlier in the year. So in order to prove extravagance, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) wants to use the word extravagance, he has not been able to prove that there has been any extravagance in this government. It is on the revenue side where we find the budget downfall or short fall, not on the expenditure side. And you must spend money to be extravagant. If you do not have it to spend how can you be extravagant? So the Leader of the Opposition is a little off base on it.

Now in talking about the other provinces, Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition did, let me inform him as I did yesterday that most of the other

PREMIER PECKFORD: provinces have not to this date, outside of some wage restraint programmes in certain provinces, taken action as a result of the second quarter results - have not taken action as a result of the second quarter results in their provinces. They all have revenue short falls of one size or another, but none of them have taken any action in the way we are taking action now as it relates to the second quarter results. We did take action in August, when we saw the way the economy was going and the way our revenues were going, by implementing the wage restraint programme of 5 per cent, 6 per cent and 7 per cent and 4 per cent, 5 per cent and 6 per cent. That was our first measure. Then we waited for the stats to come in on the second quarter before taking the actions now that we are involved in and which will be announced next week. So one has to look at it now.

And the last point that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) mentioned on our fiscal agents, I indicated to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday and I repeat it again today that there was a review done of all the provinces of Canada. Even Imperial Oil, I think, and some of the large corporations got credit downgradings this year in the bond market after the review was done. Great Imperial Oil got a downgrading. They reviewed everybody right up until July and August, we have given them all the latest figures of what our revenue situation is, and

PREMIER PECKFORD:

they are satisfied that we are being good managers. There were two provinces that were downgraded, the Province of Nova Scotia and the Province of Quebec. The Province of Newfoundland was left unscathed after a very extensive review by both bond rating houses.

MR. NEARY: We could not go any lower!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, yes we could.

MR. MORGAN: You would love to see that happen.

MR. TULK: We are not like you.

MR. HODDER: You are showing your ignorance again.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, we could. Yes, we could.

I am very sorry to interrupt, I am very sorry to interrupt the hon. member for Port au Port, who apparently has the floor of this House right now, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to interrupt him to indicate that we could have got a credit downgrading. We could have got a credit downgrading. And all the little platitudes from the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) will not change that matter.

So all of that review was done on the Province of Newfoundland, on the Province of Nova Scotia, and all the other provinces of Canada. And as a result of that we were reinstated at our present credit rating. There are no letters on file from our fiscal agents or from the bond markets indicating that we have to do this, that, or something else. They have confidence in the ability of this government to manage its financial affairs and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - they know that over the next year or so we will continue to manage our affairs like we did

PREMIER PECKFORD: in the last three Budgets, where we brought in \$129 million surplus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a funny thing about the Premier, as I say he is a well-meaning fellow, but he has been accusing the former administration of not being able to forecast what was going to happen to oil when the Upper Churchill was developed. And now he is admitting that his own administration cannot even forecast six months ahead on their Budget. Mr. Speaker, what kind of logic is that.

They have been pork barrelling since June, since the election. The ministers and the members on the opposite side have been announcing projects, promises they made in the election. They have been pork barrelling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is making an extended preamble and I will request him to direct the question to some minister or the Premier.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is that next week when they do make a statement to the House will it be just in the form of a statement by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), will it be a mini-Budget or will it be a full Budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me respond to the Leader of the Opposition on the business of being able to predict oil prices on the Upper Churchill. I think that is what he is talking about, that we have criticized the Upper Churchill contract, and how could the government of the day predict where oil was going to go, and therefore there was not anything wrong with the three mils per kilowatt hour that was charged for forty-five years.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, nobody on this side of the House has any argument with the three mils per kilowatt hour that was charged to start to come into effect as of 1975 and goes on for forty-five years. What we do argue with is closing it off for forty years at three mils, no escalation-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: -no reopener. Nobody argues with the price that was charged at the time. But to close it off for forty years with no reopeners, no

PREMIER PECKFORD:

escalation, that is what the people of Newfoundland are mad about. And then, Mr. Speaker, to have the gall to say that the contract opens and closes again automatically and the price actually goes down to about 2.5 mils for the last twenty-five hours, that is what the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are arguing about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is what they are arguing about.

You would think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would have better sense. Talking about people being naive, Mr. Speaker, talking about people being naive and not knowing, well intentioned? Oh, yes! The Leader of the Opposition is well-intentioned too, Mr. Speaker. The problem with the Leader of the Opposition is that he does not realize that inflation goes on regardless and the Greeks knew about that. So let us not talk about the Upper Churchill and suddenly try to justify some blatant, wrong Liberal policy of twenty years ago or fifteen years ago. Oh, no, Mr. Speaker! Oh, no! The Leader of the Opposition better stay clear of the Upper Churchill when he starts talking about people on this side of the House. That is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why there are forty-four over here and only eight over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, talking about pork barrelling, we are very proud that earlier this year we took action and we pre-tendered a lot of projects. We took action. Who was it? What government came to the assistance of all the small fish companies in this Province and all the medium sized fish companies? Twenty-nine dollars! If that is pork barreling let us have more of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if doing roads around the Province to the tune of \$20 million to \$25 million early

PREMIER PECKFORD: in the year is pork barrelling, let us have more of it, Mr. Speaker. I want more of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if completing the hospital in Channel-Port aux Basques, in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) district is pork barrelling, let us have more of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If doing water and sewer projects to the tune of \$30 million this year is pork barrelling, let us have more of it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If building a hospital in Clareville, Mr. Speaker, is pork barrelling, let us have more of it. I want more of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And if the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hisock) were here - where is the member for Eagle River? - I would suggest to the hon. member for Eagle River if building a medical clinic in Forteau is pork barrelling, let us have more of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. PECKFORD: Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to stand and answer the charge.

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

I recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - is very testy today. We know he is a well-meaning fellow, it is unfortunate for the people of this Province that he just does not understand. The question that was put to the hon. gentleman, he does not seem to understand, had to do with whether we are going to have a mini-budget or a full budget or just a statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, when I asked that -

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. the Leader of the Opposition rising on a point of order?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Okay, I would like to hear it.

MR. NEARY: When I asked the question, Your Honour drew to my attention that I had to be brief in my preamble. I believe the rules also say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister or the Premier when answering also has to be brief in the answers.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is correct in that the Question Period is thirty minutes; questions should be brief and answers should be brief.

MR. WARREN: Treat both sides alike.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am very, very sorry, Mr. Speaker. I apologize to all members of the House. I apologize to everybody, I just got carried away. I got carried away, Mr. Speaker. When the hon. the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary) started taling about pork barrelling and trying to create jobs and telling about how bad a job we did on the economy, I got carried away. I got carried away for his hospital in Port aux Basques, I got carried away for the medical clinic for Eagle River, for all those Liberal districts where there is P.C. money flowing in, flowing. So I am very sorry

PREMIER PECKFORD: and I apologize, Mr. Speaker, I will not be any longer than I can possibly be in trying to answer the question to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

Now we are going to in this case, Mr. Speaker, indicate, as I did yesterday to the Leader of the Opposition, that we are going to take our cues from Ottawa on this one, we are going to give a financial and economic statement to this House like the Minister of Finance in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: That will be the first time that the Premier of this Province ever followed an example that was set by that great Liberal Government up there in Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will deal with the extravagance and waste and the pork barrelling at another time, we could provide a list the length of this Assembly, it could stretch up and down the floor, Mr. Speaker, but I do not want to get sidetracked off the seriousness of this matter. Now, I want to ask the hon. gentleman what steps have been taken to reassure investors in the United States especially, the people who loan money to Newfoundland, the people in the international financial world, in the bond markets, what steps have been taken by the administration since this news was sprung on everybody about the \$70 million deficit, what steps have been taken to reassure these people that we are not going to have total collapse of the finances of this Province? Now wait now, just a minute, now.

I have another question.

MR. TULK: Try and cool off.

MR. NEARY: Just take it easy, I know the hon. gentleman has good intentions. He does not understand so therefore I have to preamble my question. And would the hon. gentleman also tell the House if there have been any difficulties in the bond market, especially in the United States of late, with regard to Newfoundland floating a bond issue, borrowing, and would the hon. gentleman also tell us what steps he has taken -

MR. WINDSOR: One question.

MR. NEARY: It is three questions in one, three questions in one. What steps has the hon. gentleman taken to reassure the investors, especially in the United States, that there will be no referendum in Newfoundland to separate from Canada, that could -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Because, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman is well aware, the people who loan us money in the United States do so on the assumption that we are a Province of Canada and Canada will not allow us to go bankrupt and so therefore this referendum talk of separation and so forth would make the money lenders of the United States very nervous. Now what has the hon. gentleman done to put that situation at rest?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am very, very pleased that the hon. member, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked those questions, those three questions.

MR. WINDSOR: He walked into that one.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, did he ever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Number one, Mr. Speaker, the biggest problem the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) and myself, and other people have had in going to New York, and even to Toronto for that matter, and to Europe has been this, 'When is the Canadian Government going to get ride of FIRA?' That is the biggest problem we have. That is why the Prime Minister two weeks ago had to invite all the corporate heads from the United States up to Ottawa. They did not go to Regina, they did not go to Edmonton, or Victoria, they did not go to Halifax or St. John's -

MR. NEARY: What has that got to do with this problem?

PREMIER PECKFORD: It has a lot to do because people in the United States -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Are we a province, Mr. Speaker? Does FIRA apply to Newfoundland or does it apply just to Ottawa? The Foreign Investment Review Agency is the biggest deterrent -

MR. NEARY: I asked about the referendum.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am answering the Leader of the Opposition's first point. He asked, 'How are investors reacting to Newfoundland?' And this is how investors are reacting to Newfoundland as a Province of Canada. They are saying, 'We want to invest in Newfoundland. We believe in the financial management that you have put in place over the last three or four years. We are very confident of the Government of Newfoundland and the stability that it provides, but we cannot get in there because we have red tape to go through for about two years. We have to go through FIRA. Every time we invest a dollar we have to make an application to FIRA.' And, secondly, they say the National Energy Programme discriminates against foreign investment. 'You are allowed to come down in the United States and invest but we are not allowed to come to Canada and invest.' What is going on here in the National Energy Programme? That is the two biggest inhibitors to investment in Canada today, Mr. Speaker, that any economist will tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) if he goes about to ask them for their advice.

Secondly, any problem in the bond market? The answer to that, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. Go and check how long it took our bonds to sell in the last two or three months in the bond markets of the world. They were swept up just like lightning, swept up just like lightning. Everybody has great confidence in Newfoundland and the Province of Newfoundland. We had absolutely no problem. Other people did but we did not.

MR. NEARY: How about Newfoundland Hydro?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Newfoundland Hydro, the Newfoundland Government, Newfoundland Municipal Financing

PREMIER PECKFORD: Corporation, no problem, Mr. Speaker, no problem at all because they have a lot of confidence in the management that we have shown over the last three or four years.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I have never mentioned anything about referendum or separation.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Prime Minister of Canada is trying to push us out of Confederation but the Prime Minister of Canada will not be successful.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Prime Minister of Canada will not be successful in pushing us out of Canada. We want to be in Canada but we want to be equal partners in Canada and that might take the elimination of Mr. Trudeau.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, Mr. Speaker, let those who have raised that spectre, let them answer their own comments. I have no comment to make only simply to say that the Prime Minister of Canada, by making those statements - he made them, I never; he made them - they are provocative and unnecessary and do not create the kind of the climate that we need to get an agreement on the offshore, Mr. Speaker. We do not need those kind of comments made in Ottawa to try to flutter down here with a bunch of Liberal sheep up there clapping his every move when he made such statements. The people of Newfoundland are not to be insulted by the Prime Minister of Canada, nor are they to be insulted by the people up there representing the Liberal party. So, Mr. Speaker, if you want

PREMIER PECKFORD: to know about referendums and separation you will have to ask the Prime Minister, I know nothing about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie).

MR. MORGAN: Send a telegram to the Prime Minister and ask him to resign. .

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if the sculpin would have a mind to close his mouth I might have a word to say.

My question to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development is I understand that his department administers assistance to native students, in particular in my district and in the minister's district. Could the minister give the House a definition of what his department considers a native student?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel eminently qualified to define a native student. As it pertains to the Native People's Agreement - that is what we are talking about, funding which comes under the Native People's Agreement. There are no registered natives in this Province as they exist in other parts of the country - financial assistance is provided this year to twenty-six students from along the Coast of Labrador and from the community of Sheshatshit in my district. These students

MR. GOUDIE: are attending high school in some instances, trade schools in others; there are a couple of nurses and there are several university students. Under the financial assistance programme, tuitions are paid, cost of books are paid, food, board and lodging are paid, transportation to and from the school facility is paid, plus an additional trip per year either at Christmas or Easter, home to visit families; a clothing allowance is provided, out-of-pocket expenses are provided, and if that is not enough, then my colleague, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has special programmes in place to assist in addition to all that.

Under the agreement itself and the assistance provided to native students, Mr. Speaker, a native student, a person who can receive assistance under this programme, is a person who resides, I believe, for three years or more in any of the designated communities in the Province, which are Nain, Davis Inlet, Hopedale, Postville, Makkovik, Rigolet and Sheshatshit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister tell me that in the past year

MR. WARREN:

all of the twenty-six students who have received assistance under the Native Peoples Agreement are people who have lived in Labrador for at least three years?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there were twenty-six people assisted last year or not. There are twenty-six people being assisted this year.

