

VOL. 2

NO. 17

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
MONDAY, APRIL 11, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, when this Province acquired the controlling interest in the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation there was representation from Hydro Quebec on its board of directors. After obtaining control of the company in 1975, the Province replaced the BRINCO directors with its own nominees but continued the practice of allowing representation from Hydro Quebec on the board. Hydro Quebec never was in a position, as a minority shareholder, to claim seats as a matter of right in the boardroom of CFLCo. BRINCO presumably thought it in its best interests to have representatives of the purchaser of substantially all of the corporation's output on CFLCo when it agreed to Quebec representation first in 1969.

After 1975, after the BRINCO takeover, this Province, as majority shareholder, continued this practice in the hope that the resultant contact and interrelationships between Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's nominees and those of Hydro Quebec might serve to assist resolution of issues between their respective governments brought about primarily because of the unjust and inequitable contract for the sale of Upper Churchill power.

Most unfortunately, this hope proved in vain. This act of good will on the part of this Province in continuing Hydro Quebec's representation was

MR. MARSHALL: ignored. Quebec continued to disregard our legitimate and reasonable request to address in a substantial manner readjustment of what is generally regarded as the infamous Upper Churchill contract so that the people of Labrador and Newfoundland who own the resource might derive a reasonable return from it in relation to current and future circumstances.

The last meeting that occurred between the governments was one between the hon. Yves Duhaime, the Minister of Energy and Resources for Quebec and myself. As has already been reported, this meeting proved merely to be another fruitless exercise in the long series of efforts on our part to have the Upper Churchill situation addressed in a meaningful manner.

MR. MARSHALL: On my return I wrote Mr. Duhaime expressing disappointment and stating that this Province's position was that a resolution of the Hydro impasse between our Provinces required Quebec addressing in a substantial manner renegotiation of the Upper Churchill contract. At the same time Mr. Duhaime was advised this Province was willing to negotiate if Quebec was prepared to address the issues in a meaningful manner such as described in my letter. Sometime later he responded merely saying my letter raised interesting issues and perhaps we could discuss them sometime. While these letters were released before, they are appended to this statement to refresh the memories of members.

I might just say Mr. Duhaime's response to my letter was brought to the attention of members it was very brief, it was a letter of November 18th written in response to one of October 27th, 1981, to him was not received in my office until December 11th, 1981, so it was on his desk three weeks before it was mailed, and it merely said "I acknowledge receipt of your recent letter in response to our meeting in Halifax, and I thank you. I have read it with interest and great attention but would prefer reserving comment at this moment. We look forward to having the opportunity of further discussing the matter at a mutually agreeable date." The mutually agreeable has not arrived Mr. Speaker, because that is the situation as it presently exists, and we still await an official written indication that Quebec is prepared to address the matter seriously.

Shortly after assuming responsibility for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro in

MR. MARSHALL: September of 1981, and after reviewing its affairs, I questioned the purpose of a continued Hydro-Quebec presence on the CFLCO Board. Following Mr. Duhaime's response, that letter that I referred to Mr. Speaker, which at best can only be regarded as a coarse indication of Quebec's intent not to address this urgent issue in any serious manner but to continue to rely upon its perceived contractual rights extracted from its superior position in the Canadian Confederation -

MR. W. MARSHALL: I again requested the reason for maintaining this representation.

It certainly appeared very difficult, to me, to justify, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand we would be sanctioning representation on CFLCO of those consistently intent upon inflicting an oppressive contract upon the owners of the resource from which this corporation derives its very being. On the other hand, the continued insistence upon the application of that contract threatens the solvency of the corporation. It certainly does not appear in the interests of anyone but Quebec to maintain Hydro-Quebec's presence on the CFLCO Board, it did not last year either.

But in response to this questioning as to why they should remain on the Board, the response to this question was that the Quebec membership on the Board was that new personnel were to be proposed by Hydro-Quebec to serve on the Board, which in fact happened last year. Notwithstanding the intransigent position of Quebec as recently reaffirmed in Mr. Duhaime's letter, it was decided to permit once again the election of two Quebec nominees in the hope that the new representatives of Quebec might have been sent to the CFLCO Board to play a meaningful role in establishing the long sought after meaningful dialogue with the government in Quebec City. Unfortunately once again, Mr. Speaker, this action proved to be in vain and it was found as the 1983 annual meeting approached that the membership on the Board of Messrs. Guy Coulimbe and Hoseph Bourbeau turned out to be as absolutely irrelevant to the overall situation as the membership of their predecessors had been.

I mention all of these facts to demonstrate just how far this Province has gone in its efforts to achieve a negotiated settlement which will realize

MR. W. MARSHALL: a reasonable return to the Upper Churchill resource by its owners. It seems we always have to go the extra mile and indeed we have always been prepared to do so.

To date, all our efforts to resolve the situation through conciliatory acts and negotiation have met a stone wall. This reaction is evidenced when Quebec challenged our rightful request to recall necessary power in accordance with the contractual terms. It then forced us into the lengthy recall case and consciously employed every conceivable means to preclude an early resolution. This in turn resulted in enactment of the Reversion Act, by this Assembly, the constitutionality of which is being determined by the Supreme Court of Canada. The intransigent and indifferent attitude of Quebec has forced us to take, Mr. Speaker, yet another step, that is to replace nominees of Hydro-Quebec with residents of this province on the Board of CFLCO.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, acting on instructions of the beneficial owners of the majority of shares in CFLCO, that is the Government of Newfoundland, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro cast its votes at CFLCO's Annual Meeting and were directed to cast its votes to elect two Newfoundlanders to the positions previously held by nominees of Hydro-Quebec on the Board of CFLCO. Accordingly, at the Annual Meeting of CFLCO held in St. John's on Tuesday last, April 5th, Mr. Fred Goudie and Mr. Michael Monaghan, Q.C. were elected to the Board and now fill positions held last year by Messrs. Coulombe and Bourbeau.

Mr. Goudie resides at Springdale and is well known and highly respected businessman in that town. Mr. Monaghan is the senior partner in the law firm of Monaghan, Seaborn, Marshall & Roberts located in Corner Brook where he resides. These gentlemen will bring their valuable experience and talents to the Board and will join the continuing directors, Messrs. Victor L. Young, James J. Greene, Q.C., David W. Mercer, Q.C., and Brian C. McGrath.

This action results in CFLCO, the control of which was purchased at great cost to Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, having a board comprised entirely for the first time of residents of this Province. The selection of Mr. Monaghan and Mr. Goudie will assure more comprehensive geographical representation on the composite boards of CFLCO and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. Since these corporations are associated with issues vital to the entire Province, Government feels fuller Province-wide representation to be beneficial and these appointments allow this aim to be more completely realized.

MR. MARSHALL: Let me repeat once again, Mr. Speaker, in this and other issues affecting our relationships in the Canadian Confederation, this Government earnestly desires negotiated settlements above all else. These settlements must, however, be good ones. They cannot be cosmetic in nature or resolutions at any price. They must be reasonable and give to the people who own the resource a fair chance to ascend the ladder of Confederation.

On the other hand, settlement cannot be attained unless the other side is prepared to show its sincere commitment to negotiate on a substantive basis. The open invitation to Mr. Duhaime to respond in this manner and his letter of reply to me shows Quebec not to be ready to deal with the issue in a serious manner. This leads us no alternative but to take the actions we have employed such as the Recall case, the Reversion Act and now the replacement of Hydro-Quebec nominees on CFLCO.

Let there be no doubt as to the seriousness of our intent to gain justice and equity from the Upper Churchill. If Quebec remains committed to following policies which will eventually bankrupt CFLCO., the presence on the Board of its nominees can hardly serve the interests of the Corporation. If it is bent upon delaying a reasonable resolution of the Upper Churchill issue, it is difficult to see how their

MR. MARSHALL:

association with people who are integrally involved with government and committed to a just resolution of the Upper Churchill contract is going to serve anyone other than the Province of Quebec.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I draw attention of hon. members to the irony of the fact that resolution of two of the major issues affecting this Province today are being stymied merely because those with whom we negotiate refuse to demonstrate the sincerity of their intent in writing. Faced with this we just cannot allow the legitimate aspirations and expectations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to be toyed with and are forced to measures which we have taken.

In the meantime, both the federal government and the Government of Quebec are just going to have to understand that we will not be dealt with on an unequal basis because of our geographical position or our small population and representation. We merely want the opportunity for our people to be able to see the resources which they brought with them into Confederation to be used so they can achieve equality with the average Canadian and thereafter share more fully with our fellow Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

We seek, Mr. Speaker, equality as a Province and will not settle for colonial status within Confederation.

This is our aim in these negotiations and in this administration. We shall continue to advance it calmly and coolly and with as much vim and vigour as the occasion demands. Mr. Speaker, the day this administration ceases to do this it will have lost its life and its very being.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the statement and appended to the statement for those who are interested are the two outstanding letters with respect to this issue which show conclusively the fact that the Province of Quebec has not shown any serious intent to negotiate otherwise they would have responded to the letter. And I say to the hon. gentlemen to your right too, Mr. Speaker, that the same conclusion pertains to the federal government in the offshore issue. If people are serious in their intent to deal fairly with us and they have a sincere intent to come up with a reasonable, rational solution to problems why will they not put in writing what their understandings are. How can you deal with people, Mr. Speaker, who are afraid to put in writing their understandings and to put down what they deem to be reasonable. This government has done it again and again and the letters that are appended to this statement is an indication of the type of way in which government has dealt with other concerns in the past, will continue in the future. We are not afraid to put our positions in writing and we ask from those which we deal with, no less from them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that the administration practice what it preaches and that they follow the same procedure as far as the teachers of this Province are concerned. What the teachers want are things they have taken for granted for years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Touchy, touchy.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: I realize we hit a tender spot when we talk about standing up for the interests of the Province of Newfoundland and that the hon. gentleman would try to slinge and veer away from the issue. But the point of this statement is the removal of Hydro Quebec nominees from the CFLCO board and the hon. gentleman is getting in obviously into the general realm of debate. If he has nothing to add to the situation perhaps he can exercise his rights and say nothing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) rose on a point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was recognized in response to the Ministerial Statement and in the few words he had had an opportunity to say there was not much relevance to the Ministerial Statement and maybe he will be relevant to the statement.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the principle that the hon. gentleman just outlined of putting things in writing I would submit to the hon. gentleman that the administration practice what it preaches in connection with negotiations with other groups both inside and outside of this Province.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour called the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to order. It is my understanding that what the hon. gentleman is now talking about is negotiating with other groups. There is a statement that has been made here about the replacement of Quebec Hydro nominees on the Board of CFLCo. The hon. gentleman must address himself to the statement that has been given and not be allowed to hide behind other issues that he wishes to bring up in order to avoid commenting directly on a matter of importance to this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to confine his remarks to the content of the Ministerial Statement.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very wide ranging statement. When you clear away the political rhetoric that was read by the hon. gentleman you will discover that all that is happening here is that the government are insisting on their right to appoint two Newfoundlanders to the Churchill Falls Corporation rather than have two nominees from the Province of Quebec on the Churchill Falls Corporation. The rest of it, Mr. Speaker, is just a rehash of things that we have been hearing both

MR. NEARY: inside and outside of this House
for the past number of years. It is obvious from this
statement, Mr. Speaker, that the government are hurting,
they are smarting, under the tremendous pressure in the
Province for the government to do something. And this
is another camouflage another red herring because,
Mr. Speaker, it will come as a surprise to the people of
this Province to learn

MR. NEARY: that even though the government made a decision back in 1973 or '74 I think it was, to nationalize the Churchill Falls Corporation, to kick out BRINCO which was a good corporate citizen in this Province, that it will come as a surprise for people to learn that the government did not insist at that time that the Board of Directors of the Churchill Falls Corporation be made up of Newfoundlanders, even though we had the controlling interest in the Churchill Falls Corporation. It certainly comes as a surprise I would think to many members of this House, as well as to the people of this Province.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the government are desperate for another offshore controversy. They have dragged this in today as a red herring. The minister did not tell us anything new. He did not tell us for instance about the proposal that is on the table to develop the Lower Churchill, the Muskrat Falls and the five rivers with their headwaters in Newfoundland that flow into Quebec, Labrador. He did not tell us about the package deal involving the re-opening of the Upper Churchill Falls contract. He did not refer at all to the corridor across the Province of Quebec. This was supposed to be the saviour of the Lower Churchill Falls project. And, Mr. Speaker, we were told for the last few years, and the people of this Province were led to believe that once the Parliament of Canada granted Newfoundland the power corridor across Quebec that our problems were over. And now we learn after the act was proclaimed, and Newfoundland was given a power corridor across the Province of Quebec that now they had to sell the power, they had to get a buyer for the power before they could take advantage of the legislation that was passed in the Parliament of Canada.

