

VOL. 2

NO. 18

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, APRIL 12, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Acting President of Treasury Board, who is on his way, I wish to make the following statement with respect to the teachers' strike.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to clarify the position of Government and the School Boards with respect to the strike by the Province's teachers, which commenced today.

Teachers have now taken strike action in an effort to gain concessions from Government in ongoing negotiations for a new contract. By withdrawing from providing necessary supervision, the teachers have caused the majority of the Province's schools to be closed, since it would be unsafe to open the schools under these conditions.

In cases where the principal and a sufficient number of teachers in a school are prepared to provide required services, including a guarantee that supervision will be maintained, the School Board concerned is prepared to consider the opening of that school. Teachers who are prepared to provide the full range of duties in such situations will receive full pay. Any teacher who is not prepared to carry out all required responsibilities will be on strike. As is consistent with Government's policy in this area, teachers who are on strike will not receive salary or other benefits.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, Government has maintained a reasonable position throughout negotiations with the N.T.A. We must, at all times, be as fair as possible to our employees, while maintaining our overall financial position and the ability to exercise appropriate management discretion in the operation of the schools. The N.T.A., on the other hand, has demonstrated unrealistic expectations in this round of bargaining as evidenced by the fact that there is still, Mr. Speaker, no formal unconditional acceptance of Government's wage restraint policy for a full two-year period. Teachers are still formally demanding a 19-month contract and have indicated informally that they would accept the wage restraint policy only under certain conditions. This policy has already been applied to some 10,000 other employees and has been accepted without conditions.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Teachers will not be treated any differently. They must, like all the other groups in the public service, accept the wage restraint policy without conditions.

Apart from salaries, other outstanding issues include government's proposal to bring substitute teacher pay more in line with that in other provinces. The savings that are to be realized are to be spent to assist in the cost of implementing an improved pupil/teacher ratio next year, which, along with the introduction of Grade XII, is resulting in an additional 450 teaching positions being created this Fall. The NTA is also demanding concessions with respect to working conditions which include the following: One, a commitment that time off should be scheduled during the school day for lesson preparation, administrative and other non-teaching duties; they want a guarantee, in the new contract, that time will be set aside in the school day as it is now defined for non-teaching activities. Two, they want a guarantee of a minimum one hour lunch period. Three, a guarantee that no increase in the length of the school day will be implemented in any school. So they do not want the school day to get any longer; we have to keep it as it is now but build into that very short school day two or three other things that they would do outside of the classroom. And, four, acceptance of the principle that class size will not exceed thirty students. These are some other items that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association negotiating team has put to government as their demands in order to realize a contract.

These kinds of demands would be administratively difficult and/or very costly if written into the collective agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to read a statement and hon. members on the other side keep interrupting me, so I would request that I be protected by the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! Order, please!

Hon. members, I am sure, are aware that when a member is speaking he does have the right to be heard in silence, and I would request hon. members to adhere to that rule.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of demands would be administratively difficult and/or very costly if written into a collective agreement-as one can tell just by the description of them - since they would result in a reduction in instructional time required of teachers and therefore lead to the hiring of additional teachers to do that additional work, you could not have an empty classroom while they were at lunch, or you could not have an empty classroom while they were preparing for another class, so you would have to have additional teachers and therefore that would cost more money. Government and the School Boards have demonstrated by their actions over the years that we are prepared to provide reasonable working conditions for teachers. We are prepared to stand by our record in this area and will not agree to contract language that will restrict our ability to operate the schools efficiently or result in additional costs.

While government and the school boards are available for any discussions with the N.T.A. that might assist in resolving the current impasse, it would appear that some basic change is needed in the NTA's outlook and expectations for real progress to be made.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see the day that I would hear the Premier make such devastatingly destructive remarks about the teachers of this Province. So malicious, Mr. Speaker, and so insidious