The recommendations come from a Committee in place to deal with such matters. And as far as

I am aware the people who received assistance are people who have been residents of their respective communities for three or more years, yes.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the minister is: If the minister does find out that some students have been paid assistance in the past two or three years, and in fact this year, who have not been native residents of Labrador for the past three years, will the minister endeavour to get the money back into the Treasury?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I would certainly have to be advised of the details of any such cases. I can recall phone calls that I had received from people living in St. John's, for instance, who were residents of Nain or Makkovik, or whichever community, under this designated communities programme who appealed to me to receive assistance because they were originally from these communities and were native people and were not eligible for such assistance. For instance,

MR. GOUDIE: in the community of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, again in my district, there are quite a number of native families but they do not qualify for student assistance either. In the event that someone was wrongly given student assistance, I would have to be aware of the specific case and the circumstances surrounding such aid provided to a person who may not qualify, and then make a decision based on that individual case. But at this point in time I am not aware of any.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
Time for the Question Period has expired.

Before we proceed to other business, I am sure the House would wish me to welcome to the galleries today a gentleman who served this House very well in his capacity as a former Sergeant-at-Arms. I refer, of course, to Mr. Hemmens, who is sitting in the gallery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I have been asked to welcome a delegation from the Port aux Basques Municipal Council.

I do not have their names so I cannot mention them personally, but I do welcome them to the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTION

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following resolution: - although on Orders of the Day I will ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) if he agrees to deal with the matter immediately, without debate -

WHEREAS the seal fishery is an important source of income to hundreds of fishermen in our Province; and

WHEREAS the European economic community is moving rapidly and swiftly to ban the importation of all seal products; and

WHEREAS the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador has Telexed the Prime Minister twice in October to express Newfoundland's concern and to request federal action;

AND WHEREAS no response from the Prime Minister has been forthcoming;

AND WHEREAS the Federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans has expressed his concern in the House of Commons and indicated he would request the Prime Minister's involvement;

AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister is presently meeting European leaders;

November 9, 1982

Tape No. 2091

MJ - 2

PREMIER PECKFORD:

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House endorse today the following telegram to be sent to the Prime Minister in Europe: "The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has expressed its concern to you about the actions being taken by the European Economic Community to ban the importation of seal products. As you know this would be a serious economic hardship to hundreds of fishermen in Newfoundland and Labrador. We request, therefore, that you raise this issue in your talks with the appropriate European leaders and support Newfoundland's position that the European economic community refrain from taking such action against Canada's fishery."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we will support the wording of the telegram but not necessarily the resolution. Because we are not sure, Mr. Speaker, the believability and the credibility of this Premier has been so badly damaged in the last several weeks, we are not sure if the facts as set out in the preamble are correct. We have not seen any documentation or any evidence to prove that the facts are correct. But the telegram is all right, once you remove the politics from the preamble, from the resolution.

MR. TULK: Straight politics.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is straight politics, Mr. Speaker, it is just as well to face it. Mr. Speaker, we will support the telegram to the Prime Minister providing the hon. gentleman will eliminate the preamble.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker. There is no support. The Government of Newfoundland, with all these signatures of the people on this side, I am sure, will send it. But if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does not believe that I have not heard from the Prime Minister, that is his problem and he can send his own telegram.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may -

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

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

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

The House seems to be getting into a debate on the Notice of Motion as raised by the hon. the Premier. I did allow the hon. the Leader of the Opposition a few moments to seek some clarification, or make a very brief statement, but now it seems to be getting into the realm of

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): debate. It is really notice of a resolution, and I gather from what has been said that there is not agreement to receive this without any further debate and it will be accepted by the Chair in that way.

MR. NEARY: No. On a point of order.
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: That is not quite correct, as Your Honour outlined it, with all due respect. We are prepared to endorse the telegram, but the part that I wanted clarification on was, 'WHEREAS the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador has telexed the Prime Minister.'

Now, the Premier, in his response to what I said, said, 'Well, if you do not believe I have telephoned the Prime Minister, that is your problem.' But it says in the resolution 'telexed'. It would be a very simple matter for the hon. gentleman to lay on the table of the House the telexes and then we can make up our minds. And we would be glad to, if the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, I just say to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I just say to them, just for the record, so it is in the record, That is an unnecessary condition for the Leader of the Opposition to put on his support. I will table the telexes, if he does not believe me, and I will table the

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will table the telexes if he does not believe me; I will table the telexes anyway. But whether or not the Opposition supports it or not the government will send a telegram today with the support of all the members on this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It is obvious they do not want our support, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I think the Chair has allowed enough discussion on this particular resolution.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, 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 supplementary supply to Her Majesty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: And also -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair is having some difficulty hearing the hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. ROBERTS:

He would have done it four months ago if he cared.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I also give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the advancing or guaranteeing of certain loans made under The Loan and Guarantee Act, 1957, and move that this House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the guaranteeing of certain loans under The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1977.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any other Notices of Motion?

Before proceeding to Orders of the Day, I would like to welcome to the galleries Mr. John Mullins, the Chairman of the Board of Western Memorial Regional Hospital, Dr. Harry Watts, the Hospital Administrator, and Mr. Dennis Waterman, the Assistant Administrator.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Pension (Auditor General) Act, 1968," carried. (Bill No. 58).

On motion, Bill No. 58, read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Pension Benefits," carried (Bill No. 69).

On motion, Bill No. 69, read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

November 9, 1982

Tape 2093

PK - 3

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Pensions For The Members Of The Royal Newfoundland Constabulary And The St. John's Fire Department And The Staff Of Her Majesty's Penitentiary," carried, (Bill No. 66).

On motion, Bill No. 66 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Judicature Act," carried. (Bill No. 60)

On motion, Bill No. 60 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister Responsible for Communications to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act," carried. (Bill No. 59)

On motion, Bill No. 59 read a a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Transportation to introduce a bill, "An Act To Promote Public Safety In The Transportation Of Dangerous Goods," carried. (Bill No. 61)

On motion, Bill No. 61 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Transportation to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend the Department of Transportation Act". (Bill No. 65)

On motion, Bill No. 65 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Opposition's refusal to unanimously endorse the resolution proposed by the hon. the Premier today, I call Motion 8, which was the motion that the hon. the Premier proposed yesterday.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I might say in response to the hon. gentleman that the statement he made is completely untrue and I want to tell the hon. gentleman that we already had a resolution passed at the Liberal Convention in Ottawa dealing with the seal fishery that Mr. Trudeau is taking to Europe with him.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition did not indicate that he had risen on a point of order and so he was not recognized.

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, on behalf of the government and this side of the House, I moved a resolution which was sparked by two things that happened over the last number of weeks, really over the last month or two. I moved the resolution: WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland has sought a political settlement to the offshore resources question; AND WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland placed a compromise proposal before the Federal Government on January 25, 1982; AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada has not answered this proposal; AND WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland continues to seek a political settlement; AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister of Canada has made statements which are provocative and unnecessary; BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House go on record in (a) condemning the statements of the Prime Minister as helping to destroy a climate necessary for a political settlement; and (b) request the Federal Government to answer the Government of Newfoundland's compromise proposal.

And I put the resolution forward, Mr. Speaker, for two reasons. One is that over the last while many people in my view have lost sight of the fact that the Federal Government of Canada in this whole long dispute and impasse, that the Federal Government of Canada has not ever responded to our proposal of January 25th, 1982. And sometimes that gets lost with all the press releases and statements and so on from various federal ministers, from the TV extravaganza that Mr. Lalonde had on one of the private TV stations down here during the Spring and Summer. From time to time I get the feeling, in talking to people outside of the Province especially,

PREMIER PECKFORD: but also to a large segment of people within the Province, that they forget that that proposal that during the election campaign I held up on the TV debate, that compromise proposal has never been responded to to this day by the federal government. And all they did when after seven months they finally put something on the table themselves, all they did was to put on the table a Nova Scotia agreement. After seven months and after going through a lot of study and spending a lot of money - hundreds of thousands of dollars spent to prepare that very, very comprehensive compromise proposal - nothing but nothing has been heard from the federal government. They have ignored it, completely ignored it. It could never happen in any other province. Mr. Speaker, I submit it could never happen in any other province. It is only because we are small, it is only because we have seven seats that the Federal Government of Canada can get away with not responding to a proposal which would see a settlement to the largest oil field ever discovered in Canada's history, to the third largest offshore oil field in

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the world, 1.8 billion barrels known. It boggles the imagination, Mr. Speaker, when one thinks that about three or four weeks ago, the Department of the Interior for the United States of America issued new tenders for acreage to be tendered upon by oil companies in the Alaska area, in the Prudeau Bay area. Prudeau Bay has already had a very successful oil discovery. It is now being developed and the oil is now flowing across Alaska by pipeline. It is then being taken at a port on the other side of Alaska, on the Southern side of Alaska, into tankers and is taken down the West Coast of Canada and on down into Washington, the Seattle area, and then put in a pipeline and shipped across the United States. Well, they think they have other acreage near Prudeau Bay in the salt water on the ocean floor, which equals or comes close to the Prudeau Bay one. And in some statements made in Time Magazine and some of the oil industry pamphlets over the last three or four weeks, there was a great flurry of activity and all the major partners and oil companies in the world got involved in bidding upon this acreage. And the Department of the Interior of the United States estatically announced, enthusiastically announced, that they are sure in their own minds that when this acreage is let out under tender to the successful bidder and when that successful bidder begins drilling, that they are going to find every bit of 1.3 billion barrels of oil, Mr. Speaker, 1.3 billion barrels. And we have out here already discovered, known to be able to be taken out of the ocean floor 1.8 billion barrels of oil. That will give you an idea of the dimensions of just that one oil field that we have out here.

So here we have the largest oil field in Canada's history sitting dormant out here

PREMIER PECKFORD: while the federal government, the Canadian Government, can, without very much problem at all, completely ignore a proposal, a reasoned proposal put on the table by this Province to settle a jurisdictional dispute and to see matters go ahead from a political point of view through a political settlement. I mean, it is absolutely incredible! Historians will write about it, Mr. Speaker, in decades to come, how for so long one government could completely ignore another government within the Canadian Confederation. It never ceases to amaze me.

We did, earlier this year, as part of our campaign to explain to other Canadians the reasonableness, the Canadianism of our proposal, start in British Columbia with our negotiating team and we met with all the provinces of Canada, with their economists, with their finance people, with their oil people, with their energy people, and presented the proposal to them and explained the proposal and allowed for questions and answers, and had a dialogue and had a debate and a discussion with all the provinces of Canada. Then we met with all the editorial boards of all the major newspapers in Canada and the editorial boards of all the major magazines in Canada. And then we met with the Conference Board of Canada, that economic organization, private organization, which from time to time comments upon the economy and talks about what growth you can see in the Canadian economy in the next quarter, in the next year, and how all the provinces are doing, which ones are going to grow more than others, where unemployment is going to go, where inflation is going to go and all the rest of it. It is a

PREMIER PECKFORD: very reputable economic organization, national organization, and we presented it to them, the Conference Board of Canada. We presented it to the Economic Council of Canada, which is an arm, really arm's length, but an arm of, agency of the federal government. Funny that the Canadian Government should have this very elaborate Economic Council of Canada, which is supposed to comment upon the economy and give advice to the Canadian Federal Government, and here now the Prime Minister has gone off to appoint a royal commission on the economy when he already has very expert people, economists and financial analysts, coming out of their ears, already in place to comment upon and to give advice to the government on the direction they should take for the economic recovery of this nation. It is very odd that the Prime Minister should suddenly find - what he is really saying is, 'I do not believe the Economic Council of Canada.' What he is really saying is, 'I do not believe the Conference Board of Canada.' It is just an unusual circumstance.

MR. MORGAN: Starting the MacDonald platform, that is what he is doing.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. No doubt it is a Macdonald platform for the leadership to keep Turner away.

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, we presented that proposal to the Economic Council of Canada, to the Conference of Canada, to the Institute on Public Policy, and to all the editorial boards across Canada. And what was the unanimous, what was the overwhelming response to that proposal? After scrutiny, after questions, after they had the proposal for a number of weeks so they could study it themselves, experts in the field of oil and gas, experts in the field of finance, experts in the field of economics, what did they all say? "Newfoundland, this is a

PREMIER PECKFORD: very reasonable proposal, this is a very workable proposal, this is a very Canadian proposal'. So, Mr. Speaker, the problem lies not with the Canadian people, not with the institutions of Canada, not with the Governments of Canada, the provinces, not with the Economic Council of Canada, not with the Ontario Government, or the Alberta Government, or the New Brunswick Government, it lies directly at the seat of power in Ottawa today.

I had a meeting with the Leader of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Broadbent, I had a personal meeting with him on the proposal, in Ottawa. I sat down and sent it to them, gave them all the things on it, allowed his research people to take it and chew it and tear it up, dissect it. And what did Mr. Broadbent say? I have no great love for the Socialists of this world, but what did Mr. Broadbent say? He said he could not see anything wrong with it. As far as he was concerned it was a good proposal and it should be accepted.