April 11, 1983

Tape No. 817

NM - 2

MR. NEARY:

They were not ready, Mr. Speaker. They were not ready. They told us they had it but they did not have it. And all this will do is just add more fuel to the fire, Mr. Speaker. There is no genuine attempt made on the part of the administration to sit down, man fashion, face to face, and negotiate a package deal with the Province of Quebec. This will do nothing. It will

MR. NEARY:

accomplish nothing, only just add more fuel to the fire, Mr. Speaker, and I will have more to say about this when I get an opportunity to study this document. It was only passed to me two or three minutes before the minister read the statement in the House. It will accomplish nothing, as far as I can see, except widen the rift between this Province and the Province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, in order to resolve the problem of the Upper Churchill, the Lower Churchill, the Muskrat Falls and the five rivers that have tremendous hydro potential in Labrador, there must be mutual trust, there must be good will, there must be bargaining in good faith, and there is certainly no indication in this document that any of these ingredients are present, Mr. Speaker. All they are trying to do is just promote another controversy to take the place of the offshore to try to distract and divert attention from the real problems that are facing the people of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other Ministerial Statements?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, today a consensus document on Established Programme Financing or EPF funding is being released in Toronto on behalf of all provincial Finance Ministers and Treasurers. The document informs Canadians of the potential serious impact on the quality of health and post-secondary education services resulting from the federal government's unilateral actions to change the EPF arrangements. The measures currently proposed by the federal government in combination with major federal funding restraints implemented in April, 1982 will result in Newfoundland losing over \$145 million of funding for these

PREMIER PECKFORD: programme areas by 1986-87. Last year the federal government eliminated the revenue guarantee component of the EPF arrangements resulting in the loss of \$20 million in 1982-83 for this Province. The loss of revenue for the five year period up to 1986-87 will be about \$125 million. As a result of this change, the federal contribution to health and post-secondary education programmes dropped from 37 per cent in 1979-80 to less than 30 per cent, just a little bit less than 30 per cent in 1982-83, decreasing federal support to health and post-secondary education is part of a nation wide trend. The federal government is now proposing to segregate EPF funding into health and post-secondary education components on a two thirds/one third basis. The post-secondary education component is to be placed under the new federal restraint guidelines which could result in the loss of approximately \$20 million to this Province over the next four years. As in other provinces, health expenditures represent about 80 per cent of the total cost of providing post-secondary education and health services. In effect, the federal restraint measures would have a spill-over effect on provincial health care funding, contrary to the federal claim that health programmes would not be effected.

We also anticipate that the federal government will soon attempt to introduce new standards and conditions for health and post-secondary education programme funding. These changes could lead to further reductions in the federal financial commitment to health and post-secondary education, thereby increasing provincial programme delivery costs. They could also restrict the province's ability to generate revenues directly for the delivery of health and post-secondary education services. To counter the negative affects upon post-

PREMIER PECKFORD: secondary education and health care services of this unilateral federal actions provinces will have to consider either increasing taxes, increasing the size of the provincial deficits, or choosing some combination of these measures. Neither of these options is desirable, especially during these difficult economic times.

On behalf of our Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) and his colleagues from across the country I strongly object to this latest attempt by the federal government to transfer its deficit to the provinces, and I fully support in the name of the government of the province, the consensus document which I am distributing in the House today.

This is a document, Mr. Speaker, which represents a consensus that has been forged by all the finance ministers and treasurers of the provinces of Canada. It is not Newfoundland saying this, it is not

PREMIER PECKFORD:

British Columbia or Alberta saying this, it is every single Province of Canada, through their ministries of treasury or finance, who have assessed the situation, see the absolutely negative impact that this restriction, and withdrawal of funds by the federal government, is going to have on health and post-secondary education. And we see the results of that already in most of the provinces where the treasurers, through their budgets, have had to cut back on post-secondary education, and on health care. So I table a copy of my statement, Mr. Speaker, with the accompanying documentation and just let me highlight once again that over the next four or five years this Province will lose \$145 million that it dearly needs to maintain existing levels of services in post-secondary education, and health care services.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, certainly nobody appreciates cuts in any area of public service, but of course this document is a difficult one to reply to. Mr. Speaker, one becomes suspicious when one realizes the persons who prepared this document, the provincial Ministers of Finance, all of which belong to governments whose determination is to undermine and flog the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: They just have one ambition, Mr. Speaker, each of these provincial ministers have one ambition and that is to flog, destroy and undermine the federal government for their own political purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I stood here and listened to the Premier make the statement and never said a word. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be afforded the same courtesy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

And, Mr. Speaker, one would have thought that in these times of restraints, in these times of restraints each of these provincial ministers would have come out man fashion, as they do federally, and try to get our people to understand the kinds of sacrifices that we have to make during these times of restraints. That is what the Province has been going on with, Mr. Speaker. That is what they have been going on with.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the EPF arrangement is rather difficult to speak to, we just got the document a few minutes ago, but my understanding, Mr. Speaker, of the EPF arrangements is that the finances are going up. The Premier gives us the impression that we are going to lose \$145 million. Certainly we will lose \$145 million according to the old arrangement, but in 1982, Mr. Speaker, in joint meetings with the federal government and the provinces, they came up with a new arrangement, and this year this Province will receive more money for health and education than they did last year, and the next year they will receive more, but the Premier, of course, is using this, Mr. Speaker, to distort the facts and to try and exonerate this government from its own failure. The point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we will be receiving more money in this year and in every year until 1986, but the impression given here is to show that we will lose \$145 million. Mr. Speaker, I could use the same analogy: If all members thought that they were going to get a 10 per cent increase in their salary over the next five years and on that basis said we will earn x number of dollars but over those five years did not get the 10 per cent but only got 5 per cent, then they could go out telling people they lost the difference. That is the analogy, Mr. Speaker. The essence of it, Mr. Speaker, is that we will be receiving more monies.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

The time for the response of

the hon. member has expired.

MR. T. LUSH:

By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Leave is not granted.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I saw the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) in his seat earlier but he is not there now since I cannot direct a question to him I will direct it to the Premier instead because, after all, it is a one man show on the other side anyway, Mr. Speaker. Here is the Minister now, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if the tenders for the extension to Confederation Building are all in and what the situation is regarding the awarding of the contract for the extension to Confederation Building? I ask that, Mr. Speaker, even though I am against any extension to Confederation Building and building a new House of Assembly and new offices to expand the public service because there are greater priorities in this Province than putting an extension on Confederation Building. But if they insist on going ahead with it, what is the situation now regarding the contract for the extension?

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is against everything this government does except spend more money in the Opposition Leader's office.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: I would like for the hon.

member to advise his colleagues over there -

MR. NEARY: Answer the question.

MR. YOUNG: I am getting around to it.

This is a preamble I am putting to the answer.

If they would only just take the restraints in his office that this government has been taking.

Now, Sir, getting back to the hon. member's question. Public tenders were called, Sir, and closed one day last week. Eight tenders were received and once the officials of my department recommend which tender, the contract will be awarded.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: First of all, let me say that since I became Leader of the Opposition, I am not allowed to use the Conference Room on the 11th Floor, our office grant has been cut -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they cut off our access to the -

MR. YOUNG: What about your phone bill?

MR. NEARY: Yes, what about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: What about it? Does the hon. gentleman want to talk about his and mine, or what?

MR. YOUNG: I will talk about it if you will have a debate.

MR. NEARY: Okay, fine.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I will be glad to talk to the hon. gentleman about it. But, Mr. Speaker, if they want to talk about phone bills, let us get it on the table and we will talk about them.

They have denied me access to the transportation pool. The hon. gentleman has done everything possible to try to restrict and retard the activities of the Opposition Office, at least since I took over. But that does not bother me, Mr. Speaker. We will still manage to carry on. But let me ask the hon. gentleman - the hon. gentleman said -

MR. BARRETT: I heard somebody else is going after your job.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRETT: I heard somebody else is going after your job. Is that true?

MR. TOBIN: Any truth to that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not dealing with rabbit's tracks now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Eight tenders have been received. Can the hon. gentleman tell us, in order, is it a Newfoundland company that is the lowest bidder, is it a mainland company or is it a number of mainland companies who are the lowest bidders? And if so, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if the government is considering awarding the contract to a Newfoundland company in light of the depressed economy, and the number of Newfoundland subcontractors who would be involved,

MR. NEARY: the supplying of materials and so forth? Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House some answers to these questions about the order in which the tenders were received? Are they mainland companies or Newfoundland companies? Just how did the situation work out when tenders came in?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Well, Mr. Speaker, there again, if the hon. member had sent his executive assistant or whatever he has - a couple of his fellows over there - down to the public tendering opening, he could have heard it all. Now, I do not know in what order they have been received. I would presume, Sir, they were received in the order in which the mailman delivered them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the tenders range from something over \$20 million up to \$24 million, but I would also inform the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that this government has a local preference policy and no stone will be left unturned, Sir, and no piece of material will be used unless it is right off this old rock of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman is not very familiar with the tenders, I would take it, from his answer.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is all public, boy. It is all public. You could have had all this stuff.

MR. NEARY: Well, I get the information here in the House by asking questions of the ministers and of the hon. gentleman. We do not have access to these things, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You have representatives at my press conferences. Can you not send them along to public tender openings?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the hon. gentleman. This is a very serious matter because our understanding is, Mr. Speaker, that four Mainland companies bid lower than the Newfoundland companies.

MR. BAIRD: Which of those four would you prefer?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me go on record as saying that we on this side of the House favour the Newfoundland companies. What I want to find out from the hon. gentleman is what kind of legal implications are involved now in jumping over these four Mainland companies, who are low bidders, and getting back to the Newfoundland companies and awarding the contract to a Newfoundland company so that they could use Newfoundland labour and material and use Newfoundland subcontractors? Is it legally possible to do that?

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question. I understand there are two Newfoundland firms - his understanding is not clear on it - and six Mainland firms. But once my department and the Department of Development apply the local preference policy and so on and it is all worked out, we will be awarding the tender then to the lowest bidder when the local preference policy is applied.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.
Would the hon. gentleman inform the House when he thinks he will be in a position to award the contract on the extension to Confederation Building, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the largest tenders ever called for by Public Works or the Government of Newfoundland, and probably it will take anywhere from two to three weeks before it is all finalized.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: Are you a substitute teacher?

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am a substitute teacher and proud to be one. I am proud to be a teacher, but I have not earned a cent, though, in about three years as a substitute teacher, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. I want the

April 11, 1983

Tape No. 823

PK-3

MR. LUSH:

minister to tell the House

what she has done up to this point in time, up to this very minute, to assist the Province's teachers in getting their contract dispute with the Provincial Government resolved,

MR. LUSH: what she has done to try to avert the impending crisis in education, the complete shutdown of our schools, which appears to be inevitable unless the minister can move more quickly and with more sympathy and with more understanding than seems to have been the case in the past few months.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have worked long with the other members of this government in planning for the provision of schooling over the next year and in budgeting for the spending on teachers' salaries of about \$260 million plus, which is \$25 million more than we are spending this year, and that is providing for 480 more teaching jobs in September than there are right now. That is what I have helped do for education in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not at all allude to the question that I asked. She talks about more teachers coming in next year, which was what we had to do if we were going to have Grade XII. The question was what she has done up to this point in time, up to this very moment, to try to avert this crisis from taking place in education tomorrow, what she has done to try and bring both sides together, the NTA and Treasury Board? Has she done anything in the last few hours to try and bring both sides together so that we can avoid having this critical situation develop tomorrow, where we are going to have a complete shutdown of our educational system at this most critical point in time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I and officials of my department have been working with Treasury Board and with the Federation of School Boards in preparing for tomorrow, in assessing the situation in each of the schools in the Province. The school boards, the local and regional school boards, of course, directly employ teachers and directly operate schools and it is they who have the moral and legal responsibility of determining whether or not the safety of their students will be protected and ensured. And in cases where school boards feel that safety will not be protected because of the threatened withdrawal of supervisory services on the part of their teachers, then school boards are taking action to close their schools.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this government I have an important responsibility to students and their families for

MS. VERGE: ensuring their education. I also have an important responsibility as a member of the Peckford team to ensure that the same people get adequate health care, get adequate social services, have decent roads to drive over. And, Mr. Speaker, the government has a fixed amount of money which can be likened to a pie and there has been a slice of that pie earmarked for teachers' salaries next year. The dollar sign is \$260 million. Is the member opposite suggesting that we make that slice larger by taking away from hospital expenditure or road upgrading or social services? Is that what the member opposite is inferring?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, again the minister is averting the question, avoiding the question. To my understanding there is no talk about salaries at all in these disputes with teachers, no talk at all about salaries. The question, Mr. Speaker, is, simply, we are led to believe that both sides are willing to negotiate, if we can believe what we are hearing, that both sides are willing to sit down and negotiate rather than have this situation, this complete closedown of our educational system at this most critical time, at the homestretch, so to speak, before schools' closing. So has the minister done anything to try and bring both sides together in the past twenty-four hours? Has she made any approaches to either of these sides, or both sides, to bring them together so that we can avoid this situation from developing at this most critical time in our educational system, when we are now in the homestretch towards final exams and this sort of thing, a most critical time? Has the minister done anything? Has she made any moves?

MR. LUSH: Has she contacted the NTA? Has she contacted her own colleagues and tried to get both sides together?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, it seems hard to believe that the member opposite, who is the Opposition's Education critic, does not realize that the issues that are outstanding between the NTA executive and their employers cost a lot of money. They have to do with salaries, they have to do with no formal acceptance of government's wage restraint programme for twenty-four months, something that 10,000 other public servants have accepted, it has to do with pay for substitute teachers.

Mr. Speaker, the employer negotiating team is ready and willing to meet at the request of the NTA when they come to accept some of the financial realities facing this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering, with the situation with respect to supervision tomorrow, if the teachers should withdraw their services,

MR. LUSH: I am just wondering, so that all Newfoundland can know what is the situation with respect to providing supervisory responsibilities is the government in favour of bringing in other people, parents, for example? Has that been considered? Is the minister doing anything in this respect? Is this going to be permissible tomorrow? If parents want to come in and do the supervisory tasks that teachers have normally performed, are parents permitted to come in and perform these tasks?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this government is in favour of teachers doing their jobs properly and fully, including protecting the safety of children. Mr. Speaker, the member opposite may need to be reminded that all teachers and principals are members of a union, and the union executive, the NTA executive, have called on all of them, the principals and all the teachers, to have nothing to do with supervising children when they are getting off buses, when they are filing into schools before classes start. These people are directed to stand around with their arms folded watching the kids mingle around, no discipline threatened, no authority figure on the part of the paid teachers. Further, the NTA executive is directing their teachers not to have anything to do with kids when they are out at recess time, lunch time when they are in the cafeteria, or when they are milling around the laboratories where there are dangerous chemicals, when they are milling around the industrial art shops with dangerous woodworking equipment, and when they get out of classes at the end of the afternoon and have to get back on buses. The direction from the NTA executive to the principals and the teachers is to ignore

MS. VERGE: the students apart from regular classroom instructional time. Their people are suppose to show up five minutes before classes start and pack it in five minutes after they are finished in the afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, school boards, who are directly responsible for the operation of schools, have no choice in that type of situation, if they cannot make any other arrangement by bringing in people from outside, but to close the schools. It is obvious that if they are to do otherwise the safety of children will be seriously impaired.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is a well-known fact that if the teachers of this Province are forced out of their classrooms, if they are locked out, a position which they do not want to get themselves into, Mr. Speaker-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: If teachers are locked out, if they are out for any length of time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, if I were in a government where teacher relations were so bad I would be jumpy too, I would be a little bit jumpy too.

MR. LUSH: It is understandable, Mr. Speaker, why they are a little bit jumpy and a little bit testy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: They know the feelings of the teachers, Mr. Speaker, that is why they are so testy and jumpy. The question, Mr. Speaker, is as all hon. members know that if the teachers are locked out for any length of time, of course, this is going to save the government a lot of money. As a matter of fact, I think if they are out for a month this will possibly amount to a \$20 million saving for the government and help them balance their budget. Is this why the government is being so arrogant? Is this why the minister has not taken any steps to try and resolve this situation?

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this government has budgeted for the payment of full salary, averaging \$28,000 each, to the 8,000 teachers in our Province. That money is budgeted for, and were it not for unilateral action on the part of the NTA executive, preventing, telling their members not to carry out the full duties for which they are contracted, that money would be forthcoming. I am disappointed that a member of this hon. House, who happens to be a member of the teaching profession, would even infer that this government is trying to save any money on the backs of the students of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the minister.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague was trying to pry some information from the minister regarding her involvement in the dispute to date. Now the hon. gentleman did not ask the minister about preparations for tomorrow, did not ask the minister about the salaries of teachers or anything, my colleague put a straight question to the minister. She can sweet and smooth talk all she wants, but my colleague asked the minister, and I am going to ask the minister myself what involvement did the minister have, what did the minister do, what steps has the minister taken to try to avert the crisis that will take place in education in this Province tomorrow? Will the minister tell us what the

MR. NEARY:

minister has done to try to avert - not plans for tomorrow, not teachers' salaries, not the cost of education - what did the minister do to try to avert the crisis that is about to take place?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have worked with the full government of this Province with my colleague the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins), with the Premier of the Province as part of a team developing a fair and reasonable package for the new collective agreement between government and the Federation of School Boards and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. In my role as Minister of Education I was part of the collective decision-making to provide for 480 more full-time teaching positions in this Province next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: We still have not gotten a straight answer. I will ask the minister what advice she gave as Minister of Education to Treasury Board with regard to tomorrow's crisis in education in this Province? What advice has the hon. minister given Treasury Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, I have been part of the collective effort that has been exerted over a period of weeks and months to develop a fair and reasonable package for presentation to the NTA bargaining committee. I have also been part of the decision-making process that led to budgeting for health care, for social services, and for roads. I think that this government has done an admirable job in difficult economic times of keeping everything in perspective and allotting correct proportions to all the essential services for our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, some time ago the NTA indicated that they were willing -

MR. TULK: They have a cheerleader over there.

MR. NEARY: Well, they have it well orchestrated today. They have to prop up the morale of the troops.

PREMIER PECKFORD: When you win forty-four seats, boy, you have to organize something.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier has put the word out, "Now, boys, pound your desks as hard as you can today, keep up the morale, show the press and show the gallery that we are all united behind the Minister of Education."

MR. TOBIN: At least teachers got the right to collective bargaining now. They did not have it when you were in government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Is that not wonderful, Mr. Speaker?
Here we are on the eve of one of the biggest crises we ever
had in education in this Province -

MR. TOBIN: Not true.

MR. NEARY: - if I were the hon. gentleman
I would try to talk my way out of the situation he got
himself in in Burin and Gaultois.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago

the NTA indicated -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - the NTA indicated that they
were willing to accept binding arbitration. What advice
did the minister give her colleagues on that very reasonable
request from the NTA for binding arbitration?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I fully concurred
in the decision made not to abdicate our responsibility to
the people and the taxpayers of this Province to delegate
to somebody else decision-making affecting spending of a
large chunk of this Province's budget. Instead, Mr. Speaker,
I supported

MS. VERGE:

and respected the decision taken to shoulder ourselves, as the duly elected representatives of the people of the Province, the decision-making process affecting budgeting for the teachers' payroll and other associated costs for next year. And in doing so we have budgeted, as I said before, \$25 million more than the previous year for a total of \$250 million on teachers' salaries for next year. That is in accordance with the wage restraint programme which was introduced for all public servants, hospital workers and teachers and which has been accepted by about 10,000 public servants. I fully concurred in that decision to reject the request for binding arbitration.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: On Friday past the NTA indicated publicly, the outgoing President of the NTA stated publicly that they were eager to return to the bargaining table and to negotiate a settlement of this dispute before the crisis occurs tomorrow. Now would the hon. minister tell the House if a contact was made from the NTA to the administration through Treasury Board or through the minister and if so what advice -

MR. TULK: She does not know.

MR. WARREN: The Premier knows everything.

MR. NEARY: But the Premier does not have to coach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, if not, if there was no direct communication from the NTA to the administration, at least the NTA stated publicly that they were prepared to return to the bargaining table, to the negotiating table. Now I am going to ask the hon. minister, again, what steps has she taken

MR. NEARY: over the weekend, certainly within the last twenty-four hours, and what steps she will take for the rest of this day to try to avert the biggest crisis that we have ever had in the field of education in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the NTA President or any other representative of the NTA has not contacted government with a request for resumption of bargaining. When and if - hopefully it will be soon - that request is forthcoming, then the employer negotiating team is ready and willing to sit down and negotiate. Also, as I said before, the NTA President has not officially told government or the Federation of School Boards that the NTA is willing to accept government's wage restraint programme. All they have ever said officially and formally is that they are willing to accept the wage restraint programme for up to nineteen months, up to March 31st, 1984. They have never said formally that they are willing to accept the full wage restraint programme the same as the 10,000 other public servants have already done.

MR. LUSH: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we have a very serious situation in this Province in education, and

MR. LUSH: the minister in her role obviously must act as a mediator at this point in time. I am just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the minister has made any contact with either her colleagues at Treasury Board or the NTA to find out what would be necessary to get both sides back to the bargaining table? In other words, has she tried to ascertain whether either side has changed its view, whether there is some possibility of compromise between now and tomorrow to avoid, Mr. Speaker, this critical situation from happening at this most important point in time? Can the minister indicate if she has done anything or will she be doing anything in the next couple of hours?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday I went to the Annual Convention of The Newfoundland Teachers' Association here at Holiday Inn. I attended their formal opening session that morning and I regret to say that no olive branch was handed to me on that occasion. I am here willing and certainly eager to hear from the NTA executive, if they choose to contact me.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is not the hon. minister aware that it is her duty and responsibility to keep the schools open? And would the hon. minister not consider it very worthwhile to offer the olive branch to the NTA and entice them back to the bargaining table to see if there is room for compromise and to avert this major crisis, the worst crisis that we have ever had in the whole history of education in this Province? Is the hon. minister shirking her responsibility in that regard?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, many people have a responsibility to see that school children are provided with normal instructions, and those people include teachers and the NTA -

MR. NEARY: It is your responsibility.

MR. WARREN: You are a failure!

MS. VERGE: - as the teachers' union and professional association, and the school boards, as well as the provincial government. It is the local and regional school boards who are now dealing with the principals and teachers in each of their individual schools and seeing whether safety will be ensured for students if schools are to open tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: It is obvious you are trying to force the teachers out of the classrooms.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
This will be the final question for the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am having a great degree of difficulty getting any information from the minister. I will put the question a different way. Is the minister saying that she has not done anything in the last twenty-four hours? Is the minister saying she has not raised a finger in terms of

MR. LUSH: trying to get the NTA and Treasury Board back to the bargaining table again?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I have been part of this government's effort to develop a fair and reasonable package for the next collective agreement between the employer and the NTA. I have been part of the effort to get 480 more teaching jobs for September than there are right now, ensuring job security for the 7,000 to 8,000 teachers. And, Mr. Speaker, I and the other members of this government are standing by ready and willing to talk to the NTA bargaining committee when they come to realize the serious financial difficulties faced by this Province and the need for this government to maintain spending for hospital services, for social services, roads and all the other services that are just as essential for the families of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I wish to table Special Warrants for the Departments of Finance, Social Services, Health, Labour and Manpower and Justice. And Finance has to do with unemployment insurance contributions for provincial government employees; Social Services has to do with training and rehabilitation, allowances and assistance and salaries, social assistance;

PREMIER PECKFORD: under Health, for the Newfoundland Medicare Commission, an increased volume of billings; for Labour and Manpower, for the health study down in Labrador West, the dust study; and for Justice, relevant to student aid. So as required under the Financial Administration Act of 1973, I hereby table the Special Warrants just described by me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: An excellent speech.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is a good speech?
Would I not make a good Minister of Finance?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to a question on the Order Paper of March 25, 1983, asked by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

It was a foolish question
again,

MR. H. YOUNG:

was it all done by public tendering and stuff like that.
I would not even repeat it.

MR. NEARY: Telephones or what?

MR. YOUNG: Not telephones. I would like to
table that.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present
a petition on behalf of 192 petitioners in the district of
Bellevue. This petition, Mr. Speaker, comes from the
residents of the Town of Hillview which is just off the TCH.
You can easily see most of Hillview as you drive along
the TCH and even though, Mr. Speaker, this town is, as I
said, only several hundred yards off the TCH, and even though
there is only about a mile and a half, two miles which will
take in every inch of road in the town, the only bit of pavement
that these people see is when they arrive on the federal
government road, the Trans-Canada Highway. This petition,
Mr. Speaker, and I will read the Prayer, says:

"We the undersigned, residents of Hillview, in the provincial
district of Bellevue, do respectfully submit a petition to
our Provincial government requesting that upgrading and
paving of the community's roads be carried out during the
Summer of 1983, the construction season of 1983. We
believe the authorities will recognize our request as being
one long overdue and that every effort will be made for the
realization of the same."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the
first time that I have stood here in this hon. House as
the member for the district of Bellevue and had
occasion to present a petition on behalf of these very

MR. W. CALLAN: same people, requesting improved
and paved roads. They have done it time and time again.

Mr. Speaker, actually, if one looked back over the last couple of years in particular in this hon. House, one cannot help but notice that Presenting Petitions in this hon. House is quickly becoming a thing of the past. And I guess the reason for it is obvious, that even though these people, for example, and there is a fair amount of organization and footwork involved in going from house to house and home to home with a petition to get these signatures, the reason, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is becoming a thing of the past, presenting petitions, or the circulation and then the presenting of petitions, is because in far more cases than not the petition has ended up in the appropriate minister's office but has never been reacted to in a positive manner. I can think,

MR. CALLAN: going back to 1975 when petitions were the order of the day, Mr. Speaker, of thousands of names attached to petitions against the increase in electricity and so on and so on over the years, but nothing was ever done by government, nothing was ever done to reduce the cost of electricity I am afraid, Mr. Speaker. But I hope that the opposite is true, I hope that this petition presented at this opportune time by the people from Hillview, because we have not yet finished the Department of Transportaion estimates -we were supposed to meet this morning but we could not because the minister was unavoidably absent and so the meeting was cancelled. Mr. Speaker, I hope that when the minister stands in his place to respond to this petition he will stand and say, yes, I am very pleased to say that Cabinet and the officials in the Department of Transportation have recognized this stretch of road through Hillview for a number of years now as being one of the roads in the Province that needs and deserves to be paved because of the taxpayers there and so on. And I hope that the minister will tell us when he stands to respond to and support the petition that there is an allocation in this year's transportation budget to spend \$500,000 in the district of Bellevue. And I hope ,Mr.Speaker, that all the money in his department will not go to Bonavista South and out on Ramdon Island and so on, which is where a lot of it has been going, especially over the past several years, recent years. And, of course, the people in Hillview and the people who live in close proximity to these other districts I just mentioned, go down there for Sunday afternoon drives, they go down there to visit their

MR. CALLAN: friends and relatives and they know that places have paved roads down there where the population is far less than their population, and the number of tax dollars are far less than the number of tax dollars that are paid in by people like the people who live in the town of Hillview.

MR. MORGAN: They vote for me in every election and I look after them.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I hope that the public address system in this House of Assembly has picked up the comments just made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), because copies of the transcript will be taken

MR. CALLAN:

off of what has been said during the past four minutes and what will be said in the next five. They will be mailed out to each individual whose signature appears here and I hope that the minister, I hope that his words that the reason we give pavement, the reason this government gives pavement is because of the way people vote, I hope that that will be recorded so that when it does go out -

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. CALLAN:

- Mr. Speaker, since my time is up I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Fisheries,
a point of order.

MR. MORGAN:

On a point of order, I want to clarify - maybe you can rule it a point of clarification. I did not say that people should be getting services based on the way they vote, I said I, as one member of the House, make sure I can get all the things and services I can for people who vote for me in every election. I work between elections to get things done for them, services and paving of roads and water and sewer services. And surely the hon. gentleman is not interpreting that as government policy -

MR. CALLAN:

At the expense of other settlements.