Mr. Clark even went further. The Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, when he was Prime Minister, agreed in writing. The letter is outstanding, it is there sitting in the files. He said, 'I will treat, the Government of Canada under my leadership will treat the oil and gas on the Continental Shelf the same way as if it was on land', Mr. Speaker. Then a couple of weeks ago here in Newfoundland, in Corner Brook, Mr. Clark reiterated that position, that if he becomes Prime Minister of Canada and his party forms the Government of Canada, then they will honour the letter that they signed.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, here we have it. What an odd, strange situation we have here, what a strange situation. Everybody in Canada who is anybody, either economic councils, governments, leaders of all the other political parties, everybody agrees that the proposal that we have on the table is a reasoned Canadian proposal, a great way around a very difficult problem, Mr. Speaker, a great way around a very difficult problem. And it saddens me, Mr. Speaker, as a Newfoundlander and as a Canadian, it saddens me when I heard the comments of Mr. Smallwood, the Premier from 1949 to 1972, to hear what Mr. Smallwood said. Because I had occasion to go back and read some documents, and not only the Throne Speeches which he wrote and some of the comments that he made in this very chamber about Newfoundland's status, I went back even further. The former Premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Smallwood, the Only Living Father of Confederation, wrote a book in 1930 Entitled The New Newfoundland. It was just two years before we got into financial problems but at that time he was very optimistic. Mr. Squires had just been elected Prime Minister in 1928. He loved Mr. Squires and thought the world of him and Lady Squires. There is a great chapter on Lady Squires who was, by the way, a Green Bay girl, she came from Little Bay Islands. She was a Strong and she was elected in that election of 1928 as well. In any case, Mr. Smallwood wrote that book, The New Newfoundland, to try to tell all the people in Newfoundland, and especially those coming into Newfoundland, about this wonderful country called Newfoundland and Labrador - what a wonderful thing it was, how big it was, how many people were here, of course, how

PREMIER PECKFORD: many schools and how much roads, the same as he did after he became Premier in 1949. But in one part of his book he talks about the status of Newfoundland, and in that he categorically states - and the book is available for anyone to look at - in that chapter he categorically states then as a journalist, as somebody who had studied the politics of Newfoundland, that Newfoundland has the same status today - all you tourists who are coming in here and you people who want to know about Newfoundland this book is going to be read all around the world, and I want to tell you about the political status of Newfoundland. This Newfoundland has the same status in the British Commonwealth, in international law as the Dominion of New Zealand, as the Dominion of Canada, as the Dominion of Australia or any of the other great dominions around the world. That is a statement that Mr. Smallwood made. It saddens me to think that in the last several weeks the

PREMIER PECKFORD: same gentleman who was so instrumental in having us join Confederation in 1949, that the same gentleman would now contradict that statement that he made in writing in his book in 1930. Because I am sure he fervently believed that and even after Confederation his statements right here in this House confirmed that position. And now he has deserted the cause, deserted the idea. Forget about opposing me or opposing the Tory party or opposing this party or that party, he has deserted the concept, he has deserted the idea. He has not deserted me, he has not deserted a party, he has deserted a very fundamental idea which all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians believed fervently right from 1855, when we got Responsible Government, right up and including 1949 and right on up to this very moment and this very second, this very day, that we did have all of the powers that any other Dominion had in the British Commonwealth, and that when we joined Confederation in 1949 we joined on that basis. And, Mr. Speaker, as I say it saddens me also as a Newfoundlander, it saddens me deeply to see so many of our own people who from time to time through comments try to lay the blame equally on both governments, 'Oh, both governments should get together' - as if both governments were equally to blame. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is doing an awful injustice to the cause that this whole idea of the offshore represents. That is doing an awful injustice - again, forget about the party, forget about the government - it is doing an awful injustice to our future, it is doing an awful injustice to a destiny which we could have if we were getting a fair and reasonable deal. Those people, who perhaps for their own monetary gain, for their own business gain, who continue to articulate positions which somehow puts them as the kingmaker in the middle, say, 'Oh, but both governments must get

PREMIER PECKFORD: together', do a great disservice to the concept that we are trying to advocate and to the proposal which we have put on the table since January 25, 1982, a great disservice. And they will live to regret it one day, Mr. Speaker. They will live to regret it one day because if there is one thing anybody knows who has been in politics or around public life in Canada very long, if there is one thing the federal Liberal Party - a lot more than the provincial Liberal Party in recent years - the federal Liberal Party knows is they know the polls and they know what is going on in every nook and cranny of Canada every day. They monitor it

PREMIER PECKFORD: very, very closely. And when you have five MPs who continue to say nothing about a proposal put forward by the Government of Newfoundland, when you have business interests who continue to throw just as much blame on the Government of Newfoundland as they will on the Government of Canada, that is a victory for the Government of Canada. That is a victory for Mr. Trudeau. That is a victory for Mr. Lalonde. And when they view the vacillation of the opposition parties in this Province, who one day say one thing out of one side of their mouth and the next day say something out of the other side of their mouth, then that is a victory for the cause to ensure that Newfoundland never has an opportunity to be equal in this Confederation, Mr. Speaker, and they will live to regret it one day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And that is what saddens me most about this whole affair since it became hot and heavy and since it has got the public focus that it has got since we started to negotiate and since we put the proposal on the table last January.

So I want, on behalf of the government and of the members on this side of the House, to put this resolution forward for the opportunity to say that there are groups and political parties in this Province who have since January 25, 1982, the election of April 6th. notwithstanding because, Mr. Speaker, do you know what April 6th. proves? That there is a lot of wisdom in the crowd, that very often the people are a head of their leaders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is what April 6th. proves - way ahead of their leaders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Then every day to have to sit and listen or stand and listen or try to sleep and listen to five Newfoundlanders in Ottawa who will not stand up for their Province as having the same rights in Confederation as Saskatchewan has, as Alberta has, or B.C. has, or Ontario has, who will swivel away and quietly say nothing, quietly say nothing!

They have to come back, Mr. Speaker, and try to get re-elected. And no amount of fanfare over Canada Works, no amount of fanfare over calling up this one or that one down in this particular district, and this particular community and say, 'I got you this \$20,000 or \$30,000' is going to buy off a Newfoundlander who knows that these same people sold them out in the House of Commons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: You know why, Mr. Speaker? Because the next federal election - talk about trying to drag us out of Confederation! Mr. Trudeau is going to have to try another tactic. Mr. Trudeau does not know who he is intact with yet. He should spend a bit more time in Newfoundland. When Mr. Trudeau gets involved with the Newfoundland people on a basic, fundamental issue, on which their very existence and livelihood to be equal in Canada is based, then no amount of verbosity, no amount of verbal gymnastics, no amount of Canada Works or direct delivery to any part of Newfoundland is going to change Newfoundlanders' or Labradorians' minds on that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: tell Mr. Rompkey now, and Mr. Baker and Mr. Tobin, and Mr. Simmons and Mr. Rooney right now that when the next federal election is called they better answer well to the people who elected them the last time around, because we will be there right ready to tell them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Here is our MP for Burin-St. George's (Mr. R. Simmons), "A Strong Voice in Ottawa", Like he was a strong voice over here on the Opposition side of the House? Yes, some strong voice!

MR. MORGAN: That is a laugh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The place for the member for Burin-St. George's, and I told him here in this House to his face two or three times, was to have the courage of his convictions and come out and run against me in Green Bay where everybody knew him at the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: He would not dare.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Because he ran away. He ran away.

MR. NEARY: Are you going to run in the next federal election?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So that is one reason, Mr. Speaker. That is one reason because the debates in this House of Assembly are very important documents in the history of Newfoundland, very important documents. And it must be recorded, for the benefit of the people on this side of the House it must be recorded that those, over the last eight or nine months, nine or ten months now, who have refused to pick up the cause of our proposal and support it completely, categorically, those who have refused to do that will have their day to answer of why Newfoundland in 2010 or 2020 is still wallowing to rob Peter to pay Paul. Why its government had to open the House and bring in a financial statement in the year 2009 because they got halfway through the year and found that the revenue was down. Because we will be always in the same

PREMIER PECKFORD: kind of circumstances that we are in today, Mr. Speaker, unless and until through revenues from offshore, through revenues from a change in the Upper Churchill, we can get out of the financial straight jacket that we have always been in, and that we ensure, more importantly, that we use the oil and the oil does not use us. We use the oil for fish, we use the oil for trees, we use the oil and the revenue for the renewable resources that will be here when oil is gone. That is why, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his party have lost so badly, because they did not understand what Newfoundlanders understood, that when we talked about oil we were really talking about fish, we were really talking about trees. Because in order to do the economic uplifting that is necessary in this Province you have got to be able to access a whole pool of money, \$500 million, \$600 million, \$700 million a year, just to replace equalization, and then build on top of that to bring us up. We have got to do a whole bunch of catch up first and that is \$500 million or \$600 million. That is only catch up. Catch up what? To replace equalization. No catch up at all. It is after we replace that \$500 million that we start to catch up. We have to build above the \$500 million - \$600 million now it is.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are no better off if we just create another \$600 million, not one cent, not one penny. It is after the \$600 million that we start to get better off.

And then there are those who say - within the Province but mostly outside the Province, thank God - that somehow we are greedy, that we are selfish, selfish because we want to be number five or number six in Canada, that we are not satisfied to just take somebody else's wealth to build our community stages, to take somebody else's wealth to pay our UIC, to take somebody else's wealth to build the roads and all the other water and sewer facilities or whatever it is we have to build in the Province. We are not satisfied with that because being a human being - not being Newfoundlanders, not being Canadians, not being Americans, not being Chinese or Frenchmen - being human beings mean that you have the dignity that you want to do it by the sweat of your own brow and create your own dollars and then contribute back into the larger whole of which you are a part, the political jurisdiction that you are a part of.

The silence is deafening, Mr. Speaker, the silence is deafening all across this Nation and especially among those of the leadership of this Province who have come to me, hundreds of them. And my only answer back to them is: Tell me what is wrong with the proposal. Tell me what is un-Canadian about it. The onus is on you, the onus is on Newfoundlanders today, on the Liberal Party, the NDP Party, every organization, every individual in Newfoundland and Labrador and every individual in Canada to tell the Newfoundland Government what is wrong with that proposal. Why cannot that work for the good of Newfoundland and the good of Canada? And when they can answer that question and show to us that somehow we are being deficient or somehow we are being selfish, we will negotiate, we will negotiate. But until somebody can show us where we are wrong,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Canada stand up at a gathering in the past week and try to raise the spectre - as other people have tried to raise against me personally for quite a few years now - raise the spectre of separation, the spectre of referendum and all the rest of it. Somehow the Canadian Government, even though Alberta never had a claim, could give them their oil. Somehow the Canadian Government could give to Saskatchewan, even though they had no claim, the oil. Somehow they could give to Ontario and to Quebec all the resources, even though they had no claim. But when it comes to Newfoundland, because now it is 1982 and not 1930, the same rules do not apply. Shame! Shame! We are too late. Somehow the rules got changed on us. Somehow the rules got changed on us. History has struck a queer and unfair blow to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Because we are where we are, in 1982, we are not to be treated the same as Albertans were treated in 1930 or 1920, or whenever.

So the Prime Minister can stand up then in Ottawa at a political gathering and raise the Separatist spectre, Mr. Speaker, and I think, as I have said already publicly, that what we object to is that the Prime Minister needed to say anything at all. It is not so much what he said as why say it at all. Why was it necessary to say it at all? If in fact there is still a chance for a political settlement on this very vital issue, then let us try to refrain from being provocative one with the other so that the proper climate can be created, and, if there is the slightest possibility of change, that we can get back to the table and negotiate a settlement. But no. I guess the Prime Minister was advised, one way perhaps to get to

PREMIER PECKFORD: Peckford, boy, might be to start raising this business - a lot of people now in Newfoundland are talking about it - that a lot of people seem, when you mention to them, you know, that the Premier, he might be a Separatist, you know, he might be trying to take Newfoundland out of Confederation. Perhaps that is the way to get at the Government of Newfoundland, that might be a vulnerable spot, that might be a weak spot in the armour of the Government of Newfoundland.' Well, I have news for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. As I said in Question Period, I have news for the Prime Minister.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are not going to get overly excited about what the Prime Minister said. The only point we want to make on that is simply that his comments were unnecessary, completely unnecessary, and they have destroyed any chance in the next month or two for us getting together and trying to negotiate this very difficult problem. Because nobody is talking about separation, nobody is talking about referendum. What we are talking about is trying to get a fair and equal deal the same as other people who live in this country. That is what we are asking for - no more, no less. And that has been interpreted in some political quarters as somehow to be a bad Canadian. I think that we have demonstrated many, many times, Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and this government, that we are good Canadians. But that does not mean that we are going to lie down, Mr. Speaker, and take the crumbs as they give them out to us like some of them would like us to do. Oh, no! We will negotiate and we will negotiate firmly on all the things that come across our bow, and we will defend the rights that we believe we have under the Constitution. That is all we ask. So when the Prime Minister tries to raise the spectre of separation referendum, he does a great injustice both to himself and to Canada and, most especially, not to me, but to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, to the Canadians who live in this Province. That is who is doing an injustice to because all they are asking for - they do not want to be lectured at - all they are asking for is a fair deal, the same kind of deal that the other Canadians have gotten over the years. And the hon. members on the opposite side, just recently the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) suddenly came out one day with a statement, suddenly he supports - he does not support our proposal, I do not think, I do not think he said that, but he supports better revenue sharing, whatever that means, and

PREMIER PECKFORD: some say over the management of the development.