MR. MORGAN:

- that you have to vote a certain way to get services.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman has a real problem getting services.

MR. CALLAN: You are on the record.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) rose on a point of order which really was a point of clarification, not a point of order at all.

The time for the hon. member for Bellevue has expired.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition rises to speak to that petition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thought the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) was going to respond. If he is, I will gladly take my seat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to support the prayer of the petition. It is not the first time that my hon. colleague has brought a petition into this hon. House from the people of Hillview who seem to be discriminated against by this administration. This same administration, Mr. Speaker, is squandering all kinds of taxpayer money on paving country lanes, and driveways, to Summer cottages, and paving parking lots in front of lounges, Mr. Speaker, and this same administration will not grant a legitimate request -

MR. DAWE: Name the place?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I could if I wanted to, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to at this moment.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us where they all are.

MR. NEARY: Well, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) can answer the hon. gentleman and tell him where all the driveways have been paved and roads paved to Summer cabins and country lanes. The Minister of Transportation is an expert on that. And, Mr. Speaker, we heard all kinds of condemnation of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) recently by two mayors, condemning the hon. gentleman for pork barrelling in his own district.

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

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

MR. NEARY: But I am not going to get into that now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is speaking to a petition presented by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). I refer Your Honour to Standing Order 92, "Every member offering a petition to the House shall confine himself to the statement of the parties from whom it comes, the number of signatures attached to it and the material allegations it contains." And again Standing Order 97, "There shall be no debate on a petition, unless the House has it under consideration."

The hon. gentleman is not

MR. MARSHALL: speaking to the petition and he is also, Mr. Speaker, entering into debate, so he is out of order on both grounds.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Maybe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would like to confine his remarks to the prayer of the petition.

MR. NEARY: Well, it looks like, since we resumed this session, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have a crack-down. We heard that that crackdown was going to take place at the beginning of the session, but it is only now because the administration are hurting, because the administration cannot stand criticism, because the administration are under tremendous pressure and are being criticized for their lack of action on the economy and so forth that they are now going to resort to raising points of order. The crackdown has started that was supposed to have started at the beginning of the session last month.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). These people down there feel that they are being discriminated against. And the hon. gentleman can raise all the points of order he wants. We have all kinds of opportunity in this House to make our point and we will be doing it, and the hon. gentleman will have to stay here in his seat. He will have to study Beauchesne upside down and inside out in order to muzzle the Opposition, because he is not going to do it. He can try all he wants, Mr. Speaker.

Getting back to the petition, Mr. Speaker, the government can find ways and means to pave parking lots in front of lounges, country lanes, driveways, and pave roads to Summer cottages,

MR. NEARY: and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) can manipulate the money that was allocated last year and this year for reconstruction and upgrading and paving of roads and put it all in his own district, but there are people who are watching these things, Mr. Speaker. And I hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to find a few dollars to look after these good people of Hillview. I believe this is the third petition, is it not?

MR. CALLAN: At least three.

MR. NEARY: At least three petitions have been presented by my colleague. So far the request seems to have fallen on deaf ears, But by now they must be getting some kind of a guilt complex, a guilty conscience, Mr. Speaker, so let us hope that the minister will stop his pork barrelling, stop trying to feather his own nest and do something for people in other parts of the Province.

MR. CALLAN: They are taxpayers too.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, like most of the people in the Province, I will ignore the comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). They continue to fall on deaf ears not only on this side of the House but also, I might add, in his own district which lies adjacent to my particular riding. However, I would like to speak with reference to the petition.

I have no hesitation indeed in supporting the prayer of the petition, as I am sure that all hon. members in this House would support that particular petition and similar petitions that have been

April 11, 1983

Tape 835

EC - 3

MR. DAWE: presented in this House
and similar concerns, Mr. Speaker, that have been
presented,

MR. DAWE: just concerns about the conditions of roads in all parts of this Province, not only on the Island but in Labrador as well. There is a crying need for improved transportation systems in this Province. It is a very vast Province with limited financial resources. We have had over the past decade or so, some financial arrangements through the Department of DREE which has assisted this Province in developing some major secondary roads and enabled it, by having some federal funding into those roads, to put additional expenditures into local roads and other provincial highways. Unfortunately, that support from the federal government as in other aspects of financial support, as we heard earlier today in the Ministerial Statement given by the Premier, as it relates to EPF funding and other areas, the federal government have shirked their responsibilities in providing the necessary funding for this Province not only in the area of post secondary education and health care but also in the area of highroad construction and transportation requirements.

Mr. Speaker, we are very conscious of the needs for the paving of roads that are not already paved in this Province, some thousands of miles of them. We are also very cognizant of the responsibility to maintain existing paved roads and to, in fact, build some very necessary road links in this Province not only on the Island but, as well, in Labrador. And we are very, very conscious of it. We are very concerned that the necessary financial commitment from the federal government has not been forthcoming. We are also very concerned that the federal government seems obsessed with the idea of making

MR. DAWE: sure that Newfoundland and Labrador never reaches any kind of economic security so it can address the problems on its own.

Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned and we will continue to be concerned and continue to address the needs, with the limited financial resources that we have, based on a priority system that has been set up over the years that addresses the requirements based on safety, on transportation figures, on traffic volumes and other engineering data that is made available to us. And it is a very, very difficult decision when the time comes to expend the dollars that we have available. It is a decision that this government and my department do not take lightly, and we will continue to address the legitimate concerns of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in the area of transportation in all parts of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Committee of Supply.
On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
Head I.
The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, this is the Committee of the Whole. Perhaps for the benefit of the Committee, Mr. Chairman, it might be beneficial if you advise the amount of hours remaining. Approximately six, is it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Approximately six hours and fifteen minutes.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Chairman, this heading of expenditure is Consolidated Fund Services, and it relates to the provision of money to provide for interest mainly on the public debt and retirement of the public debt. Most of the elements in this heading are not to be voted upon by the House because they are statutory in nature and by this we mean that - and this is very important and very relevant, it means that this has a first and prior charge really on all of the revenues of the Province in each year. So it does not depend upon a vote every year as to whether or not it is going to be paid, it is an undertaking as a part of the condition of the borrowing itself. The major elements in this heading are not voted on. The only one that is voted on is the one I think, Mr. Chairman, that you will call eventually, which is the one with respect to ex gratia payments, that I will be prepared to answer any questions on when it is called.

But, Mr. Chairman, Head I, the public debt, I know that the hon. gentleman is going to make certain observations with respect to the public debt, which is very fitting of course. They have been made from time to time. They have been made by myself, made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), made by many people with respect to the size of the public debt. If members would like to refer

MR. MARSHALL: to the estimates on page 4 it shows the Public Sector Debt and gives a resume of the debt from 1979 to 1983. It stood at \$2.5 million - or \$2.5 billion, we wish it were \$2.5 million, but \$2.5 billion in 1979, and with the borrowings that will be incurred this year, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has indicated in the Budget Speech, it will total \$3.5 billion. Now this is a matter, obviously, of great concern to the government of this Province, as it would be

MR. W. MARSHALL: to any government, the size of the public debt. The reason for the size of the public debt, Mr. Chairman, quite frankly, is that we have not been able to generate in this Province enough revenues to be able to meet the expenditures to the degree that we would like. The revenues from the general public, and I think that this has to be borne in mind by everybody dealing with the government and making demands on the government, whether it be through health services, whether it be through teachers, whether it be through the public service or from whatever source, the revenue of this Province has to come from two places: It has to come either from taxation of the citizens of the Province or it has to come from our resources. Now, we all know and the government fully concedes, that the taxation levels in this Province are higher than the government would like them to be. It is completely and absolutely unavoidable, there is no further room for taxation. As a matter of fact, it is the aim and the objective of this government and certainly its hope, over a period of time to be able to alleviate or reduce that particular debt.

The only other area, Mr. Chairman, apart from taxation, where you are going to get your money is from the resources, the resources of the province concerned. And, Mr. Chairman, it is there and it is only there that we have any hope of being able to address the magnitude of the public debt, to reduce the amount that we have to expend yearly, on interest each year, and thereby be able to have more funds available at the same time to meet the growing demands that are upon government.

To get a picture, Mr. Chairman, of the effect of the debt I refer hon. members to Page 7,

MR. W. MARSHALL: exhibit 7, showing where the money goes and you will see that in the ensuing fiscal year it is estimated that 16.3 per cent of the revenues will go towards debt charges and other financial expenses under this particular heading. And as you see, I think it is very picturesquely depicted here in the schedule, there is a circle here, it is a pie as it were and it shows a segment of the pie. The aim of the game of any government or any prudent administration is to get that segment which shows debt charges and other financial expenses smaller and thereby you would have a greater proportionate amount to be able to use for the purpose of provision for ordinary services. But we have not been able to do that to date, Mr. Chairman, because of, as I say, the problems that we have had and we have met in trying to get a just return from the resources of this Province and the resources that we brought into Confederation with us. And hence, Mr. Chairman, it comes back to square one again, to gaining a proper revenue from our major industry, the fishery, but most importantly what we are not receiving but we should be receiving from our hydro power, where Quebec gets \$600 million to \$700 million a year and we get a paltry approximately \$10 million a year, and with respect to the offshore.

MR. MARSHALL:

I mean, if we were dealt with on a reasonable, rational basis in those areas, we would be able to see the light of day where we would at last be able to wrestle with the problems, the financial problems under which this government labours. So, Mr.Chairman, that is one observation I would make.

The other observation is that when hon. gentlemen there opposite get up and talk about the public debt, as we indicated in the brief exchange before we adjourned on the last Tuesday we were sitting, that a large part of this public debt has been thrust upon us and remains a legacy - even though, thank God, it is some ten or twelve years since they were in power - but it remains a legacy which the previous Liberal administration cast upon this Province like a rope around its neck. What they did, Mr.Chairman, was they had borrowed the then astronomical amount, when this party assumed government in 1971, of approximately \$1 billion. Interest has ascended on that over the years, so a large part of this public debt is attributable to their administration.

But it is not my purpose to dwell on that; what it is my purpose to dwell on and the point that I would like to make is that the only way in which we are going to be able to get out from under the financial problems with which this Province is faced is to get a more reasonable return from the resources of our Province and the resources which we brought into Confederation.

So these are the opening remarks, Mr. Chairman. I will be happy to answer any questions that hon. gentlemen may wish to raise with

MR. MARSHALL: respect to this matter.

The fact that most of the items are not voted upon, that is one issue, but we do not mind, of course, and we would be only too happy to respond to any questions under the subheads even though because of statutory reasons they are not to be voted upon.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me first start out by saying, oh, how the hon. gentleman has changed his tune in recent years. Only a few years ago we were given a lecture in this hon. House by the President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) on the state of the public debt at that time, which was running around \$1.7 billion, I believe, at that time, and the hon. gentleman thought that was horrendous, thought we were going under, did not think we would see the light of day, separated himself from the administration, refused to sit

MR. NEARY: in the Cabinet, resigned from the Cabinet so that he could assert his independence in this House to talk about the public debt which was a little more than \$1.5 billion around that time, but the hon. gentleman was concerned in this House. Now the public debt has gone to \$3.5 billion, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. gentleman who introduced the Consolidated Fund Services portion of the budget, Item 1 did not express any concern at all, just got up and brushed it off, got a few little political jabs in, did not give the House very much information on how we are going to service that debt. And the hon. gentleman told us, Mr. Chairman, that there were two sources of revenue, the Province had two sources of revenue. Hansard will confirm what I am saying, that is what the hon. gentleman said. My hon. colleague came into the House right at the time when the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Marshall), who just introduced these estimates, told the House there a few moments ago, as my hon. friend came in the doorway, that there are two sources of revenue - taxation, he said, and our own resources, two forms of revenue. The hon. gentleman left out the most important source of revenue. There are three sources of revenue, Mr. Chairman, but the hon. gentleman deliberately left out the most important source of revenue to this Province, namely: the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada contributes almost half of the revenue of this Administration, of this Government, 47.8 per cent of the revenue taken in by the Provincial Government here comes from the Government of Canada. Now, that is rather trivial and insignificant.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman did not think that was worth mentioning, I suppose, \$900 million from the Government of Canada, that is just loose change in your pocket. The hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) carries that around in his wallet. Almost \$1 billion out of a \$2 billion budget, almost half of it comes from the Government of Canada

MR. WOODROW: We are still Canadians.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman says we are Canadians, Well you would never say, Mr. Chairman, to listen to some of the remarks that come from members there opposite that they were Canadians -

MR. SIMMS: Hon. gentleman there opposite.

MR. NEARY: Hon. gentleman there opposite that they were Canadians. If you listen to the statements, anti-Canadian, being made daily both inside and outside this hon. House, you would never say they were Canadians. I have yet to hear the gentleman who just introduced this part of the budget stand in this House and say ' I am a proud Canadian'. I have never heard him say it and probably never will.

Mr. Chairman, it is very, very important then, it is very important, if half our revenue is coming from the Government of Canada, that we maintain good relations with the Government of Canada. It is very important that we tap every source of revenue that we can lay our hands on in Ottawa. But we are not doing that, Mr. Chairman. Instead of that, Federal/Provincial relations are practically non-existent, caput, they do not exist. And that is very unfortunate indeed, because I think it is having a very strong bearing, a very large bearing on other sources of

MR. NEARY: revenue that could be tapped in Ottawa. I submit that millions of dollars are being left on the Ottawa table every year that should come to this Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as far as our own taxation is concerned let me say this, that I do not think that we can increase taxes in this Province anymore. I think we have reached the saturation point, I think that we have reached the point, as my hon. academic friend says, the point of diminishing returns.

MR. NEARY: We are pricing ourselves out of business as far as taxation in this Province is concerned. But I would not be at all surprised, Mr. Chairman, with the direction of this administration, that before this year is over and before too much longer, the administration will be back looking for more revenue in the form of provincial taxation. There is no way that we can meet a \$27.5 million deficit in current account with the present state of the Newfoundland economy, brought about mainly through the mismanagement of this administration. So we have to forget increasing taxes. We just had a sneak tax put on tobacco products in this Province, something that we were not told about when the Budget was brought down a few weeks ago. They sneaked that one in. They did not have the courage to tell the House about it and have come in for a lot of criticism as a result of sneaking that tobacco tax in and as a result of their contempt in this regard for this House. So, Mr. Chairman, we have to forget increasing taxes in this Province in future. People cannot stand it. They cannot stand any more increases in taxes. This administration have not taken any steps to slow down the growth in the public service. As a matter of fact, they are doing anything but. They are putting an extension on Confederation Building. They are going to build another new House of Assembly, Mr. Chairman. Most provinces of Canada are operating out of their original legislature. This is the second House of Assembly that we have had in Newfoundland since Confederation. Now the administration tell us that their number one priority is to build another House of Assembly, the third one since Confederation. Most provinces and most places in the world, most states in the United States are still operating out of their original legislatures, except Newfoundland. And this

MR. NEARY: House we are in now, by the way, would put most legislatures in Canada to shame but it is not good enough for the administration, it is not good enough for them. The emperor wants to have his flag flying over an extension to Confederation Building so that they can have nice comfortable offices and continue to build the public service so that they can live in the laps

MR. NEARY:

of luxury - air conditioning, wall to wall carpeting - as the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) is used to, up to your knees in carpet, Mr. Chairman, and a House of Assembly, we are told, down in the lobby of Confederation Building. Now that is priorities for you, Mr. Chairman. And they are carrying out this extension, this unnecessary work at a time when they are closing hospital beds, laying off hospital workers, making the people who are unemployed, forced on welfare, suffer, cutting student allowances. That is how concerned they are, Mr. Chairman, about the welfare of the people of this Province and about the public debt.

MR. WARREN:

Closing hospitals.

MR. NEARY:

Closing down hospitals in

Northwest River -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are we going to keep it open for?

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are we going to keep it open for?

MR. NEARY:

What are you going to keep it open for?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY:

And, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman has not gotten the message by now he should go down to North West River and find out. The hon. gentleman has not had the courage to go and face the people of North West River, he sent down his deputy, his assistant deputy down to take the flack.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be sidetracked by hon. members. Apart from not being able to increase taxation any more in this Province - as a matter of fact, taxes should be reduced. Hon. members should have discovered last year that the tax increases

MR. NEARY: they brought in were counter-productive, the tax increases were counter-productive, that they did not get the anticipated revenue that they had forecasted and that we ended up with a deficit in current account of \$60 million and we are going to have a deficit this year of \$28 million, in round figures. Two years in a row a substantial deficit in current account, Mr. Chairman, and that is devastating. That means the Province is borrowing money to pay off money that they already borrowed. And anybody with an ounce of intelligence knows what that means.

Mr. Chairman, following the bringing down of the budget we had a statement from a very noted professor over at Memorial University, a very renowned professor,

MR. NEARY:

a professor of international business, a gentleman who was educated in some of the most ancient universities in the world.

MR. HOUSE: Oh, boy!

MR. BAIRD: Perhaps he is antiquated.

MR. YOUNG: John C. Doyle.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, Mr. John C. Doyle

is an angel compared to that hon. gentleman. An angel!

An angel! The hon. gentleman thinks he is crafty. If the

hon. gentleman makes any more remarks like he made when he

ran out of the House today he better be prepared for the

consequences.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman now is not

as clean as he tries to pretend he is.

MR. WARREN: That is right!

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman now wants

to talk about telephones and talk about labour on people's

houses, let him put up and let him man-fashion get up and

put the evidence on the table of this House and not make his

little snide remarks or we will deal with the hon. gentleman.

MR. CARTER: Tell us about John Doyle.

Tell us all about the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this professor

accused the administration of mismanaging the resources of this

Province. And I do not think that a truer statement has ever

been made. And he challenged the Premier to debate his statement

on television.

MR. WARREN: Are you going to do it?

MR. NEARY: And the Premier said in this

House he would accept the challenge.

MR. BAIRD: Where is he from?

MR. NEARY: But has he accepted the challenge,

Mr. Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. NEARY:

The Premier has not accepted the challenge. First of all, the Premier has not yet told us how he is going to deal with Mobil Oil. You remember, he threatened Mobil, said we will deal with Mobil Oil. We have a secret weapon up our sleeve to deal with Mobil Oil. And now they admit that they cannot deal with Mobil Oil. They had no secret weapon. They were bluffing, and their bluff was called. Now they are humiliated and embarrassed, Mr. Chairman. Now the Premier has said, yes, I will accept the invitation from the professor to debate whether or not we mismanaged the resources of this Province, but we have not seen any date set for the debate. Does the Premier still intend to debate these matters with this professor, or has he chickened out? Does he lack the courage? Does he not have the intestinal fortitude? Does he not have the goods that he cannot back it up, that his administration did indeed mismanage the resources of this Province?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. S. NEARY: I will come back later, Mr. Chairman.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I just listened to some of the words that the Leader of the Opposition had to say (Mr. Neary) about some of these expenditures of money and so on, and I have listened to the Leader of the Opposition now the last number of days as it relates to the waste of money on the extension to the Confederation Building and so on. Now, you know, it is incredible and I have had people come up to me over the last number of days, Mr. Chairman, and say to me, 'Is the Leader of the Opposition serious or does he understand that there is a difference between capital account and current account?' What we are talking about here is a capital account expenditure. And the reason why we are making it, Mr. Chairman, is to save money. Because in an analysis that was done by the Department of Public Works and Services, if we have to renew all these lease agreements with all the people from whom we are now renting space - knowing that the market has gone up from eight or ten or twelve dollars per square foot to fifteen or twenty or twenty-five dollars per square foot, we would have to spend huge sums of money to retain all of this space from all the various people who own these buildings. So what we did then, Mr. Chairman, in light of that, knowing that we had some lead time for those leases to be up, we examined to see whether it was wise now to renew all of that square footage at much higher rates per square foot, and we got a market analyst to tell us what the square footage would be, or would it be better to build a building, borrow the money and the repayment schedule

PREMIER PECKFORD: on that money would be less than the payment schedule on the rent of all that space. And what it showed was, Mr. Chairman, that we would be money in over about twenty years if we built an extension to Confederation Building: We would own the building, we would have an investment and we would have no more payments after twenty years, and those payments would not be greater than the amount we would have to pay for leased premises. So what we are doing for the taxpayer of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Chairman, is saving the people money. Now, the other alternative is not to build to an extension to Confederation Building and not to renew the leases, so we would have hundreds of public employees on our hands which we lay off. That is the only other way out of it that I can see out of it, Mr. Chairman. We either keep these people on because they are performing a valuable function in the public service, in the various departments or we do not. Now, if we are going to keep them on, I can only say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that if he is opposed to the Confederation Building Complex going ahead - he has got two things: If he is opposed to it, that means that he wants the government to spend more money to provide accommodation to these employees than we now have to spend by building a complex. So he wants us to waste money.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He either wants us to waste money, more than we would have to spend, or to lay off a lot of public employees. It is one or the other. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has taken a very firm position and I can only put down his motivation as being that he either wants us to waste money or to lay off a lot of public employees. Because, Mr. Chairman, we can conclusively prove that by building the Confederation Complex we are going to save money and keep the people employed. Both! That is what we are going to do.

It is a measure to save money for the taxpayers of this Province. Now I cannot for the life of me see how the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of a political party in this Province, can stand up and oppose government saving money on behalf of the taxpayers. Now he either does not want to save money, or he wants to lay off a lot of public employees. Now, that is the long and short of it, Mr. Chairman. So the Leader of the Opposition can rant and roar all he likes, and it has nothing to do with current account at all, we are borrowing the money as part of our capital account, because the repayment on that money will be less than the money we would have to pay out for the leasing arrangements we would have to make after the five years are now up, when we would have to renew them.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, it is a tremendous - and we have an investment then. We own the building, so we have an investment. So, Mr. Chairman, you know, in talking about spending money the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is out to lunch, out in left field in criticizing the extension to this complex. Because we can save money, and surely one of the objectives of government must be to save money. So I repeat,

PREMIER PECKFORD: the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) either wants us to continue to waste money and that is why he is against the extension to Confederation Building Complex, or if he does not want us to waste money and he is still against the extension, he must want us to lay off hundreds and hundreds of public employees. Because that is the only logical conclusion that I can draw from anybody who could be opposed to the extension of the Confederation Building Complex.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that you have to take advantage of the situation at the time and everybody in this Province knows at the present time that rents are dirt cheap. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) -

MR. YOUNG: Where? Where? Where are they? Where are they dirt cheap? Where are they?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) opened a tender call

MR. NEARY: last week and the cost per square foot on that particular tender ranged from \$7.50 up to \$18 a square foot - bargain basement. This is what government now can rent office space for. But no, Mr. Chairman, they do not take advantage of that situation. And the fact of the matter is that interest rates are fairly high, so it is going to cost a fair amount of interest on the money that will be borrowed to amortize the loan to extend Confederation Building.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is still cheaper.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman has not produced any documentation to show the House that it is cheaper. Put the documentation on the table of the House, Mr. Chairman, so we can examine it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman were interested in saving money, keeping hospital beds open and keeping public servants on the payroll, he would cancel that twenty year lease he gave to his buddy for a military museum down in the Murray Premises.

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty years!

MR. NEARY: Twenty years. They just signed now a twenty year lease.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: No tenders.

MR. WARREN: That is right, no tenders, a twenty year lease.

MR. NEARY: You talk about political patronage!

MR. WALSH: You cannot talk about it.

MR. NEARY: Well, I can talk about it and I am going to talk about it. A twenty year lease for office space that was unnecessary in the first place -

MR. WARREN: And it is still unoccupied.

MR. NEARY: - that is still unoccupied, Mr. Chairman, still unoccupied. Because they wanted to move the military museum off the 11th Floor of this building to make a conference room so that the Premier could hold press conferences and get his picture in the paper. He will not allow the Opposition to use the conference room. The Opposition are not allowed to use it. The minister without portfolio can use it. Anybody in the Province can use it except the Leader of the Opposition. He will not allow the Leader of the Opposition to use the Conference Room. But I am not complaining about that, Mr. Chairman. I can manage to get my message across without using the Conference Room. But the point that I am making, Mr. Chairman, is this, that if the hon. gentleman is sincere, if he wants to save money to keep public servants employed and he wants to save money for the taxpayer, let him cut out the extravagance and waste, let him give up his apartment over in Tiffany Place, let him give that up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have the most greedy Premier in our whole history. We have had twenty-two Prime Ministers or Premiers in this Province and we have the most greedy Premier in the whole history. Out of the twenty-two we presently have the most greedy of all Premiers in this Province. So let us hear no more about the Opposition wants to do away with this, the Opposition wants to force the government to lay off public servants, let us hear no more of that silly nonsense.

MR. TOBIN: You are against the jobs, all the jobs that are going to be created in building that extension. You are against that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I believe this would be the time for government to call tenders for rental of office space downtown, because they can get it at bargain basement prices.

MR. HODDER: For any period of time they want it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, for any period. There are more vacant buildings around St. John's, office buildings, than in our whole history.

MR. HODDER: We can have the London, New York and Paris.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman just opened a tender last week and got the shock of his life, ranging from \$7.50 up to \$18.00.

MR. YOUNG: Storage space. You do not put people in storage space.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the government should test it, put it to the test, call public tenders for the required office space and see what the going price is today, see what bargains they can get today.

MR. HODDER: Where is Joey's fountain? It is all ripped out down there, you know.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I know the fountain is gone, and they have been taking down the trees down there. That is saving taxpayer money.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that while the hon. the Premier was on his feet he would tell us about the challenge of Professor Montgomery, who challenged the hon. gentleman to a debate, to debate his mismanagement of the resources of this Province. And the hon. the Premier said in this House that he would accept the challenge. Could he now tell us when the debate is going to take place? Has the time been reserved, Mr. Chairman, on television and radio for the debate? I was hoping the hon. gentleman

MR. NEARY:

would deal with that matter, because there is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman, that this Administration have grossly mismanaged the resources of this Province

MR. HODDER:

I remember John Crosbie

saying that we were bankrupt in 1968.

MR. NEARY:

That is right. \$700 million and

we were bankrupt, now it is \$3.5 billion and still climbing, no end in sight. The people who set our credit rating Moody's, Standard and Poor, are going up the wall, going out of their minds got to have eyes in the back of their heads to try and keep the administration straight. They can no longer use the argument while you are a Province of Canada, Canada is not going to let you go bankrupt, That used to be the argument. They cannot use the argument now about offshore oil, they threw that away. When the Premier threw the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, he threw away whatever chances we had to get the large share of that offshore treasure, The hon. gentleman threw that away and then the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) has the face to get up and tell us about how there are only two sources of revenue, taxation and our own resources.

Mr. Chairman, just turn back the hands of time for a moment, go back to January 8th, 1972, just turn back the clock eleven years and see what this Administration have done with our resources. They have not done anything.

MR. WARREN:

They destroyed it.

MR. NEARY:

They destroyed it is right.