MR. S. NEARY: These are the only two items that are stopping an accommodation.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And permanence too is a problem and trigger point is also a problem.

MR. NEARY: They were not when.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You negotiated it, sure that is right, I forgot. Where was I when all this went on? Do not be foolish. Do not be silly. Act sensible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary), different from some of the other Leaders of the Opposition-I will give him credit as long as he stands to it - but where the Leader of the Opposition fell down is that because that proposal is on the table, the Leader of the Opposition should have said, 'Look, Prime Minister, people of Newfoundland, people of Canada, we support the principles contained in that proposal.' Not every last dot and cross every T and all of the rest of it, but, "We support those principles that are being enunciated by the Government of Newfoundland on behalf of Newfoundlanders." And it is clear that the majority of Newfoundlanders support it.

MR. B. TULK: We wanted it recorded in blood.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, you want it the right way so nobody can misinterpret it. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) knows better than that, or should know better by this time.

MR. J. MORGAN: He does not know any better.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Do not weasel around. Stand up and be counted. Do not be like Mr. Rompkey. Do not be like Mr. Baker and hide away and now and then come out with a little wormy statement.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Stand up and be a man, stand up and be counted on principles.

MR. TULK: You are trying to fight an election at a cost to Newfoundland.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There you go, Mr. Speaker. There it is. We are just fighting an election at the cost of Newfoundland.

Forget about the long-term, Mr. Speaker, just think about the short-term. There they are, short-term politicians, Mr. Speaker. And how short they got. How short they went. From eighteen to eight, that is how short they went.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, yes! Oh, yes! The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) knows where he is well off. The members for Fogo knows where he is well off, yes.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) to get you a job.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker, it makes no difference, the member for Fogo has not taken a clear stand. He has been all over the place, everybody knows that. Why waste time on somebody who really knows all that?

So, Mr. Speaker, it is for these two reasons, one, that just for the record, for the record of this House, I feel obliged to indicate that we have a proposal on the table that has not been answered, has not been answered in any way, shape or form. And really, I suppose, it is pretty hard that after all the hurly-burly, and all the talk and all the rest of it by the federal authorities, I think just about everybody, even the people on the opposite side of the House, in their own hearts and souls, and, I would say, by far, 90 per cent of Newfoundlanders, the people in the press, everybody figured for sure that the federal government, Mr. Lalonde, was not coming down to Newfoundland and putting the Nova Scotia agreement on the

PREMIER PECKFORD: table. I would say, if you took a poll at that time, most people would have said, 'By the Lord Harry, they are going to come down with something now that is going to be pretty hard for the Government of Newfoundland to turn down. They are going to have to accept this one. This is it now, after seven months and all the talk! What a Newfie joke! What an insult to our intelligence, to our way of doing things! A proposal on which meetings had been held between the two sides, and then to wait seven months to come down and put that on the table.

Well, if we were not more civilized, Mr. Speaker, I dare say we would have thrown him in the harbour.

MR. TULK: How low.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, that is how low. That is how low, Mr. Speaker, for any Minister of Energy in Canada to wait seven months to put only on the table what was already there after all the fanfare.

MR. NEARY: Do not be acting like the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young).

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, we did not throw him in the harbour, we treated him mannerly, courteously, with hospitality and all the rest of it. But it has to grate any individual, it has to grate any individual to think that after seven months on such a fantastic issue, a monumental issue, that the best that the federal government could do was to come down and put on the table the same thing as they had put on in Nova Scotia months before without even answering one comma in our proposal. An incredible turn of events!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And as I say, as I introduce the debate, you know, it is unbelievable and it could only happen in Newfoundland. It would not happen anywhere else. There would be a national outrage about it, an national outrage. So, Mr. Speaker, we just want to make those two points. One, that we are still waiting on the federal government for some kind of reasonable and rational response to a proposal that has been sitting there since January 1982. And secondly, we are saddened and regret that the Prime Minister of this nation saw fit this past week to destroy any chance, with the provocative comments he made somehow implying that this government somehow wishes to move itself or to move this Province out of Confederation. To make those comments and to imply that kind of thing, to imply that kind of thing to this government must be rejected by me as the leader of the government and as Premier of the Province, must be rejected outright.

The Prime Minister can make those statements till he is blue in the face but he will not push this Province out of Confederation. He can try all he like. He can do it through the back door, the side door or the front door. We will come back to the Prime Minister every time and say to him, 'Answer our Canadian proposal. Answer our proposal for a settlement which will give Newfoundland a fair share and give Canada a fair share so that we do have the chance to be equal in this Confederation.' So, Mr. Speaker, we will wait and see over the next few months whether these kind of statements continue by the Prime Minister or other members of the federal government. We hope they do not. And we hope that they see in the proposal that we have on the table the elements and the principles for an agreements which will

PREMIER PECKFORD: take us out of this impasse. It would be sad to think, Mr. Speaker, that a year from now we face - you know, we talk about facing a bleak time now. We have some budget problems as do all the governments of Canada and we will deal with it and we will do what has to be done. But that is only momentary, that is only a small window in time it would be extremely unfortunate that a year or two years from now we find ourselves as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians no further ahead on the Upper Churchill and no further ahead on the offshore and still with a government in Ottawa that controls 80 or 90 per cent of our fishery, and we are left to try to make our way and to balance our budget on trees and fish without any meaningful access to the rest of it. One of the startling statistics when people talk about management and controlling their development and so on, Mr. Speaker, one easy way, one simplistic way, and I think most Newfoundlanders understand when we talk about directing the development so it does not overheat the economy and all the rest of it, that you still have a good interface between your fishery and your offshore and so on.

MR. NEARY: Do not be such a fool, boy, overheating the economy.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ask Norway what happened on that score.

MR. NEARY: The only one who is in heat is you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: There you go, Mr. Speaker,
That is our alternate Premier over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is our alternative. That
is what we have, the best we got.

MR. NEARY: At least you are thinking about
(inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I stay awake
every night thinking about it, Mr. Speaker. I have not gotten
any sleep now ever since the Leader of the Opposition became
more than interim leader of the Opposition because nobody else
wants the job. But in any case, my point was simply this:
Look at the fishery, Mr. Speaker, look at the fishery.

MR. NEARY: He is almost as bad as Haig -
almost.

PREMIER PECKFORD: How many federal employees
of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans find their
residences in the Province of Nova Scotia and how many
federal employees of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans
find their residences in the Province of New Brunswick -
because Mr. LeBlanc was there for a while - how many in total?
I am told there is somewhere around, in total, 1,600 federal
employees working for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans
in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. How many are in Newfoundland,
Mr. Speaker? Somewhere between 400 and 600.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do they
manage? I guess the New Brunswick federal officials of
Fisheries and Oceans manage the fishery in New Brunswick and
the Nova Scotians who live in Nova Scotia manage the Nova
Scotia fishery. No, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The Bay of Fundy.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Two-thirds of the resource that they manage is in Newfoundland and two-thirds of the employees are in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick -

MR. MORGAN:

That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- just the opposite to what it should be. Sixteen hundred employees should be in Newfoundland helping to eliminate our unemployment problem and the 600 should be in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. And so if you want to simplistically look at management of the offshore, just think about what happened in the fishery when that was given away for the most part, or traded away or negotiated away, legitimately negotiated away in 1949; it has meant that two-thirds of the people who managed two-thirds of the stock live away from where the resource is.

What would happen, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what would happen on the offshore, what would happen on the offshore? If that happened in the fisheries - 1,600 of the federal fisheries people managing the fishery of Newfoundland from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and only 600 from here - what would happen as the peak of the offshore development?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

There would be a run on people in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia like you would not believe, There would be a run on people like you would not believe.

And so I guess to forget about the more intangible aspects of management and control and direction and social and cultural considerations and dimensions to the problem, one only has to look at the employment situation and what has happened in the fishery. And we do not want that to happen here, Mr. Speaker. If we have the majority of the resource, which we do, we have all the oil and as much gas as Nova Scotia has - they have a little bit of gas - the same thing is going to happen: two-thirds of them will be up there supposedly managing the gas but really managing the oil, and one-third of them will be down here - the same kind of thing as we have in the fishery. They got less than one-third of the hydrocarbons, we got more than two-thirds, and the same thing will happen; they will have over two-thirds of the employment and we will have less than one-third of the employment. That is the great danger simply put, simplistically put, but I think it accurately makes the point.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I just want to conclude by saying that Labrador and the Upper Churchill is a very important issue for Newfoundlanders, and there are other very many important issues, but the offshore oil and gas and the promise that it holds to enhance our financial well-being, to enhance our fishery, to give us a chance to really do the things that we have always wanted to do but could not do because we never had the money, we must use it to our benefit, wrestle it to the ground and use it to develop Newfoundland in our way so we still have a Newfoundland left and not a Hamilton, Ontario. The hydro is important, the fish is important, and so is offshore oil and gas. And I believe the day is going to have to come, whether it is this year, next

PREMIER PECKFORD: year or the year after, when whoever are in power in Ottawa are going to have to say, 'Boys, we got to go down a strike a deal with them because they are not going to go away.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Nothing to do with court decisions, nothing to do with proposals, nothing to do with anything else - Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are not going to go away. And those Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who believe that we deserve a fair share of the offshore are not going to go away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who believe in a change in the Upper Churchill contract are not going to go away. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who believe in a greater share in the fishery are not going to go away. And some day, some day soon, I hope, there will be a realization up-along -

MR. NEARY: Some day have-not will be no more.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, that is right.

MR. NEARY: Oh, boy! Oh, boy!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is right, exactly. You are learning fast. You are learning fast, after ten years you are not doing a bad job.

And, Mr. Speaker, that is the great strength that Newfoundland has. It has it in its people who are not going to go away and their firm belief that what they are saying on those major issues is being very much a Canadian and also very much a Newfoundlander.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! I would like to welcome to our galleries today two visitors from Garnish, in the district of Grand Bank, Mr. and Mrs. Melvin Grandy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that I followed -

MR. STAGG: One day you will come prepared.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Premier was not interrupted when he was speaking, and I trust that I will get the same courtesy from the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I followed what the Premier had to say with a great deal of interest, and I am sorry to say that there was nothing new in what the Premier said. As a matter of fact, I was wondering when he was going to get to the resolution. The hon. gentleman talked about everything under the sun except the resolution itself. Only in the last part, the last fifty or sixty seconds, did the hon. gentleman refer at all to the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, during his remarks the Premier made a number of statements that I would consider to be anything but honest, a number of statements that I would consider, if not corrected, could leave the wrong impression and could mislead this House and indeed mislead the people of this Province. The Premier has a technique for being very loose with his words, in the way that he plays with the truth, Mr. Speaker. I found that out observing the Premier from very close quarters in the last several years, that when he goes into one of these fits of anger that he seems to have quite often, when he becomes hysterical, he does not seem to be responsible for what he says

MR. NEARY: and in the process some of these remarks that the hon. gentleman has made over the last two or three years, Mr. Speaker, have done the Newfoundland people and the reputation of this Province enormous damage.

The Premier, as I said so often in this House and outside of this House, Mr. Speaker, is a well-meaning, well-intentioned individual, but he just does not seem to comprehend. He does not understand things, especially heavy items such as have you negotiate an agreement. The hon. gentleman does not understand that negotiations are a two-way street. He just does not understand. It takes two to tango, The hon. gentleman does not understand that like maybe the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) who has observed the way that union and management negotiate agreements, it is give and take, and you stay at the negotiating table until there is an agreement.

MR. NEARY: The Premier does not seem to understand that, Mr. Speaker. And if anybody in this world is responsible for provocative statements, for damaging relations, for creating a bad atmosphere between this Province and the Government of Canada, it is none other than the hon. gentleman who just took his seat. He could not resist the temptation in his remarks, Mr. Speaker, to have a little dart at Mr. Rompkey and the four other Liberal MPs from Newfoundland. He did not have a go at Mr. McGrath or Mr. Crosbie.

MR. TOBIN: No, because they are Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Oh, they are Newfoundlanders, I see. They are Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman says they are Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, do you have to be a Tory to be a Newfoundlander? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying? And is the hon. gentleman toeing the party line saying that the only right way to do things is the Tory way, there is no other way? That is what the Premier just told us; if you do not do it the Tory way there is no other way to do it. Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier is going to go down in the history of this Province as being the biggest flop and the biggest failure in the whole political history of Newfoundland. The Premier is continuously wrong. The Premier is wrong, wrong, wrong! He is so wrong that people are beginning to wonder if he is ever going to be right. He was wrong on the provincial Day of Mourning.

MR. BAIRD: He was right in the last election, was he not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if that is what it is all about, if that is their concern, if all they are concerned about is politics, if all they are concerned about is whether they are going to be elected or defeated, or if they are concerned about whether or not the Liberals are going to win federally or whether Mr. Rompkey and the four other MPs are going to be re-elected, if that is all they are concerned about, why do they not say so? Why do they not have the courage to get up front and say what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is fighting the next federal election and they have no intention, no intention of signing an agreement or negotiating an agreement until that is over?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would ask to be heard in silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Could I be heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. the Premier made the statement that he made a half hour or so ago, that the proposal that was laid on the table by this government was ignored by Ottawa, that was a false statement. It was just not true. And the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), seated to the right of the Premier, knows that that is not true. In September, when Mr. LaLonde came to Newfoundland, he brought with him a proposal that was handed to the hon. gentleman -

MR. TULK: A counter offer.

MR. NEARY: - a counter proposal. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier has not received that proposal, it is only because his Minister of Energy did not give it to him,

MR. NEARY: it is only because the Premier did not want to see it. Now how do I know that, Mr. Speaker? How do I know there was a counter proposal? And remember negotiations are proposals, counter proposals, negotiations, talking until you reach an agreement. Is that not correct? Does that make any sense? Is that common sense? How do I know there is a proposal? Well, Mr. Speaker, I happened to be sitting down one evening watching the CBC News and I saw Mr. Rick Seaward, I think it was, discuss this matter of offshore and proposals, and he produced on the CBC a proposal, a federal proposal, And I said to myself, 'That is funny. The Premier of this Province has been saying there is no counter proposal from Ottawa.' So I started the next morning to search for that counter proposal and I am happy to say that I found it. Through devious and various ways I found the proposal, the federal proposal, and in case hon. gentlemen think that I am

MR. BAIRD: Which one do you agree with?

MR. NEARY: That is not the point, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: How many times have you been on television.

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker - and I cannot accuse the Premier of deliberately misleading this House or misleading the people of this Province, he probably did not know the difference. He made the statement probably in ignorance, ignorance of the facts, Maybe the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) forgot to lay the proposal on the Premier's desk - here is the federal proposal. I am holding it here in my hand.

MR. TOBIN: Is that the one Roger Simmons said he would not sign?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there was a counter proposal, and the obvious thing to happen once this counter proposal was made was for the two parties to continue negotiations until an agreement was reached. That was the obvious next step. We had a provincial proposal on the table, we had a counter proposal from the Government of Canada. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is shaking his head. I am holding it in my hand.

MR. DAWE: Holding what?

MR. NEARY: I am holding the federal proposal right here. Look.

MR. CALLAN: He should be holding you.

MR. NEARY: The obvious next step, Mr. Speaker, was for the two parties to continue to negotiate until all items in both agreements had been settled to the mutual satisfaction of both parties, and the people of this Province and the Canadian people as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Premier has shown his caucus the federal proposal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, having produced the federal document that explodes the statement made by the Premier, let me say this, that I do not necessarily agree with all the items in the federal proposal, no more than I agree with all the items in the provincial proposal. There are two outstanding items, as far as I can see, that are stopping a negotiated agreement between the two parties. What are these items? They are revenue sharing and management or control of the resource.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me deal with revenue sharing. The Premier took to the airways in a Provincewide broadcast a few weeks ago and he used charts to tell the people of this Province that once the revenue from Hibernia was shared between the Government of Canada and Newfoundland that other revenues from other oil fields would be capped. That is the term he used. He said, after Hibernia there would be no revenues to Newfoundland, there would be a cap put on the revenue. That statement, Mr. Speaker, is false and misleading and is not true. Now, how do I know that? I took the opportunity over the weekend to spend an hour with the federal Minister of Energy, I wanted to discuss these two points, revenue sharing and management of the resource.

This morning I had a call from the Minister of Energy, the hon. Jean Chretien, who told me that revenue will accrue to the Province on all oil fields. Not only one oil field, but if there are two we will get our share of the revenue, if there are three we will get our share of the revenue. That is the truth of the matter. There is no cap, that is false and untrue and misleading.

MR. BAIRD: You would believe Chretien, would you?

MR. NEARY: I would believe him before I would believe the hon. gentleman who does not know, who does not understand, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is like the Premier, he just does not understand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no cap on revenue. Now, the revenue may drop on oil field two, and drop on oil field three, and drop on oil field four, and if we get four or five oil fields we may be asked to share revenue with the other provinces of Canada. Mr. Speaker, there is no cap. And anybody who makes that statement is trying to mislead, deliberately mislead the people of this Province.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the revenue sharing is negotiable; both of these items, by the way, are negotiable items, Mr. Speaker, both of them. The revenue sharing and management of the resource are negotiable items.

Revenue sharing, you are talking about money, that can be negotiated. And the management of the resource, which is the makeup of the Committee that will control and manage the development, that is a negotiable item, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: That is why I said that the Premier apparently does not understand the way negotiations work. He is a nice fellow. He is a nice fellow and he means well, but he just has not got what it takes. He has not got what it takes.

MR. YOUNG: He is the best Premier in Canada!

MR. NEARY: The Premier in his remarks almost got down to the same level as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). And if I were the Minister of Public Works, the guttersnipe, the hon. guttersnipe, I would go back to my seat, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman uses unparliamentary words when he refers to the hon. Minister of Public Works as a guttersnipe and I think he should be made to withdraw them.

MR. NEARY: Show me.

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

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

MR. HODDER: There is nothing in Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, or in our Standing Orders which precludes the member from using the word 'guttersnipe.'

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is clearly there.

MR. NEARY: Show us where it is. Tell us where it is.

MR. WARREN: Go on out, boy, and have a smoke.

MR. MARSHALL: It is clearly, Mr. Speaker, in the Standing Orders that members cannot use insulting language to other members and that is obviously unparliamentary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

On page 114 of Beauchesne:

"Unparliamentary words may be brought to the attention of the House." It is impossible to lay down any specific rules in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate against particular Members, or to declare beforehand what expressions are or are not contrary to order; much depends upon the tone and manner, and intention, of the person speaking; sometimes upon the person to whom the words are addressed, as, whether he is," etc., etc. But, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious and it is a matter that hardly needs statement by authority, even though I have given it, but insulting words of that nature are unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY:

If it will make the hon.

gentleman happy, although I know I am in order, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the statement because I do not want to be sidetracked. This is too serious a matter, Mr. Speaker. If I hurt the feelings of the two hon. gentlemen, I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. I am not interested in getting sidetracked off this subject at all. But I know the hon. gentleman just got up to try to use up some of my time because I am making some pretty hard hitting points.

Mr. Speaker, now let me carry on. Negotiations, as I have said, should have continued. Now what happened after that, Mr. Speaker? Well, Mr. Lalonde was transferred to another department and the hon. John Chretien took over. And then a meeting took place between the Prime Minister and the Premier. Now, did anyone expect that meeting to succeed? Only a day or two prior to meeting with the Prime Minister, the Premier of

MR. NEARY: That would be pretty poor strategy on my part, Mr. Speaker, pretty poor strategy. So nobody expected the meeting with the Prime Minister and the Premier of this Province to succeed.

MR. TULK: The Premier made sure it would not.

MR. NEARY: And the Premier made darn good and sure, because, Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Province knows now what kind of a game the Premier is playing; he is fighting the next federal election, and he has no intentions of negotiating an agreement offshore until the election is over, hoping that Mr. Clark will give him a better deal. Well, Mr. Clark has been pretty silent on that matter lately, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Clark is making no commitments to the hon. gentleman. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the Tory MPs that I talked to in Ottawa tell me that the Premier of this Province is an embarrassment to Mr. Clark -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - and they cannot wait for the Supreme Court decision, we are told by the Tories in Ottawa. They say the hon. gentleman is an embarrassment. Mr. Speaker, the Premier is playing a very dangerous game indeed. When the next federal election is called, it may be a completely new ball game. You may have new faces, new players; you will have new players in that game and you will have new policies. So what do we have to do, wait another two years before we sit down and negotiate? - waste another two years? We have wasted ten years already and it is going to be seven or eight years before the development starts, even after we get a negotiated settlement.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, one other point before I get off that particular item.

The meeting took place between the Prime Minister and the Premier. Now, should that be the end of it, Mr. Speaker? Should that be the end of it? The hon. Jean Chretien, who has a success record that is unequalled in Canada for negotiating agreements, for instance, for negotiating with the provinces the constitution -

MR. TULK: He did something that could not be done in fifty years.

MR. NEARY: He did something that could not be done in a hundred years.

MR. BAIRD: And then he up and left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do not make me laugh!

Mr. Speaker, nobody but nobody in this government, as of this day, nobody has met with Mr. Chretien to talk about continuing negotiations, nobody. There have been no meetings between a minister in this government and the hon. John Chretien, the federal Minister of Energy. They will not even return his telephone calls.

MR. TULK: Right on!

MR. NEARY: Is that the crowd, Mr. Speaker, who are interested in a negotiated settlement? And I have to say this before I wind up this part of my remarks, that they have come a long way.

MR. NEARY: I remember the day in this House when the present Premier stood in his seat and said, 'We own the resource and everybody can go jump in the lake. We are not negotiating. We are not going to give up the ownership of the resource, it is ours, and they can come on their hands and knees to us.' What has happened now, Mr. Speaker? The hon. gentleman accuses the Opposition of talking out of both sides of their mouth.

We supported the Premier on that, because the people on this side, the Liberals, historically and traditionally say we own the resource.

MR. BAIRD: I know you were not for us.

MR. NEARY: Well, what did the Premier do? What did the Premier do? He said before he would go into negotiations, lay the ownership aside forever. That is what the hon. gentleman said. That was talking out of both sides of your mouth. We owned it and we are not going to talk to anybody on anything else, the ownership is ours: And then he changed his mind and he said, 'Lay the ownership aside forever and we will sit down and negotiate with you'.

MR. DINN: What did Trudeau say over at the University?

MR. NEARY: And who was the first one to take it to court, the ownership question? Put it before -

AN HON. MEMBER: The federal government did -

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, the federal government. Now the hon. gentleman has really walked into something.

MR. DINN: - through the SIU case. That is what is wrong.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what did the Appeals Court of Ontario do in the SIU case? They ignored the federal intervention and they ruled strictly on the labour relations aspect of the case.

MR. DINN: After the fact. Hindsight is wonderful, is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Ah, hindsight is great on the Upper Churchill too, is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they ignored the intervention. But, Mr. Speaker, by that time the Premier of this Province had gone off his rocker, had taken the easy way out and put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court. The first move to put the matter before the court, the ownership question before the court, was done by the Premier of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am appalled, I am appalled that the Premier and his colleagues are so obviously, even anxiously, Mr. Speaker, willing to continue to play politics with this question of the stalemate between the two governments in pursuit of an offshore settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I am still not convinced that the Premier is refusing to allow a settlement to occur until the next federal election, so that he can once again haul it out of its resting place the great spectre of the national bogeyman, the terrible feds, those nasty mainland politicians, those MPs who are less than Newfoundlanders if they are not Tories -

MR. TOBIN: Tell us where you stand?

MR. NEARY: - those people who are trying to take everything away from the poor old down-trodden Newfoundlander. Mr. Speaker, that is the largest, vilest, most sanctimonious lie ever perpetrated upon a populace since Richard Nixon told the American people, "Let me make this perfectly clear".

MR. STAGG: Now he is reading his speech. You are not allowed to do that.

MR. NEARY: No one in his right mind, Mr. Speaker, no one with even the gift of imagination could devise a scenario whereby a resolution worded in such a fashion could further cause an offshore settlement.

MR. NEARY: Look at the resolution, Mr. Speaker, look at it under your microscope and then study what it entails and find out its true nature, Mr. Speaker. The very first "WHEREAS" constitutes what I consider in my opinion to be a joke, that is, Mr. Speaker, a joke to those who have a warped, buttoned-down mind and a slanted sense of humour. It says: "WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has sought a political settlement to the offshore resources question", what a preposterous, outlandish assertion. The truth is just the opposite, Mr. Speaker. The truth is that this government ran away from a political settlement. They ran away from a political settlement last Fall when they decided to back out of negotiations, the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), who, I happen to feel, is the wrong person to negotiate for this Province anyway. It was not the federal government, as the hon. member knows, who refused to negotiate. Word is still coming down from Ottawa that they are prepared to get back to the bargaining table, to get in a room - Mr. Chretien would be very happy to get in a room with somebody from this Province who he could talk to, who he could negotiate with. It takes two, Mr. Speaker, to tango. It was this Province that backed out. It was the federal government, Mr. Speaker, last September, that was left at the bargaining table, suspended in mid-air with its mouth open in astonishment wondering what was going on. Why was the Newfoundland Government ending negotiations? Why was the Newfoundland Government refusing a negotiated settlement? Why was it cancelling any possibility of a solution to the offshore and the prosperity that it would mean to the people of this Province? Well, Mr. Speaker, we found out in April that the reason the Premier needed a fairy tale offer was so that he could call an unnecessary, costly, provincial election.

Mr. Speaker, it is a political move.

MR. TOBIN:

And a good one at that.

MR. NEARY:

That is all they are interested in, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it is so unethical in nature that it almost makes me gag.

MR. TOBIN:

Is it such a shame to win an election?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in case the hon. gentleman from the Burin Peninsula is interested, the Premier and his mob managed to convince 27 per cent of 569,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that he was telling the truth. He managed to convince 27 per cent of the population of this Province. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, he failed to convince the 168,000 eligible voters, some of whom did not bother to vote,

MR. S. NEARY:

some of whom voted for the people on this side of the House. Twenty seven per cent - I will repeat that just in case the hon. gentlemen - any time they feel like getting too cocky and arrogant, they better keep this figure in the backs of their minds; that all they managed to convince in this Province on this great issue of offshore, they managed to convince 27 per cent of 569,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to vote for them.