We had a good fishery in this Province, we had an excellent

MR. NEARY: fishery. When the Administration took over Mr. Chairman, we had a good fishery in this Province, both inshore and offshore. Is that the situation today? Mr. Chairman, this administration have just about every group in this Province turned off, they have every group in this Province now against them, they have the fishplant workers, they have the fishermen, they have the teachers, they have the nurses, they have about two-thirds of the public service, they have the Newfoundland Medical Association, they have sick people, they have welfare recipients, they have construction workers, they have unemployed people. Every group in the Province is turned against this Administration. I am amazed, Mr. Chairman, that our people have not taken to the streets, and that may not be too far away.

MR. S. NEARY: I would say, Mr. Chairman, but for the NEED programmes, the community development projects and the money that is coming in from Ottawa not only would we have gone down the tube a long time ago but our people would be destitute. The only thing that is saving Newfoundland at this point in our history is Ottawa.

MR. G. TOBIN: They certainly do not say that in Burin.

MR. NEARY: We know what they are saying in Burin about the hon. gentleman. Mr. Chairman, it is amazing to me that the people have not taken to the streets, and that may not be too far away, because this administration have not lifted a finger to develop our natural resources. The only thing they have done in eleven years is argue and fight -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - argue and fight with Ottawa. And they do not realize when they are doing this, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador become very nervous and very angry, because they know that this administration have not lifted a finger to develop our natural resources and to generate new sources of revenue from this Province. They cannot point their finger to one new industry started in this Province in eleven years. They have closed down just about everything in Newfoundland and Labrador, now they are going to close the schools down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: A good note to end on, Mr. Chairman.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, make no wonder that we get a threat in the paper the other day that referred to the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), as going to try to take over from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Somebody got to.

MR. MARSHALL: In my day - it is only myself and the Leader of the Opposition who would remember this now because we are the only ones here old enough, but it used to be, in the days when you used to go up to the Nickel Theatre, many years ago, you would probably see 'Red Rider Rides Again'. We get threatened, Mr. Chairman, on the weekend with 'Red Roberts is going to ride again' and we can hardly wait. Even the member from the Strait of Belle Isle would be better than the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) if that is an indication of the quality of the way he is going to address the estimates of this Province, and particularly this Consolidated Revenue Fund which involves so many millions of dollars. Mr. Chairman, when I got up to introduce this matter I invited the hon. gentleman to ask questions with respect to it and we would respond to them, to ask questions with respect to the debt. Does the hon. gentleman know what is involved? He wants to talk about little gossip things, about various little things that ride in his own perverted imagination, Mr. Chairman. But the fact of the matter is, what we are discussing here in Consolidated Revenue Fund relates to the serious business of the Province. It relates to the provision of money for interest, some \$277 millions next year for interest alone on temporary borrowings.

MR. MARSHALL: Does the hon. gentleman know what treasury bills are? Does he ask and question how much money is being spent out in Canada Pension plan? Does the hon. gentleman ask anything about rental purchase that is there? Does he care about that and about loan guarantees, debt management expenses, pensions and gratuities, these items that carry a lot of concern to this Province and have a great demand on the budget of this Province? The hon. gentlemen, some of them over there, look quizzical. I do not think that the hon. gentlemen even understand what these are about, but translated what they mean is money, Mr. Chairman, and money that is very hard to get. And I repeat again the only way in which - this is the most critical area of the budget really, because it is an area of the budget which is not voted on by this Legislature. It is not open to this Legislature to turn around and say that we are not going to vote these monies, we are tagged with these monies. They represent a rope around the neck of this Province which we have to pay whether we like it or not. We pay that first, Mr. Chairman, and then from the rest of the monies that we are able to get we then see what we have for the many other demands and needs of this Province.

But is the hon. gentleman interested in this, Mr. Chairman? Did he ask one question about it? Was he concerned about it at all? Not at all. He got up with his own old type of arcane speech, his own pre-Smallwoodian type of speech that he uses again and again without any effect whatsoever or any question. I dare say, Mr. Chairman, that most of the members opposite do not even know what I am talking about. Now, most of the members there opposite do not even know what we are debating at the present time and I invite the hon. gentleman to enter into a serious debate with respect to the financial constraints with which

MR. MARSHALL: this Province is faced. Because there is only one way, Mr. Chairman, that we can deal with the financial restraints that this Province is meeting. And it is not with respect to the management of the government I might say, Mr. Chairman, The hon. gentleman made reference to our credit rating. The fact of the matter is, despite the fact that we labour with the lowest possible income in Canada, despite the fact that we have more demands on us per person than any other province of Canada, it is a matter of abiding pride that this administration has been able to keep the financial ship afloat in this Province and, indeed, to receive the commendation, not the condemnation, but the commendation of the various financial institutions.

The hon. gentleman does not wish to talk, does he, Mr. Chairman, about what happened to other provinces nearby? What happened to the credit rating of the Province of Nova Scotia? What happened to the credit rating in the Province of New Brunswick and the Province of Quebec, all with resources much more than ours? Their credit rating went down, Mr. Chairman. And I can inform the House because of the management of this government, but for the hard financial times in which we find ourselves, our credit rating would have gone up. Indeed the financial institutions

MR. MARSHALL:

of North America and in Europe are very much impressed with the financial management of this Province. But they do not want to hear that, Mr. Chairman. They do not want to hear that at all. The only way in which we are going to deal with the issues that are before us, the only way that we are going to deal with this critical expenditure - the hon. gentleman wants to get up and talk about tripe and gossip and all sorts of stuff not related to the affairs of the Province, but the only way that Consolidated Fund Services is going to be reduced, as it most necessarily must, is by increasing the revenues of this Province. I again say to the hon. gentlemen there are only two sources that we can get them from, that is from taxes. This government realizes that the people of this Province have been taxed beyond what we would like them to be taxed, certainly. But **our** aim was to reduce taxes. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentlemen want to address themselves to any real issues at all, and they address themselves and they have any knowledge of the proposal that was put in on the offshore, one of the main cardinal basis of that proposal was that we would get a greater share of the revenues until such times as our taxation rates came down to the level of the rest of Canadians.

So that, Mr. Chairman, is where we must cope and we must grapple with the financial position that we are in. The only way that we can alleviate the financial situation and gain some relief is to get money through the resources which we brought into Canada, into Confederation with us. And I now ask the hon. gentlemen since they want to debate, what are they doing in aid of these efforts on our part to gain a reasonable, rational share

MR. MARSHALL: of the resources? The only indication, the only thing that the hon. gentlemen are doing from time to time is, as the hon. gentleman opposite, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) indicated, and I quote him, he said, "The only thing that is saving this Province today is Ottawa."

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: And that is the kind of mentality that has gotten the Province into the position it is, because that is the kind of mentality that embraces equalization and welfare payments, Mr. Chairman, and that is the kind of future which the young people of this Province are faced with unless we can get some semblance of justice and equity on the Upper Churchill, and unless we can get some reasonable negotiated offshore agreement on the offshore. And make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, that is a fact and that is the situation. The hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to champion their fellows in Ottawa. It is not, Mr. Speaker, that we are against Ottawa as such, but we are against the unequal treatment that this Province is receiving at the hands of the people who are the present custodians of the government in Ottawa. We are against the fact, Mr. Chairman, that we are discriminated against because of our geographical position in Canada. We are against the fact, Mr. Chairman, that this government discriminates against us because we have a smaller population. And we have done and will continue to do everything possible to achieve a reasonable negotiated settlement. There was a proposal with respect to the offshore which would have given a reasonable settlement but the hon. gentlemen in Ottawa, the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, or Energy (Mr. Chretien), whatever his title is, walked away from an agreement which he had arrived at in principle with me in December and January. The pulled a

MR. MARSHALL: flip flop, they decided to go
back to the -

MR. TULK: Read this. Read this.

MR. MARSHALL: I have read that. That has
been in the paper exactly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman knows full
well that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources
pulled a flip flop in Ottawa. Now, what are the hon.
gentlemen going to do with respect to the revenue? Are
they going to support - if they would support the
Government of this Province in its position on the
offshore, if they would get up and make a reasonable
support of this Province on its position with hydro power
rather than get up and make the kind of statements that
the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) did with
respect to the statement on removal of the Hydro Quebec
Directors from CFLCo today, if they would do these
things perhaps we would get, Mr. Chairman, a more
reasonable revenue sharing and we would be able to cope
much better than we have been able to with the financial
position that we find ourselves in.

Mr. Chairman, I invite the
hon. gentlemen there opposite to deal seriously with the
serious finances of the Province as presented in the
budget presented by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).
I invite them to ask questions with respect to the
Consolidated Revenue Funds. Do not be embarrassed. If
the hon. gentleman has been in the House for twenty-five years,
and he does not know what treasury bills are or what
Canada Pension Plan payments are, we do not mind telling
him. We will not make fun of him. But at least ask
the questions, Mr. Chairman, because the situation is
extremely critical. The fact of the matter is, the borrowings

MR. MARSHALL: of this Province are very high. They cause this Consolidated Fund Services, the demands of that to be very high. This crowds out our ability to be able to look after the other needs of this Province. And until we get revenues, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to be able to improve the situation. These revenues come from one source and one source only, they can only come from the resources. One of the reasons why we are denied a legitimate return on our resources is the fact that the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish to act like Liberals rather than Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this matter of the public debt and Consolidated Fund Services is indeed very serious business and the hon. gentleman has not addressed himself to the problem yet. The problem, as the hon. gentleman indicated in the first speech he made today, has to do with the development of our resources. If we are going to reduce the public debt, if we are going to be able to meet the interest payments on the public debt, if we are going to be able to maintain services at their present level in this Province we have to develop our natural resources. Nobody disagrees with that. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that this administration have not paid any attention to developing the natural resources of this Province. As a matter of fact -

MR. TOBIN: They did not give it away either.

MR. NEARY: No, they have not done anything. They have not either given it away, they have not taken it away, they have not done anything with it. They just sit there waiting for something to happen and nothing ever happens.

MR. WARREN: Twenty per cent unemployed.

MR. NEARY: We have record unemployment, we have the highest taxes in Canada, Mr. Chairman, and the administration just lie back on their oars and do nothing. And the hon. gentleman can get up and lecture the House all he wants, he can treat it as lightly as he wants, he can be as political as he wants, but he can try to intimidate us all he wants, Mr. Chairman, he is not going to succeed.

We want to talk about the issues in this matter and if we are going to service our public debt, we are going to need new additional sources of revenue in this Province. Mr. Chairman, part of the reason why the debt is so large, by the way - and the hon. gentleman will have to deal with this, because he has mentioned a couple of times this afternoon about inheriting a huge debt. The debt was \$700 million. Less than \$700 million direct and indirect debt at the time this administration took over.

MR. WARREN: How much is it now?

MR. NEARY: It is five times more than it was when the administration took over on January 18, 1972. It is five times more. And how often do I have to say in this House, Mr. Chairman, I would not mind the public debt being five times greater than it was when the administration took over if we had something to show for it, but we have nothing to show for it. They spent \$500 million and they nationalized the Linerboard mill in Stephenville, nationalized it and it cost the taxpayers \$500 million. They mismanaged it. Mr. Crosbie, who is now out looking for the Tory leadership, is the gentleman responsible for that fiasco. And also, Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: that same gentleman is responsible for nationalizing the Churchill Falls Corporation and kicking BRINCO out of Newfoundland. How much did that cost the taxpayers? It cost \$350 million right off, and I would say that the cost is much higher than that now. And then these two explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle cost another couple of hundred million dollars. Three items alone, Mr. Chairman, the sole responsibility of this administration - the nationalization of the linerboard mill, the nationalization of Churchill Falls, and the explosion on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle to commence the development of the Lower Churchill - cost over \$1 billion. These three items alone cost \$1 billion - \$1,000 million. And what have we got for it,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman? What do we have to show for it? All we have are two little holes, one on the Labrador side of the Straits and one the Island side, two little holes in the ground, \$1 billion. That is the kind of development of our natural resources we have seen in this Province. MR. Chairman, the Premier of this Province will forever hang his head in shame for throwing the decision on our offshore resources before the Newfoundland Appeals Court. It was the Premier of this Province who did that. He was so greedy, his judgement was so bad, he was so full of hate, so full of spite, so vicious, Mr. Chairman, that he was desperate, so he threw the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and he threw away the only chance that we had left in this Province.

MR. TOBIN: What court did you throw Churchill Falls before?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Churchill Falls agreement is only for sixty-five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But listen to this, Mr. Chairman, the offshore has been thrown away forever by the Premier of this Province. The offshore has been thrown away forever. Mr. Chairman, compare what the Premier of this Province did to their old whipping boy, the Upper Churchill sixty-five year contract, compare what this Premier did compared to that contract, just compare it. What the Premier of this day did was throw away the only real treasure that we ever had. He threw it before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and in the process gambled Newfoundland's future and threw it away. And his name will go down in history as a -

MR. WARREN:

As a traitor.

MR. NEARY:

No, not as a traitor, but as the most greedy Premier we have ever had in our whole history, who, in a fit of temper and rage, threw the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court - he did not have to, nobody forced him to do it - on the advice of his senior advisor, no doubt, the man who pulled the rug out from under the minister without portfolio (Mr. Marshall).

MR. WARREN:

By the way he is getting a nine per cent salary increase this year.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, that is right. The man who pulled the rug from under the hon. gentleman's feet when he was trying to negotiate with Mr. Chretien, the senior advisor, who is getting a 9.2

MR. NEARY:

per cent increase in salary this year. That is a good way to save money, 9.2 per cent. The guidelines do not apply to the Premier's staff, his senior advisors and his buddies and his friends.