MR. R. BAIRD: Yes. A big majority, 44 seats.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that throughout the population of Newfoundland and Labrador there are 419,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, men, women and children who either cannot vote or refuse to vote or voted against the Premier and his political highjackers in the last election. That is a lot of people, Mr. Speaker, who do not seem to have a voice or a say in the shenanigans of what we see going on in this House and outside the House. Now, let us take a look at the second WHEREAS in the resolution: It says, 'The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador placed a compromise proposal before the Federal Government on January 25, 1982.' But, Mr. Speaker, this was long after the Province had abandoned the negotiating table. This was not a compromise proposal in any case, Mr. Speaker, it was a threat, it was a take it or leave it situation. And the threat was that if the Government of Canada did not respond to it hook, line and sinker, then there would be no point in negotiating. That was the threat. The Premier has said on numerous occasions, I suppose on 100 or more occasions in this Province, that, there cannot be any preconditions to negotiations. Yet the proposal that he laid down had a precondition of his own attached to it.

MR. S. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander.

Mr. Speaker, if the federal government cannot have preconditions to negotiations, then neither can the provincial government. The very definition of the word negotiate is that you barter on each point. You give and take. You make a concession here and a concession there, and you give a little ground here and you give a little ground there. Everything is negotiable at the outset until at least you have established certain mutual ground, common ground.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that even members on the government side sometimes look at the Premier when he is making these statements about preconditions. They must wonder what the logic is. What is the logic? Is the Premier and this government allowed to lay down preconditions, and nobody else can lay down preconditions? Is that the Tory way to negotiate?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us analyze the third "Whereas", "WHEREAS the Government of Canada has not answered the proposal." Mr. Speaker, did not the Premier a few weeks ago force himself into the living rooms of every family in Newfoundland and Labrador to publicly reject the federal proposal? Is that not why he took to the airwaves? Is that not why, Mr. Speaker, the Premier forced his way into every household in this Province? Is that not why, Mr. Speaker, the Premier summoned the heads of churches to the Cabinet room recently? Is that not why the Premier, last Thursday, summoned the heads of all the organizations in Newfoundland and Labrador to the Cabinet room and got told off by the President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Federation of Labour for playing politics and trying to suck the heads of the churches and the organizations into joining the Premier in the federal campaign that he is carrying on?

Mr. Speaker, if there was no federal proposal, why did he go to television and radio and the newspapers and put householder mailings in every house in Newfoundland and costly advertisements in the newspaper, and to call in the heads of the churches and the heads of the organizations last Thursday if there is no federal proposal? Because I am told what the hon. gentleman did was to compare one proposal with the other and then try to force the heads of the churches, and the heads of the organizations to take a stand on one or the other proposal. That is not the way negotiations work, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way they work and they are not going to work.

November 9, 1982

Tape 2118

NM - 2

MR. NEARY:

So the Premier is rejecting a federal counter proposal and he is telling us in the House today that there is no counter proposal. Mr. Speaker, that kind of atmosphere, in my opinion, seems to be lacking something or other.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, look at WHEREAS number four. WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland continues - listen to this one, Mr. Speaker, WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland continues to seek a political settlement. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not recall any invitation by the Premier of this Province, or his Energy Minister (Mr. Marshall) or his Deputy Energy Minister or anyone else, to the hon. Jean Chretien to come here and sit down and negotiate. And I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, right now, and I have it from the horse's mouth, that Mr. Chretien would welcome an opportunity to continue negotiations.

MR. BAIRD: From the horse's mouth?

MR. TOBIN: From the horse's mouth, alright.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I was the hon. gentleman, in my simplicity and in my ignorance, both hon. gentlemen, I would keep quiet. Because they might show they know as little about these kinds of situations as their master, they just do not understand.

Mr. Speaker, they have not invited the hon. Jean Chretien to come here and sit down and negotiate, and stay in a room until an agreement is reached. Mr. Chretien has stated publicly that if he could even get someone in this administration to answer the telephone calls he has made that he would be happy, let alone come out and have a meeting with him.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I know and I can ascertain, the hon. Jean Chretien is dying for an opportunity to get into a negotiating situation with somebody in this Province to negotiate an agreement. So if the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, led by the genius who spoke earlier in this debate this afternoon, asserts that it is still seeking a political settlement in his resolution, then, Mr. Speaker, let them show their sincerity, let them

MR. NEARY: put action instead of words as their number one priority, and meet with the hon. Jean Chretien and stay in the room, Mr. Speaker, until they have a negotiated settlement. Not if you do not do it the Tory way you do not do it, that is no way to negotiate. The Tory way has been wrong, Mr. Speaker. The Premier of this Province has been consistently wrong on every issue. On every issue that has come before this Government, the Premier has been consistently wrong. If he has been consistent in one thing, it is for being wrong. He has been a failure.

And if the court case goes against the Government, goes against the Province, and for Newfoundland's sake I hope it does not, because we believe on this side of the House that Newfoundland owns the resource, you have nobody to blame,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, but the Premier of this Province, who put the matter before the courts, took the easy way out. And what about 'WHEREAS' number five, Mr. Speaker? What does that say? What does 'WHEREAS' number five say? 'WHEREAS the Prime Minister of Canada has made statements which are provocative and unnecessary'. Well, Mr. Speaker, using what kind of logic I do not know, could you construe that statement as promoting a political settlement on the offshore? Is that resolution in itself not provocative? Is not that resolution in itself insulting? Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder what kind of logic is locked up behind the doors down on the Eighth Floor and in the Cabinet room. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, inside of these doors if there are not fellows with white jackets. That is the kind of logic, Mr. Speaker, that is coming out of the Eighth Floor. That is not logic, Mr. Speaker, that is pernicious garbage. This resolution and this administration, the geniuses across the way, Mr. Speaker, are asking you and me to believe that by announcing that the Prime Minister of Canada allegedly made provocative statements, that this will not promote a settlement or will promote a settlement on the offshore.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is going to read a speech, perhaps he might tell us who wrote it for him.

MR. NEARY: Cabot Martin did not do it or Frank Petten did not do it or the gawk from Springdale did not do it. The hon. gentleman knows I am quite capable of writing a speech and putting a few paragraphs together. The hon. gentleman had better not get me started on him.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution does not say what provocative statements. The CBC

MR. NEARY: last night and the Evening Telegram yesterday published the statements in their entirety. The CBC last night went to great pains and great lengths - and I commend them for it - and so did the Evening Telegram, to say, 'Here is exactly what the Prime Minister said,' responding to a question from one of the delegates at that great Liberal convention in Ottawa, and he was from the West. What did the Prime Minister say, Mr. Speaker? Did he mention Newfoundland? Did he mention offshore oil? Did he mention the name of the Premier of this Province?

Mr. Speaker, all the Prime Minister of this great country confirmed over the weekend to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador was that we have the same rights of self-determination as his own home province of Quebec,

MR. NEARY: or Alberta or Saskatchewan or any other province. One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier of this Province and his little band of separatists - anti-Canadians and anti-Confederates - would have dashed to the telex machine immediately to get a wire of thanks off to the Prime Minister to thank him for reaffirming democracy in Canada, in every province, and reaffirming that majority rule is alive and well and healthy in Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, one would have thought that the Premier and his motley crew would have dashed off to CN to send the Prime Minister a wire of congratulations -

AN HON. MEMBER: For what?

MR. NEARY: - on his astonishing astuteness in saying in the same breath in which he reaffirmed democracy in Canada that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador would soundly reject is separatist lunacy, soundly throw it out the window with the garbage, flush it down the sewer with the handful of quacks and aspiring poets who blindly believe that such a lunatic option has merit in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's statements in this instance were not provocative, they were candid and brutally honest, something we expect from the other side of this hon. House but never, never get.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to the climax of this comedy of errors and this comedy of 'Whereases' and 'Therefore's' that we see in this resolution. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, after this session of the House you might explain to me out in the corridors or in your Common Room with all the wisdom of your objectivity, for which you were appointed, you might explain to me how this resolution and how this statement and how the remarks made by the Premier in this Province are going to help us get a negotiated settlement. All this rhetoric we heard this afternoon on the wording of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, perhaps, Sir, in your wisdom you could tell me where the logic is in this whole exercise. Will it get us an offshore

MR. NEARY: settlement? Will it get us any nearer towards the development of the offshore so that we could pay our bills, make up for the \$70 million deficit we have in this Province, an incredible financial mess that we might be able to resolve through the promotion of an offshore settlement?

Mr. Speaker, can you explain to me and to members of this House how the exercise we are going through this afternoon will help us get a negotiated or a political settlement?

MR. NEARY: "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House go on record in condemning the statements of the Prime Minister as helping to destroy a climate necessary for a political settlement, and request the federal government to answer the Government of Newfoundland's compromise proposal."

Mr. Speaker, can you believe what you just heard and read in that resolution? Can your mind grasp what it all means, Mr. Speaker? What infantile mind developed that little technique, playing political games, and what infantile mind put his pen to such trash?

MR. HODDER: A person who wanted to throw a smoke screen over the economy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am truly frightened by this resolution. This is the kind of twisted logic that men who eventually go beserk use to rationalize their actions. This is the kind of logic that we saw used in Iran by the Ayatollah.

Mr. Speaker, this government is capable and they have proven today, and they have been proving for the last couple of years, that they are capable of asking the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to believe anything.

Mr. Speaker, we have a \$61 million deficit. We have businesses going bankrupt every day. We have 40,000 Newfoundlanders out of work. We have hundreds of thousands of Newfoundlanders struggling to make ends meet. Newfoundlanders are suffering and struggling to keep bare essentials, to keep food on the table, and keep a roof over their heads. They are paying more than \$2.00 for a pack of cigarettes, 60 cents for a Coke, 35 cents for a bag of chips, \$1.50 for a beer in most places, and almost \$4.00 for a movie, \$450 a month for a single bedroom apartment. Mr. Speaker, what is the provincial government's plan of action to help alleviate these problems?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if it does not have a plan for that it has a plan for nothing. Its plans, to me, and to everyone else in this Province, and it is becoming more obvious, seem to be of a political nature, name calling and squabbling. Why are we debating this resolution? This is what our Premier is spending our taxpayers' money on today.

MR. S. NEARY: It is costing hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer money for us to stand in this House today and debate this kindergarten resolution and this kindergarten type of politics. Mr. Speaker, instead of passing this resolution what we should do is demand that the Premier of this Province apologize to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador for insulting their intelligence and abusing their holy trust, and for flushing their hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of debate on this and other resolutions down the toilet. I beg the hon. the Premier if he wants to do something constructive, and if he does not want always to be negative - negativism seems to be the call word -

MR. J. HODDER: The order of the day.

MR. NEARY: - the order of the day for this administration. When, Mr. Speaker, have we heard anything positive originate from that side of the House? When have we heard an original idea? When have we seen the government do something constructive? Do they always have to be negative and always have to be wrong? I beg the hon. the Premier and his ministers to call the hon. John Chretien at once and set the date for an immediate meeting for negotiating the offshore. Mr. Speaker, I will even offer to allow myself or one of my colleagues to sit in on these negotiations to ensure fairness by both sides, or I will support a motion that an independent third party such as Mrs. Fagan of the St. John's Board of Trade, or Archbishop Penney, or even the Lieutenant-Governor sit in on these meetings to ensure that both sides negotiate in good faith and to spur them on when their spirits start to lag and they have a temptation to start name calling when personalities

MR. S. NEARY: start to develop and when there spirits start to sag. Mr. Speaker, I will do almost anything in my power and so will my colleagues on this side of the House. We will almost agree to anything, almost, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - to get these negotiations back on the road, back on the tracks and get a negotiated settlement and get this Province back on its feet. I will do all of that, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues to my right and left will do all of that, but we will not stoop to the political level of the Premier of this Province. We will not insult the intelligence of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador by supporting this travesty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WM. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: There is no greater insult to the intelligence of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador than was represented in the speech that was rendered by the hon. Leader of the Opposition a moment ago.

MR. DINN: He is not a responsible leader.

MR. MARSHALL: There is no doubt about it, Mr. Speaker, that he is now - as I say he has been elected leader of the party, interim leader of the party, but looking at him today all the good seems to have been reamed out of him. I think that the only reason why he got to be leader of the party is that they must have controlled him and controlled his speeches, because somebody wrote the speech for him. I suspect it was written for him while he was in Ottawa, because it was a speech that one would expect to be made by a member of the Federal Liberal Party, justifying the position of the government at Ottawa while it tramples on the rights of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: Shame, shame!

MR. MARSHALL: Well, make no wonder - well, I will not say who wrote it, but, I mean, obviously the hon. gentleman was - he read his speech, I assume that it was written elsewhere, because he is fresh back from Ottawa with instructions from Ottawa.

But make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman could be -

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

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. House Leader, Mr. Speaker, should know the rules of this House. If he does not he should. The hon. gentleman knows that you cannot impute motives to anything that is said in this House.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - is coming about as close to a lie as you can come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I cannot call the hon. gentleman a liar. But I have to tell the hon. gentleman this, that that speech did not come from Ottawa, it was done in my office. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has to accept my word for that according to the rules of this House.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We cannot accept your version, you would not accept mine earlier on.