MR. TULK: Do you know what he did? He was up there in Montreal watching -

MR. NEARY: He was across the street, watching the minister with a pair of binoculars, and when he saw Mr. Chretien making the minister responsible for the offshore (Mr. Marshall) -

MR. TULK: Happy.

MR. NEARY: - smile and make him happy, he got kind of concerned and worried. And, Mr. Chairman, let us see if I am just making this up. Am I making it up, Mr. Chairman, or is this how Mr. Chretien felt? Well, here is what Mr. Chretien said in a letter that he circulated to business people, mayors and town councils and all kinds of prominent people throughout Newfoundland and Labrador recently that provoked the other poison pen letter that we saw go out from the administration.

Here is what Mr. Chretien said:

"I was willing to meet Mr. Marshall any place, any time every day for a whole week. He refused to see me. Instead, he sent more telegrams. Because I believe an offshore deal is essential for the economic well-being of Newfoundlanders and all Canadians, I literally begged Mr. Marshall for a meeting. He refused. I can only conclude that the provincial government is more interested in political fights than in governing in the interests of the people who elect them." Mr. Chairman, that is a statement from a letter sent out recently over the signature of Jean Chretien, federal Minister of Mines and Energy, to some very prominent

MR. NEARY: people in this Province.

I believe to this day,

Mr. Chairman, and I have to say this in all fairness to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), that if they had left him alone, if Cabot had not been across the street watching him through his binoculars, I believe the hon. gentleman would have made an agreement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we needed that agreement in the worst kind of way. Back in January, before the end of January of this year, we could have had a very generous agreement.

MR. TOBIN: Why did he not sign it?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, signing it, that is just a flimsy excuse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is so bigoted, so politically bigoted, that he does not realize that in order to negotiate this kind of an agreement you have to have good will, you have to have trust, you have to be able to compromise -

MR. NEARY: give and take - you have to be intelligent, you have to be smart, you have to be able to outmanoeuvre your opponent. That is something that the administration cannot do. Mr. Chairman, we need that agreement in the worst kind of a way.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, what is the point of going through these historionics? I thought the hon. gentleman was going to come through his skull a few times, he gets so worked up and so upset about things. The fact of the matter is, I repeat again, that we are discussing a matter of great serious impact on the financial position of this Province, which is the Consolidated Fund Services. We have sat here for approximately one hour. Have we had one single question with respect to Consolidated Fund Services or the component parts? Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman. What we have had is the hon. gentleman getting up on whatever his pet subject happens to be. And he was goaded, Mr. Chairman, into talking about the offshore. He was goaded into talking about the offshore because it is his Achilles heel, because he knows full well, Mr. Chairman, that if the offshore agreement were delivered, being the agreement that was entered into between myself and Mr. Chretien, that we would have some promise for the future of this Province and that we would be able to meet many of the demands that are made - not all of them, certainly, not immediately - and we would have the prospects of being able to reduce the debt which has such a claim upon us as is reflected in the Consolidated Fund Services. But again I say, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman is not interested in debating facts, he is not interested in

MR. MARSHALL: directing himself to the matter that is before the committee, but I do want to make a few observations about what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. Chairman, we hear the hon. gentleman talk about it being all thrown away because the matter was referred to court. Now I do not want to get into the permutations and combinations of referring to court except to say that the action that was taken in the court was a deliberate one, it was one that was a wise one at the time, and it was one that, if we had to do it again, we would take exactly the same course of action. But the thing that I want to draw to the attention of the hon. member is the statement he made, 'We threw away the only chance we ever had'. 'We threw away the only chance we ever had' - as if the court case in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland or the Supreme Court of Canada was going to be the ultimate determinant -

MR. NEARY: It is.

MR. MARSHALL: - in any event, of our rights to the resource that we brought into Confederation with us. All that the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and the Supreme Court of Canada could decide would be on the narrow issue of ownership. All

MR. MARSHALL: they could decide, if the Supreme Court of Canada upholds the decision of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland eventually, is that the resource that the people of Newfoundland brought into Confederation with them is held as trustees, as it were, by their government, which is the federal government. And in that respect we will be no different, Mr. Chairman, than the people of Alberta prior to 1930. Because prior to 1930 they did not even need a court case to determine who owned the resources of Western Canada, the resources of Western Canada were owned outright by the federal government at that time. The oil fields of Alberta were owned by the government in Ottawa, the potash mines in Saskatchewan were owned by the Ottawa government, and the minerals in Manitoba were owned by the federal government. Now that was prior to 1930. But, Mr. Chairman, the people of Western Canada did not take the mulish, toadyous-like attitude that the hon. gentleman there opposite is doing in saying that this is the only chance we ever had and we have no rights to these resources. They pressured over a period of years to get their just desserts and eventually, because they had patriotic people in Western Canada, because they applied pressure over the years, the federal government, as a matter of record, in 1930 gave to them what they were due, which was their resources.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I say that we, as far as the court case goes - and the hon. gentlemen get up and say, 'We are not going to pay any attention to the court case' - it is one thing to recognize the law, Mr. Chairman, but it is another thing to recognize also the fact that we brought this resource, the offshore, into Confederation, nobody can deny that, and we are as absolutely committed, as the people in Western Canada were prior to 1930,

MR. MARSHALL:

to see that this resource comes to the people of Newfoundland. Now when we say that, we do not say that we want ownership even to the degree of Western Canada. Mr. Chairman, all we want from that resource are really in essence two things; to be able to manage it jointly with the federal government in a way that is beneficial to the Newfoundlanders and all Canadians, on the one hand, and, number two, to have the bulk of the revenue committed to this Province until the people of this Province acquire average incomes equal to the average of other Canadians. Now, are the hon. gentlemen there opposite against that? Because when they are not supporting us in effect what they are is they are against us. When they make silly statements such as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, 'the only chance we ever had', it is a declaration really in effect of just giving up on the situation.

MR. MARSHALL: And, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the people of Newfoundland, no matter whether they are Liberals or Conservatives or what they may be, or if they are of no party stripe, can ever give up on the premise that we have to be treated not as Albertans were prior to the 1930s, but as Albertans are today and we have to be given a just return from our resources.

We had such an agreement, Mr. Chairman, that gave us a return on our resources and joint management. It was an agreement that was entered into, and I repeat again, an agreement in principle that was entered into between myself and Mr. Chretien on behalf of our respective governments in December and January of this year. And we had arrived at that agreement in principle, and had in effect put most of the bones on the skeleton of the agreement even, we committed it to the public servants to put the finishing touches on that agreement in principle. And we know what happened then; what happened then was there was a flip-flop in Ottawa, there was a change of mind. It was brought about, in my opinion, by the pressures of persons in Ottawa who feel that the way in which this country is to be governed best is through a central power in Canada and that these interests managed to pull the rug from underneath Mr. Chretien's feet and they were aided in their endeavours and I report this again, Mr. Chairman, the reports or rumours that were circulating here in St. John's with respect to the disposition of the court case.

Now I said it before and I will say it again, and I will say it over and over again, that we had an agreement in principle, an agreement in principle

MR. MARSHALL: that was beneficial for the people of this Province, and when we arrived at that agreement in principle, Mr. Chairman, we thought we were dealing with people of sincerity, with good faith. And, Mr. Chairman, when we came to that agreement in principle, let there be no mistake about it, that this Province gave its bottom line. And what I mean by the bottom line is this Province has no more to give. It was an agreement that was beneficial to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and it was beneficial to the people of all of Canada. It maintained a satisfactory balance with respect to the management. It permitted this Province to determine how the development was going to take place and gave certain safeguards to the federal government with respect to its concerns about energy self-sufficiency and security of supply.

It also, Mr. Chairman, provided as adequately as a resource would allow, for the young people of this Province to look forward to the possibility of acquiring a per capita earned income equal to the national average per capita earned income.

Now that was the agreement which we made with them. That was the agreement and that was our bottom line. We were prepared and are prepared to deliver on that agreement; unfortunately, for reasons best known to the federal government, they are not prepared to do so.

Now I ask the hon. gentleman there opposite, when you were talking about negotiations, and I want to emphasize this as well, he quotes what Mr. Chretien said, that he 'was willing to meet' and 'he steadily refused to see me.' It is a matter of record, Mr. Chairman,

April 11, 1983

Tape No. 859

NM - 3

MR. MARSHALL: that Mr. Chretien was written
a letter and, in view of the confusing positions taken
between him and his officials, he was asked to put his
understandings in writing, just merely asked to put his
understanding in writing and then we would resume
negotiations

MR. MARSHALL: Instead what Mr. Chretien said, and this is also a matter of record, is, no, I will not do that, I will not put in writing what I said to you, but what instead we will do now we will wait until the outcome of the court case. And the very statements that he makes, that he is waiting for the outcome of the court case, I think is very, very significant and corroborates what I have indicated before, that the rumors that were spreading around the city of St. John's as a result of the outcome of the court case before the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland where one of the motivating factors that strengthened the hand of those people who are attempting to, and in effect did, turn the tables.

So, Mr. Chairman, we did reach an agreement, and let there be no doubt on that. We were prepared to honour that agreement; all we ask is that the people with whom we were dealing, when there came to be inconsistencies, could show the sincerity of their own purpose by putting in writing what their representative had agreed to me in our talks. Now, I ask the hon. gentleman there opposite what is unreasonable with respect to this request. Instead of being Uncle Tom and todies and responding to every kind of thing, whatever Mr. Chretien's says the hon. gentleman will -

MR. NEARY: Have you seen this?

MR. MARSHALL: I have seen what the hon. gentleman is waving about, like he would wave about probably the St. James version of the Bible because of the fact -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The Douay version.

MR. MARSHALL: - I am sorry, whatever version; the Minister of Justice corrects me on that - let us just put it this way, like he would wave around the Bible, or the Koran or whatever it happens to be, he waves around letters from the Federal Raj or the Federal Minister concerned. What

MR. MARSHALL: is in that letter just does not happen to be true. All the hon. gentleman has to do is to prevail upon his friends in Ottawa and get them to respond to the reasonable request we made, to respond in writing as to their understandings on the offshore, instead of making the type of statements that he is making. You know, like real toadies, Mr. Chairman, like the real Uncle Toms that they are on the other side, they will get up in this House and they will say, 'the only chance we ever had.' Well, I have news for the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, it is not the only chance we ever had, we are going to be treated like Canadians in the 1980s, not like Canadians were treated in the pre-1930s. Now the hon. gentleman will not champion this, but the person who is in conflict with him now for his leadership, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), indicated in the paper the other day that we were fighting too much for the people of Newfoundland, I think that was what he said, Mr. Chairman, and he said that he would negotiate a deal with Ottawa. I am sure he would negotiate a deal. The simplest thing in the world to do is to get an agreement with Ottawa. We could

MR. MARSHALL: have an agreement tomorrow if we wanted to. We could sign a contract tomorrow with Ottawa and we would have a deal. But the question that has to come is what kind of a deal. It is not that you have a deal at any price, it is what kind of a deal. And I will guarantee the hon. gentlemen there opposite that this administration will not be giving away the resources as the hon. gentlemen there opposite did.

MR. NEARY: You have already done that.

MR. MARSHALL: And I fancy, Mr. Chairman, that the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), and I know he is never going to get the opportunity again because he already participated in one giveaway, Mr. Chairman, that we are trying to unravel now which is the Upper Churchill contract, which formed the subject of the statement that I gave earlier this afternoon. And we have seen from that what kind of contracts that the hon. gentlemen there opposite would sign. Sure they would sign, sure we would have a deal, Mr. Chairman, and the whole shop would be given away like another penny arcade; the Province of Newfoundland would be given away like a fire sale, like some of the glorified manufacturers agents down on Water Street would have us do. But, Mr. Chairman, we act for all of the people of Newfoundland and we are concerned with respect to these resources, which we brought into Confederation, that the young people of this Province get a fair break, that the per capita income of this Province rise a little bit above 50 per cent of the Canadian average, which is all we have been able to manage since we entered into Confederation, that we be able to preserve our social and cultural and economic base in this Province by getting joint management. And, Mr. Chairman, we are never going to do it by the mulish, mealy-mouthed types of statements

MR. MARSHALL: made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). It is good that nobody takes the Leader of the Opposition seriously, not only in Newfoundland but also in Canada anyway, because that statement should never be taken as a statement by a Newfoundlander, that statement that we gave away the only chance we ever had. Mr. Chairman, we have not given away the only chance we ever had. Our chance is based on our rights as Canadian citizens, that Canadian citizens in the Canadian nation be treated equally.

So when the hon. gentleman stands up and starts waving little bits of paper that his masters in Ottawa send him down, full of all sorts of distortions and subjective impressions that they have with respect to things that do not reflect the truth, I would be a little bit careful if the hon -

MR. NEARY: Are you saying that Mr. Chretien is lying?

MR. MARSHALL: What I am saying is that Mr. Chretien is colouring the world to suit himself because Mr. Chretien, you see, was a -

MR. NEARY: He would not do that.

MR. MARSHALL: No.?

MR. NEARY: He would not do that.

MR. MARSHALL: He was a very embarrassed man, Mr. Chairman. Poor Mr. Chretien made a deal with me but the rug was pulled out from underneath his feet -

MR. NEARY: By Cabot Martin.

MR. MARSHALL: So consequently he had to make these statements. The difference between me and Mr. Chretien, Mr. Chairman, is that I am prepared and I have the authorization of this government at any given time to conclude the agreement in principle that we made with the federal government.

April 11, 1983

Tape No. 861

IB-3

MR. MARSHALL: But you ask Mr. Chretien whether he has that, and that is why Mr. Chretien will not respond to the letter that we wrote to him.

MR. NEARY: You had your chance and you blew it.

MR. MARSHALL: Just listen to it, Mr. Chairman, just listen to it. Can there be any doubt in anybody's mind, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman over there, if there was anything left, would give away every bit of resource that we have in this Province? I mean, how can the hon. gentleman as a Newfoundlander take the position he is taking? How can the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) take it?

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL: I know the hon. member's name is Tom, but he is certainly not an Uncle Tom.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member just finished doing what he specializes in doing. He just finished doing what he is the world's greatest expert at doing, he just finished doing, Mr. Chairman, what is his area of great expertise, he just finished doing what is his great forte, namely, distorting the facts, misrepresenting the facts to condemn the federal government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman in his preamble made some reference to remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who had talked about the fact that without his federal government we would be completely bankrupt, that our people would starve. And the hon. gentleman does not like to hear that, Mr. Chairman, he does not like to talk about the federal government in any positive terms. He wants to speak negatively all of the time. As long as he can speak negatively, then he is delighted. Nowhere along the line does he want to talk about the great Canadian nation.

He continually, Mr. Chairman, gives us his narrow, parochial view. He is continually espousing his illogical and ill-conceived patriotism. That is what the man specializes in. But, Mr. Chairman, anything negative, anything to gain a few political points, that is what the hon. member specializes in, to the extent, Mr.

MR. LUSH: Chairman, of even distorting and misrepresenting the facts about the EPF programme, as the Premier did here today. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am sure that there are many hon. members on the other side of the House who do not know what the EPF programme is all about. Mr. Chairman, let me for a moment demonstrate how the Premier distorting and misrepresented the facts about the EPF programme here today.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Chairman, the EPF programme came into being in 1977 and was a five year agreement, and there were several components under the EPF programme to give this Province and other provinces more money, to give them more money. Two components, Mr. Chairman, under this EPF programme, were health and education, and in 1982 there was to be a new arrangement entered into through discussion and consultation with the federal government and provincial governments right across Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just finished speaking would be the first to condemn the federal government for its huge deficit. He would be the first. But the minute they start doing something about it, he is the first to condemn them. Mr. Chairman, it was because of the difficult financial and economic times that Canada was going through that it was necessary to come up with a new arrangement under EPF and, as I have said before, all of the provinces were consulted and they knew what the arrangements were and they came up with a new arrangement.

Now, what the Premier was doing here today was projecting the figures under that old arrangement, 1972 to 1982. This is what he was doing. And I may use the same analogy as I used earlier, that this is the same as if some group of workers had been getting a certain increase over the past few years and projected their salary ten years into the future by saying, 'If we get that same increase, this is the amount of money that we will get in ten years,' not realizing that when you came into depressed economic times that they would not be getting that increase, and then trying to bluff the people by saying, 'This is what we would have gotten had we got this increase.'

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Chairman, it was a new arrangement entered into in 1982 to fit in with the federal government's 'five and six' restraint programme. Now, it is hypocritical to think that the Government of Canada - and they had agreement with all of the other provinces that they would bring in this 'five and six' restraint programme - it would be hypocritical for the federal government not to follow that in its own programme, in its own financial assistance to the province. And this is what they did, Mr. Chairman, to bring it in line with that. But there were some components under the EPF programme that did not fit in with the 'five and six'. One was Health. For example, we will, in the field of Health this year, get 10 per cent more than we did last year. Even with the 'five and six' restraint programme this Province will receive 10 per cent more in the field of Health than it did last year.

In Education, Mr. Chairman, get this, in Education we will get in excess of 6 per cent more this year than we did last year. But, Mr. Chairman, the Premier, in his effort to condemn the federal government and try to make excuses for his own ineffectiveness, for the ineffectiveness of this government, is projecting figures that had

MR. LUSH:

been agreed to under the old FTF arrangement of 1977. Now, Mr. Chairman, why would the Premier (Mr. Peckford) do that? Again, to try and undermine the federal government and, of course, to try and enhance his own image, to try and convince the people of this Province this is why they have had to increase their taxes, this is why they have had to take away the student aid programme. And, Mr. Chairman, these are not the facts. As a matter of fact, taking the whole EPF programme in its totality, over the next few years this Province will receive 8.1 per cent more than they would have a year ago. The total increase under the EPF will be in excess of 8 per cent. In all areas, we will get, over the next few years, in excess of 8 per cent increase. But the Premier tries to misrepresent and distort the figures by trying to tell our people that we are going to lose \$125 million in the one instance and then, taking all of the figures together, that we will lose \$145 million. Mr. Chairman, a pure misrepresentation and a distortion of the facts.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD):

A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

You are not allowed to impute motives. You are not allowed, Mr. Chairman - you can get it from Beauchesne that is there before you; I have it down below here, but I can give Your Honour the authority - you are not allowed to impute that somebody else is misleading and distorting the facts. That is unparliamentary language and calls for immediate withdrawal, as I know the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) will wish to do.

MR. LUSH: That is not a point of order,
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): To that point of order, I
will have to reserve ruling on it, I was speaking
to the Clerk at the time. I will rule on it tomorrow.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman had his way to compile a dictionary for usage by members on this side of the House, it would indeed contain a very small vocabulary. But, Mr. Chairman, what the Premier tried to do in his attempt to undermine the federal government was to take figures from an old formula, figures that he projected to 1986, when in essence he was party, his Finance Minister was party to the new agreement in 1982. My understanding is that there was not a dissenting voice from this Province; when they entered into that new arrangement on Health and Education, there was not a dissenting voice from this Province. But all of a sudden now, Mr. Chairman, when they realize that they have done nothing, in an effort to try to exonerate themselves, in an effort to try to cover up for their inefficiency and incompetence, they will go back again at the federal government, Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate what we are going to lose in the EPF payment. The truth of the matter, Mr. Chairman, is this, that over the next few years we will be receiving 8.3 per cent - I believe that is the exact figure - we will be getting an increase of 8.3 per cent in the EPF programme over the next three or four years. And that is not bad considering that the federal government have a restraint programme of 'five and six' into effect itself. And over the next few years we will receive 8.3 per cent increase in the EPF financial arrangement or in excess of 8 per cent.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, we can only stomach so much in this life. It is very hard to stomach the apologies that the hon. gentlemen give. Look, there was the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) on his feet for ten or fifteen minutes justifying the federal position on the federal budget. And here, I repeat once again, we have the Consolidated Fund Services up for consideration.

So, Mr. Chairman, you can only stomach one thing by way of substance but this late in the afternoon we certainly cannot stomach two persons from the Opposition speaking consecutively.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has given me a letter from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the one that was touted by his leader, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). So the hon. member is just like his leader, exactly like his leader, a toady and an Uncle Tom who believes everything that Ottawa emotes.

MR. NEARY: At least he is not a frog.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I mean, some of us are and some of us are not, you know, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: It is time for you to get back on your lily.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, we come back again to consideration of the estimates. What I have been trying to do all through the afternoon is to try to get the Opposition to act like an Opposition, to try to show the Opposition how to conduct itself in a parliamentary atmosphere, to try to show the Opposition what exactly is before the House. When the House went into ordinary business, we called the main estimates on Consolidated Fund Services. Now, Mr. Chairman, for the reference of hon. gentlemen, when they come here tomorrow - it will be called again if it is not passed today - it is on page 5 and has various headings and they could ask various questions, if they wish to, on the interest, the statutory interest, the total expenditure on which is \$277 million. And the hon. gentlemen there opposite seem to be completely unaffected by the fact that there is \$277 million that has to be budgeted this year from our budget for the purpose of providing for interest on debt. Now that is a matter of concern. It should be a matter of concern for all members of this House. But the hon. gentlemen there opposite have not asked one single solitary question - and let this go on record - with respect to

MR. MARSHALL: the Consolidated Fund Services. Normally the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would be dealing with Consolidated Fund Services. He is not here today. When I found I had to do it for him, I got the resume, I went through great detailed information - here it is, look, all the background work I had done the weekend on it, look, on Consolidated Fund Services. Not a single question asked with respect to it. And the hon. gentlemen there opposite talk about the estimates should be back in the Committee of the Whole House. He thinks that it would be better, that what we are doing is we are derogating from the parliamentary traditions in this Province, that we have precluded - these are some of the statements - that we are preventing an examination of expenditures that are being made by removing the estimates from the House, from the Committee of the Whole as we are in now, to Estimate Committees.

Now, Mr. Chairman,

I know what the Committees have done. The Committees have done an admirable job. They give private members and members on the other side an opportunity to get fully familiar with the workings of government and they have

MR. MARSHALL: very much of an indepth examination of the estimates themselves. But no matter what they did, whatever their deficiencies could be, Mr. Chairman, they are miniscule, I think Your Honour would agree, to the performane in the Committee of the Whole House , they are miniscule because of the way in which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the members there opposite ask questions. On the one hand he spends all of the afternoon apologizing for the federal government, all of the afternoon he tries to justify Mr. Chretien's position on the offshore and because the Premier of this Province takes certain stands for the benefit of all Newfoundlanders in the Province, and he has done it time and time again, Mr. Chairman, so he draws issue with that. And then you get the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), I thought this was going to be a breath of fresh air this afternoon. When he got up I thought at last we are going to get some very incisive questions into the financial situation of this Province and in particular with respect to the Consolidated Fund Services, which is before the House, but what did we hear? We heard another apology for the federal government. I mean, they are psyched on the federal government. Whatever the federal government says, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentlemen embrace. And when we stand up for the people of this Province and we take positions which are based primarily and solely and entirely on the welfare of the people of this Province, because we dare to speak up for the people of this Province they say we are fighting too much. The former, former Leader of the Opposition now is attempting to become the next Leader of the Opposition

MR. MARSHALL: and he is going to use this as his battle cry. Do you know what his battle cry is, Mr. Chairman?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: I wish you would tell the hon. gentlemen on both sides to keep quiet. I mean, these are very telling comments. But, Mr. Chairman, do you know what the battle cry of the next Leader of the Opposition is going to be? The battle cry is that we are fighting too much with Ottawa. Because we are fighting too much with Ottawa, he wants a chance to deal with Ottawa and he wants a chance to give it away. Well, I have some news for the hon. gentleman there opposite: For every Uncle Tom that there is who walks in this Province today, there are at least ten red-blooded Newfoundlanders who see that all that we are doing in this Province is working daily to see what we can do in order to give the young people of this Province an average per capital income equal to other Canadians -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - to see that we get equality with respect to the management of resources, to see that we are not treated like toadies by the central government, to see that we do not suffer because of our geographical position, to see that we do not suffer because our population is small and merely just to see

MR. MARSHALL: that we take our place in the Canadian Confederation. But the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, are not used to that, and the hon. gentlemen think their sole purpose in life is to be apologists for Uncle Ottawa. I must say I am really disappointed with the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).

Normally he gets up and he asks questions on education and they are very intelligent. You can see he is getting right into it, he is always pulling up his belt before he comes out with something that is really, really weighty and he comes out with these very telling questions to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) day after day after day. So I sat back and I thought, well at last I am going to get an intelligent question on Consolidated Fund Services. But, Mr. Chairman, not a single question about it. He went off in a rage purely and simply because the Premier (Mr. Peckford) had the temerity to endorse the remarks by all of the Finance Ministers, every single one of them, all ten of them, NDP, Party Quebecois, Social Credit and Progressive Conservative. I do not believe there are any Liberal - and there is a good reason for that - there are no Liberals. So he gets up and he tears into the Premier because the Premier had the temerity to get up and table in this House a statement which I believe is being tabled in every Legislature throughout the Nation that is open today with respect to the inadequacies of the financing under the EPF programme by the federal government, but he takes exception to it.

Everybody is out of step but Pierre and Jean and Marc and all of his boys and the little boys who walk to his tune, the little pied pipers here in Newfoundland, the Uncle Toms of this world, the ones

MR. MARSHALL: who would sell us down the drain in a moment, the ones who beg for another chance so that they can do the same thing to this Province as they did when they were in and they gave away the Upper Churchill resources. Again and again, 'Give us another chance,' they cry. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is near the time so I am going to ask that the Committee rise. But before so doing I earnestly desire and I recommend to the hon. gentlemen there opposite that when we come tomorrow the order of business is going to be again Consolidated Fund Services and I would like

MR. MARSHALL: the hon. gentlemen there opposite to please be relevant and to ask questions. There are many questions that can be asked with respect to it. If they need a tutorial tonight we are prepared to give it to them because we can direct them to certain questions that really should be asked and information that perhaps should be gained but can only be gained through the proper procedures in this House of logical, sensible debate. You can only have sensible debate with two sides, one on each side. This side is prepared to debate the financial affairs of this Province and the financial administration of this Province but, unfortunately, the hon. gentlemen there opposite seem incapable of doing it.

So, Mr. Chairman, with those words of advice I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, I would like to advise that the Government Services Committee will meet this evening at seven o'clock in the House of Assembly to review the estimates of the Department of Transportation. The Resource

MR. MARSHALL: Committee will meet tomorrow morning at nine-thirty here in the House of Assembly to review the estimates of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. And the Social Services Committee will meet tomorrow at nine-thirty in the Colonial Building to review the estimates of the Department of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

April 11, 1983

QUESTION NO. 61

ORDER PAPER 13/83

MARCH 25, 1983

QUESTION:

MR. HISCOCK (EAGLE RIVER) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS AND SERVICES TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

DETAILS OF THE COST IN CONNECTION WITH THE RENOVATION OF THE ELEVENTH FLOOR OF THE CONFEDERATION BUILDING INTO A GOVERNMENT CONFERENCE ROOM.

ANSWER:

THE COST TO DATE OF THE RENOVATIONS AND REFURBISHING OF THE CONFERENCE ROOM ON THE ELEVENTH FLOOR HAS BEEN \$279,805.00.