MR. NEARY: No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: No one would! No one would!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his remarks and apologize to the House for lowering the decorum of this House.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: I want to assure Your Honour I am not imputing motives, I am just imputing sources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition did not raise a valid point of order, it is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. MARSHALL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, there was not really much to respond to from the Leader of the Opposition. When the Leader of the Opposition responds to a very important motion that is on the floor of this House, it is very sad to say that there is very, very little to respond to. In the first place, he holds up the agreement, or what he alleges to be the agreement that was tabled by Mr. Lalonde when he came down here to a meeting in St. John's and alleges that this was a response to our proposal. I would like to make it perfectly clear, Mr. Speaker, that that document that was tabled was not a response to our proposal, that document that was tabled was merely a paraphrasing of a Nova Scotian agreement, which Nova Scotian agreement, some twenty-four hours before that, had been completely refuted in great and specific detail by this government in a detailed statement and presentation which showed why the impact of that agreement was completely and absolutely unsuitable for this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: It was not a response and we, to date, have not received any response to our agreement. When the analysis of the impact of the Nova Scotia type agreement, which is what Mr. Lalonde presented to this Government when he came down, was given to him, he indicated that we would have a response or a rebuttal to that very, very shortly thereafter. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we have not, to date, received any rebuttal, so we must take it that they have accepted the arguments which we put up as to the inadequacy of that agreement. And, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that document is about the hottest thing off the press in this Province in the past two months, because it had wide circulation throughout Canada, particularly in the Province of Nova Scotia. And while we do not presume to tell Nova Scotians what is good for them, what they do and what they sign is their own business, it is a factor that it is regarded now in Nova Scotia that people are having a second thought about their agreement, the agreement which they signed themselves.

So when the hon. gentleman repeats and says and tries to give what amounts to be a distortion, that this Province has received a response from the federal government, I would like to state unequivocally, without any reservation whatsoever, that we have never received a response to our proposal of January 25. And instead of skirting around the issue and trying to get up in a rather embarrassed fashion once again as an apology for the federal government, let us look for just a few moments as to what that proposal of January 25 is, and what it constitutes.

That proposal, Mr. Speaker, is centered entirely -

MR. NEARY: Ha, ha, ha, ha.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, the hon. gentleman does not want to hear what was in that proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No. No.

MR. MARSHALL:

'Aside from the setting aside of ownership which we will set aside - right? - for the consideration of that for the present time' - because there has been a lot of talk about that - 'it contains two main elements, and that is the element, first of all, of joint management and, secondly, of revenue sharing'.

Let me deal with joint management first, because, as I say, it is very important that people understand the issues that are involved. The hon. gentleman apparently just wants to sing the praises of Ottawa and not get into specifics.

With respect to joint management, we proposed that the management of that resource be conferred upon a joint agency which would comprise three appointed by the provincial government, three appointed by the federal government, with one independent Chairman administering a set of joint regulations with respect to the management of that resource on the offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, instead of getting up and singing the praises of Ottawa, I invite the hon. gentlemen there opposite, as well as any other people in the business community, or any other group of people who want to whitewash things and say that there should be negotiations without addressing themselves to the issue, I would like to invite the hon. gentlemen there opposite to tell us what is wrong with a joint management system on that basis.

MR. MARSHALL: And at the same time I would point out to the hon. gentlemen there opposite that the agreement that they champion envisages this kind of system. Instead of three/three with one independent chairman, it envisages three being appointed by the federal government, two appointed by the provincial government with the rules and regulations not being joint rules and regulations but determined by the Government of Canada and being subject to change at any time by the Government of Canada. So that is what they have to balance off against. And, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that any province to sign that, for us to sign an agreement of that nature you know where the jobs would go if this occurred. Would there be concrete platforms or floating platforms? Would the benefits be in the shipyards of Marystown or the shipyards in the Province of Quebec or the shipyards in Halifax? I think we all know that answer ourselves. Would there be protection for the fishery? Would there be addressing of the interests of the people of this Province when they came into conflict with the needs of Central Canada with respect to the exploitation of oil and the exploration of the resource? I think we know what the answer to that question is. Mr. Speaker, we do not ask, and we have not asked in our proposal, when we made our proposal, for exclusive ownership. We made a giant step. When we entered into those negotiations you will note that ownership was set aside, as I say, in favour of an independent joint board, three and three with one independent chairman. And I would invite the hon. gentlemen there opposite as well as the few, the very,

MR. MARSHALL: very, minor in number, small in number people in this Province who continually make allusions to the fact that we need offshore development for business, or for the sides to get together. I say that they as Newfoundlanders have a responsibility to address themselves to the issues and to address themselves to the one set of proposals and the other set of proposals. In one case it is truly joint management, and in the other case it is federal dominance that we will never submit to, Mr. Speaker, no matter how much the hon. gentlemen there opposite urge us to.

Now, let us get on to the matter of revenue sharing as well. Under our proposal, what we envisage in our proposal is that we would get 75 per cent, approximately 75 per cent of all government type revenues of the offshore until a certain period of time. Now, that 75 per cent has been arrived at as a result of a great deal of analysis various types of taxation measures that have pertained to this resource in other parts of Canada, specifically in Alberta and Saskatchewan, where Alberta and Saskatchewan historically had gotten 75 per cent of these revenues.

MR. MARSHALL: We do not ask 75 per cent of these revenues for ever and a day, we ask for the same revenues until we get to a certain point and that point is made up of certain elements, the main, principal one of which is until our per capita income in Newfoundland is equal to the average per capita income in Canada. It should be a matter of knowledge in the Province that in 1949, our relative per capita income - and there is probably no economic yardstick that better measures the economic equality and the economic strength of a country or a province more so than per capita income - at Confederation our per capita income was 46 per cent of the Canadian average. Mr. Speaker, do you know what it is today? Today, Mr. Speaker, it stands at 49 per cent of the Canadian average. All we are asking is that we get 75 per cent of those revenues until our people have a per capita income equal to the national average.

Another element is our taxation. We are asking that we get this 75 per cent until our taxation is equal to the rest of Canada. We ask that we get 75 per cent of the income the same as Alberta and Saskatchewan got until our relative employment level is equal to the rest of Canada. We ask that we get this 75 per cent the same as Alberta and Saskatchewan got until our taxation is at the same level, not wiped out but at the same level as the rest of Canada, until we can provide such facilities as schools and health institutions and roads which are equal to the rest of Canada. And all of these things are measurable, Mr. Speaker, so what is wrong with that? What is wrong with us aspiring to be equal to the average of the rest of Canada? That is what the proposal envisages and anyone who is against that proposal, in effect, if he is answering the question

MR. MARSHALL: properly, is really being against the concept of Newfoundlanders becoming equal with other Canadians. We are not asking to grab it all ourselves. Now, when we come to that point, we have clearly indicated that - and this was another mammoth concession on our part - that we would come down in our sharing, we will recognize the fact that we have to, share even more than Alberta and Saskatchewan have historically shared. We never got to the stage of saying how much that was, but the federal government knows, Mr. Speaker, that it would come down and it would come down considerably. It would not disappear as it would under the Nova Scotian agreement but it would come down. So therefore, in revenue sharing, Mr. Speaker, all we are doing and all we have asked is that the young Newfoundlander have an equal opportunity with the young Canadian.

Now what is the agreement on the other side that the gentlemen there opposite are so quick to champion? The agreement on the other side, Mr. Speaker, says that we would get revenues up until - it is a little bit complex. The maximum that we could get would be up to 140 per cent of our entitlement to equalization.

MR. MARSHALL:

We may not get 140 per cent and I will not unduly complicate the description by saying how it could come down. It could come down because of our relative employment levels going up slightly, it can come down between the 110 per cent and the 140 per cent faction. But I do not want to get into that because it will complicate things. All I will say is that the maximum that we could get would be 140 per cent of our equalization. Now in effect what would that mean? It would mean, Mr. Speaker - and we have put this through computer models and we have had this analyzed, because 140 per cent of our equalization might now seem like a lot of money you have got to remember that a large part of that, almost one half of it, would be really a replacement of the monies we now get from equalization from revenues from our own resource. That is the offshore. And the amount, as I say, that we have put through computer models that we would have received would be barely enough to bring our personal income tax down to the same level as other Canadians and it would be barely enough to bring our sales tax down to the same level as the average of Canadians. Nothing with respect to per capita income, nothing with respect to the retirement of our debts, providing of hospitals and schools and roads equal to the rest of Canada. No equality, Mr. Speaker, with the rest of Canada.

Now, let there be no doubt about it when the hon. gentlemen get up there and they trumpet an agreement - and I notice the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did not deal with this agreement. He said what we should do is - he would not sign that agreement, he says, but we should use it as a basis. This is my understanding of what he said. As a matter of fact he skirted the issue completely. He did not get into the details. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, myself whether the hon. gentleman has read in depth both agreements themselves

MR. MARSHALL:

but I am certain as I stand here that if he did he certainly did not understand them. Because when the hon. gentleman gets up in this House and he says that there was a response to our agreement and that he was represented by the document tabled by Mr. Lalonde, I can state categorically and absolutely that that is not so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we ask ourselves
this -

MR. NEARY:

It was a counter proposal.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, it was not a counter proposal.

MR. NEARY:

What is it then?

MR. MARSHALL:

It was a regurgitation of the Nova Scotian agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would listen, what we did with respect to that agreement, we replied in specific details why that agreement was unacceptable to this Province. We did not take the same view the hon. gentleman there opposite did, you know, condemning everything without going into reasons. We went into specific reasons as to why that agreement was unsuitable to this Province. It is contained in the analysis, published as I say, which gives the relative impact of the Nova Scotian agreement in this Province. And we have gone back now - if you take the premise, Mr. Speaker, that I suggest the federal government do and that the hon. gentleman get their federal masters to do this, if we say amongst men and women of good will that

MR. MARSHALL: the Government of Newfoundland, the people in the Opposition, all Newfoundlanders, the Government of Canada, the people in the House of Commons and all Canadians would wish that Newfoundlanders have the right to draw equal with other Canadians, I think if we can accept that premise - and I would challenge anybody, you know; it is a motherhood statement I think the hon. gentlemen there opposite would agree that, the average young Newfoundlander should have the right to draw equal, to acquire equality with the average young Canadians - now that being so -

MR. NEARY: That is why we get \$500 million equalization.

MR. MARSHALL: That is what the hon. gentleman says, look, 'That is why we get \$500 million!' Well that kind of psychology led, Mr. Speaker, to the mess we are in. That is why the hon. gentleman was a party to signing an agreement that gave away the Upper Churchill.

MR. TULK: Hold on now! Hold on now!

MR. NEARY: What about your budget forecast of six months ago?

MR. MARSHALL: That is the same psychology that the hon. gentleman was prepared to accept from Ottawa the resettlement programme that wreaked such havoc here and he shows exactly the same propensity right now that anything that Ottawa says is right because Ottawa says it. But I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if you take the premise that the average young Newfoundlander is surely entitled to be able to look forward to drawing equal with the average young Canadian, if you accept that premise I say to you that the federal government proposal, which was put on the table was analysed in depth by this Province and we indicated in what respect -

MR. NEARY: The Premier said there was no proposal.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Make up your minds.

MR. MARSHALL: - or respects, Mr. Speaker, that proposal falls short and it falls abysmally short of that aim.

MR. MARSHALL: Now we have asked the federal government, Mr. Speaker, to give us exactly the same analysis and response to our proposal that we put on the table on January 25th. We challenge them today and we challenge the members of the Opposition and everybody, certainly the federal government, to respond to the legitimate proposal we made on January 25th and to tell the people of this Province in what respect or respects that agreement exceeds what is necessary for the people of Newfoundland to draw equal to the average of Canadians. If they are not prepared to do that, and they have not been prepared to do it, Mr. Speaker, you have to doubt the bona fides of the gentlemen in addressing themselves to that issue.

Now it is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, in this country and in this Province when the hon. gentlemen there opposite and their confreres, the five members on the Liberal side of the House in Ottawa sitting in the government benches, can put their party before their province to the extent and to the degree that they do.

MR. TULK: They are the same as you are.

MR. MARSHALL: It is a matter of fact after the recent by-elections that those five seats from Newfoundland in the Liberal caucus, voting against the federal government, could cause the federal government immense difficulty if not bring down the government itself because the balance is changed five votes on the other side against an issue on the offshore would really amount to about ten votes and probably bring down the government.

MR. MARSHALL: Those five members in Ottawa, I think, have a duty to respond in that way, but apart from that, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. gentleman there opposite, and the members of the Liberal Party generally, to tell us in what respect or respects, as I say, that particular agreement or that proposal that we put up is in excess of what is necessary in order for this Province to draw equal with the average Canadian. And if they are not prepared to do that, how in the name of heavens, Mr. Speaker, can you sit down and negotiate really in good faith with any expectation of coming up with any agreement?

Now, the hon. gentleman says that we ignored, - and he tried to give the impression that we should have negotiated on the basis of that piece of paraphrasing of the Nova Scotian agreement that was handed to us when Mr. LaLonde came down. And the answer to that needs to be stated for the record because it was quite obvious that first of all, that agreement was completely insufficient for this Province. It is the type of agreement that would have amounted to an even greater sell-out, if that were imaginable, than the sell-out on the Upper Churchill, and it is the type of agreement that this Province would never sign and this government, Mr. Speaker, will never sign, let there be no mistake about that. But instead of immediately getting on - it was patently obvious in talking to Mr. LaLonde at that time that the agreement was so deficient - but instead of getting on the air and stating that in unequivocal terms, because really what it amounted to was really an insult - I mean, they came down with the same agreement that they themselves knew was completely deficient for this Province and had

MR. MARSHALL: been rejected out of hand by the Province - instead of getting on immediately and saying that, we kept our powder dry, we went to Ottawa, the Premier met with the Prime Minister and we got the answer that 'No, it is the Nova Scotian agreement; the people of Newfoundland will have to submit to the Nova Scotian agreement or they will not get anything.' Now, that is the Prime Minister of this country.

MR. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, the hon. gentleman's impression of it can be as he likes, but I think all the people of Newfoundland and all the people of Canada know what the situation is.

MR. NEARY: They are being bluffed by the Premier.

MR. MARSHALL: There was no bluff, Mr. Speaker. It was said in the interview immediately after the meeting between the Prime Minister and the Premier that the Prime Minister had indicated they agreed to disagree because the Prime Minister will not depart from that Nova Scotian agreement.

MR. NEARY: Not true. All these items are negotiable and the hon. gentleman knows that.

MR. MARSHALL: No. If the hon. messengers for Ottawa wish to convey a message back they certainly can, and the message that they can convey is that, as far as this Province is concerned, it wishes to have and it feels that there must be an agreement that in the long run the courts will never decide this issue.

MR. MARSHALL:

The courts can only issue judgements, Mr. Speaker. Agreements and settlements are reached by people, people and groups and not imposed by the courts. But if we wish to have a settlement of this issue, as the Premier has indicated and we have all indicated, before there can be any settlement in any way to this issue at all the proposal of January 25th. has to be responded to and responded to in a responsible fashion in detail by the federal government. To date the federal government has shown no propensity, no desire to do that. Instead what they have done is they have gone into court. The hon. gentleman, you know, clouds the thing again when he gets up and he just repeats verbatim what they have told him in Ottawa indicating that we were the ones who put this in the court. It happens to be a fact that this issue was first pursued in the federal court of Canada by the federal government. And I do not propose in the limited time available before me now to go into a recitation of what happened there, but it is crystal clear that the people in Ottawa are seeking a court resolution of this and there can be no court resolution. There will never be a court resolution of this. The court can no more set down conditions with respect to a settlement of this nature than a court can set down agreements between, say, a husband and a wife - and I think that this analogy is quite proper - than it can set down terms and agreements under which they live together as it were. The courts, as I say, can only render judgements. But the settlement and agreement has to be reached and it has to be reached between the parties which is the provincial government and the federal government.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has always been prepared to talk and to talk reasonably and rationally.

MR. MARSHALL:

But you cannot talk to a blank wall. You cannot talk to a bunch of stooges, Mr. Speaker. You have got to be able to talk to somebody who is going to respond. We put a proposal in good faith on the table and that proposal has not been responded to, as I said.

The hon. gentleman gives the impression that he talked with Mr. Chretien. I have no doubt he talked to Mr. Chretien and he has talked to all the federal ministers up there in Ottawa. And I have no doubt that, you know, Mr. Chretien has made remarks one way or the other. But the fact of the matter is he knows himself, Mr. Chretien knows, the Prime Minister knows, Mr. Lalonde, all the people in Ottawa know that this government is prepared to be reasonable and rational. But before you can talk to somebody there has to be somebody that will respond and they, as I say, must respond to our proposal of January 25th.

I do not propose to get into the other items that are there, because the hon. gentleman,

MR. MARSHALL:

the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), really, I do not know who his speech writer is or whether he wrote it himself, but whatever it is he either should fire his speech writer, Mr. Speaker, or the Liberal party should look for a new interim leader. Because the address that he gave in respect of this very important matter was a ridiculous speech, it was unworthy of a political representative in this Province. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, how anyone can get on his feet in this Province on an important issue like this and play it tongue-in-cheek the way that the Leader of the Opposition obviously, the way the members there opposite obviously regard such an issue like this, it is almost like talking back to a school master in school and treating it in a puerile and a childish fashion. The issue, Mr. Speaker, is far too grave for the future of the people of this Province to be toyed with in the manner which the hon. gentlemen there opposite toyed with it. It is far too grave, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentlemen to treat it as a political matter that they must keep exactly on the same wave lengths as their political masters in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, in this particular instance if they wish to adopt the line of the federal Liberal party, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to them that they cannot at the same time be regarded as true-blooded Newfoundlanders when it comes to this matter because the stakes are too vital. And it is not just enough for the hon. gentlemen there opposite or anybody in this Province to sit back and very blandly say, 'Oh, the sides should negotiate. Oh, they

MR. MARSHALL: should get back to the negotiating table.' Oh, this or, oh, that. Most people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, from Labrador City to Torbay and from St. Anthony down the Burin Peninsula on April 6th addressed themselves in the greatest detail to this proposal and they have already spoken on it and they have spoken soundly and convincingly. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, if anybody is going to address themselves who are in a position of leadership, who are in a position of having been elected by representatives on April 6th, whether it be provincially or whether it be municipally or whether it be federally, they have at least the duty to be responsible, to address themselves to the issues responsibly, to look at our proposal - I mean, it is not all that difficult to understand - and to ask themselves in what respect or respects that particular proposal falls short of a legitimate aspiration of young Newfoundlanders to draw near to the average of the young Canadian and to come up with answers on that basis rather than just by rote to do what the hon. gentleman there opposite seemed prepared to do with Mr. Rompkey and Mr. Simmons and Mr. Tobin and Mr. Rooney and Mr. Baker in Ottawa. There comes a time when the issues are too grave, the issues involved are too grave and affect too deeply the people of a country or the people of a province, and now as never before has there ever been an issue which should grip the people of Newfoundland more and grips the people of Newfoundland more. And so much more is it the duty of

MR. WM. MARSHALL:

hon. gentleman there opposite not to continue to be toadies to Ottawa, not to continue to be little lap dogs and come back here after a visit to Ottawa and mulishly give out, like Pac Man, their chartered course of robots, but to stand up on their own two feet as Newfoundlanders and say to the federal government that the people of Newfoundland expect to be dealt with with justice and equity. And they truly believe that, Mr. Speaker, and if they have enough between their two ears to understand what is in that proposal, there is no other conclusion that they can come to than to make a demand - a public demand, a private demand - and a plea to Ottawa to respond to that proposal, to address themselves to that proposal and to use that proposal as an acceptable basis for the settlement of this resolution which must come and will never be imposed by any court no matter where it is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, we just heard from the most separatist, the most anti-Confederate person living in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Yes, Sir, for the last fifteen or twenty minutes we heard the most anti-Confederate person in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution; to begin with I am surprised that once the Speaker heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) giving one of his famous speeches, one of his best speeches today in the

MR. G. WARREN:

House of Assembly when he advised the hon. House that neither the Minister of Energy (Mr. Wm. Marshall) nor the Premier had the intestinal fortitude to tell the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that there was a counter proposal from the federal government.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) had to tell a lot of the ministers, a lot of the members on that side, that there was a counter proposal from the federal government.

The last sentence in this resolution reads, 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House request the Federal Government to answer the Government of Newfoundland's compromise proposal.' Now, Mr. Speaker, it was answered. It was answered. The Leader of the Opposition just told the House when he spoke that it was answered. Now, if you want to debate a resolution, surely goodness the Premier, above anyone else should have the common decency to say that he was not satisfied with the federal counter proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

This resolution does not tell the truth, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied to debate the resolution, but if the resolution does not tell the truth how can you debate it, Mr. Speaker? Therefore it is the same thing with all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians; the Premier has been caught so many times, particularly in the last three or four months, not telling all the basic facts, Mr. Speaker, that finally the people are beginning to realize that they are not going to believe him any more. He is just a colossal bluff.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the true story really came out on what happened in the negotiations that broke off between the Premier and the Prime Minister. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the Premier went into the meeting with the Prime Minister, as there are indications, that the Premier went into a meeting with the Prime Minister and he picked up his proposal and then he said, 'Mr. Prime Minister, my proposal or nothing.'

MR. NEARY:

That is the Tory way.

MR. WARREN:

That was the Tory way. My proposal or nothing.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. WARREN:

So that is what happened. And the Prime Minister said, 'No, Sir, we are going to negotiate that.' And the Premier upped with his bag and took off out of the room.

MR. NEARY: Let me tell you this, that the revenue sharing and management of the resource are negotiable. They can be negotiated, they are negotiable items.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has so much to tell us about the proposals that even the Premier in his resolution could not give us the facts. If the Premier said in his resolution, Mr. Speaker - this is my problem, Mr. Speaker - if he said request the federal government to give another counter proposal - another! But he did not, he was not even talking about the first one.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, now I know, and everyone else in this House knows after what the Leader of the Opposition said today. I did not know until today, neither did the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn), neither did the member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), neither did the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) know that the Premier and his cronies, are they? -

MR. NEARY: His minions.

MR. WARREN: The Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), not two other people in this House besides the Minister of Energy and the Premier knew about the counter proposal from the federal government.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, is that not ridiculous?

And here

MR. WARREN: the Premier comes on and says, 'Okay, boys, let us play some more politics. Let us play some more politics with the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.' With our economy in such a state, with the welfare recipients being cut off, with the teachers practically ready to go on strike, with people in the Department of Transportation being told to work more hours and get less pay, with all this happening the Premier says, 'Let us play a political game with Mr. Trudeau again'.

So, Mr. Speaker, you can see, even today, Mr. Speaker, the Premier is condemning the statements of the Prime Minister as helping to destroy a climate necessary for political settlement. How naive and childish can the Premier of the tenth Province of Canada be! How naive and childish, Mr. Speaker! It was this Premier since 1979, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador (Mr. Peckford) who has been helping to destroy the climate necessary for political settlement. So, Mr. Speaker, it has been the Premier who has in his statements since 1979 been causing this political upset in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden he blames it on Pierre Elliot Trudeau.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder is it that the Premier with this resolution is so obsessed and childish and too taken up with oil? Someone the other day, used the word that the Premier had 'Oilmilitis'. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Premier is too concerned with oil. He said, I would think, to all his Cabinet ministers and maybe to his backbenchers, 'Listen, the economy is in bad shape now and the Opposition is going to be drilling us on questions about the economy', so he said, 'Okay, ministers, I think I will bring in a couple of resolutions now'. He brought this one in today and now tomorrow he has the one on the seal fishery which is very, very important.

MR. WARREN: In fact, the seal fishery made up 40 per cent of the income of my constituents. So it looks like the Premier is so upset that he has to tackle Mr. Trudeau and try to find some reason to say to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, 'Look, boy, I am trying to fight for you.' But just a word of caution to the Premier; he fooled them on April 6, he cannot fool them any more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. the Premier speaks now he closes the debate.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) has answered most of the comments coming from the other side. I will just say to the last member who just spoke that what we are trying to do, and the whole reason for one part of this resolution, is to indicate that we should try to keep a climate in place within this Confederation that would make possible any movement back to the table, and that statements like the Prime Minister made, which indicate if you do not like what I am doing, get out of Confederation, are not conducive not only to negotiations on the offshore - that was the effect of what the Prime Minister said - but are not conducive to a good country. The same way when he talked about 'co-operative federalism is dead'. Who said that? Tell me now the Prime Minister never said that, 'Co-operative federalism is dead'. And now, of course, he has had to backtrack. He is backtracking on FIRA, he is backtracking on the National Energy Programme. He said it before the economic summit of all the Premiers.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's statements, the Prime Minister's movements, the Prime Minister's statements in the House of Commons over the years, some of his uncomplimentary comments to Canadians on what they had to do, all demonstrate that from time to time the Prime Minister of this country has alienated the West, he has alienated everybody from Winnipeg over to Vancouver

PREMIER PECKFORD: Island, and now, on the weekend, he was trying to alienate Newfoundlanders. But as I said in my opening remarks, the Prime Minister will not succeed in trying to paint us as being somehow less Canadian than he is. We will ensure that we win out on our proposal and that what the Prime Minister is saying now - he was wrong many times before, and he was never so wrong as he is now, because he misjudges Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and he will live, I hope, to see the day when somebody else will be there, Mr. Turner, Mr. Clark, somebody will be there who will reasonably respond to our proposals so that we can get on with building Canada like everybody wants to see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):
question?

Is the House ready for the

All those in favour 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The 'ayes' have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division. Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are hon. members ready for the vote?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the motion please rise.

The hon. the Premier; the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie); the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms Verge); the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer); the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall); Dr. McNicholas; Mr. Aylward; Mr. Stewart; the hon. the Minister responsible for Communications (Mr. Doyle) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

- the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook); the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews); the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House); Mr. Carter; Mr. McLennon; Mr. Baird; Mr. Peach; Mr. Tobin; Mr. Cross; Mrs. Reid; Dr. Twomey; Mr. Rideout; Mr. Patterson; Mr. Matthews; Mr. Stagg; Mr. Hearn; Mr. Osmond.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion, please rise.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition; Mr. Callan; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Tulk; Mr. Lush.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

the Council.

The hon. the President of

MR. MARSHALL:

the House on its rising adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday,
at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, I move that

On motion, the House at its
rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 10,
1982, at 3:00 p.m.