MR. LUSH: by twisting, Mr. Speaker, what appear to be the facts surrounding the present negotiations, now in dispute between the government and the teachers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier said in the statement that the teachers have taken strike action. That is not the situation as I know it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: What they have done, Mr. Speaker, is work to rule or the selective withdrawal of services which is not a strike. It is the government and the school boards which have classified this as a strike. It is the government and the school boards which have locked out the teachers. They have locked out the teachers and the teachers of this Province cannot be accused, Mr. Speaker, of causing a strike. They were working to rule. They were simply withdrawing selective services to try and bring pressure upon this government so that they would negotiate. That is what they wanted, Mr. Speaker, so that the government would negotiate in good faith. And as far as the Premier talking about the demands of the teachers, as I see it, as I perceive it, the teachers have one demand and that is to get back to the bargaining table. That is what they want to do, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the bargaining table.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the teachers not accepting the two year restraint programme, Sir, I would submit that somebody is not telling the truth in this particular situation. The President of the NTA has said time and time again that as of some time in January that they said that they would accept the restraint programme - the 5 per cent and the 6 per cent - that they would accept it over the two year period.

MR. TULK: Providing the government would negotiate.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier does not like conditions. That is what the collective bargaining process is all about, conditions. Now the Premier is a good one to talk about conditions. And I expect that the NTA is simply following his example because he puts a condition on everything. So, Mr. Speaker, let it be known that the NTA have stated categorically that

MR. LUSH: they have accepted, Mr. Speaker, the two year restraint programme providing the government will negotiate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the NTA want one courtesy, they have one demand from this government and that is to get back to the negotiating table and get the schools opened in this Province, because the one group of people who are suffering from this crisis are the students out there in our schools. That is the group of people, Mr. Speaker, who are suffering. So the NTA are making one demand, asking one courtesy of the government, and that is to get down to the bargaining table, to get back to the bargaining table and start negotiating in good faith.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform hon. members of certain changes and a retirement within the St. John's Fire Department. As members are aware, the fire department is responsible within the jurisdiction of the St. John's Metropolitan Area.

It is with regret that I announce the retirement of Fire Chief Augustine Gosse. Chief Gosse was head of the fire department since November 1, 1978, actually retired on March 31, 1983, after completing thirty-eight years of service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am sure that all hon. members will wish to join me in paying tribute to Chief Gosse for his long and loyal years of service to this Province. There are few people in our time who willingly serve beyond the normal period of service. On behalf of my colleagues I wish to express sincere appreciation to the retiring chief.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to announce the appointment of a new fire chief to succeed Chief Gosse. By coincidence he is also a Gosse but he is not related to the retired Chief. As of April 1, 1983, Assistant Chief Douglas R. Gosse has been promoted to the position of Fire Chief of the St. John's Fire Department.

The new Chief was born at Spaniard's Bay in 1928, received his early education there. He joined the Fire Department in 1950 and served in a variety of positions. He has been an Assistant Chief since 1978, and prior to his promotion to Chief served as Assistant Chief in charge of administration.

The new Chief has successfully completed a variety of courses in fire fighting and related fields. He is married to the former Elizabeth Whalen of Bauline. They have two children.

On behalf of the government, and the people whom the fire department serves, I would like to congratulate Fire Chief Douglas Gosse on his promotion to the chieftancy of the fire department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is not very often these days that we get an opportunity to agree with the government on anything, but we certainly agree with the hon. minister who just made his Ministerial Statement on the retirement of Fire Chief Gosse and the appointment of Douglas R. Gosse to replace the retired Fire Chief. We agree with the minister that both of these gentlemen are very qualified. In the case of Fire Chief Gosse, he has provided yeoman service to the city of St. John's and the metropolitan area for the last thirty-eight years, which is a long time. He is a good man and we wish him many, many years of good health and happiness in his retirement. We also wish the new Fire Chief well in his new position.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR.LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. I wonder if the minister can indicate what the status is today with respect to the confrontation between the government and the teachers, whether or not there is any change in the situation, whether the minister has done anything over the past twenty-four hours to resolve the situation, and whether there has been any exchange or offerings of olive branches?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS.VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I regret to report that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association has not made any approach to anyone in the provincial government or the Federation of School Boards to restart talks.

MR. TULK: They have not bowed down, right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS.VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I also have to reiterate that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association has never, first nor last, indicated a willingness to accept government's wage restraint programme as has been accepted by 10,000 other public servants for the full twenty-four months or two years of their contract term. The NTA bargaining committee at a meeting in late January, to which the NTA president has referred to on the news media today, informally, verbally indicated that they might be willing to have the wage restraint guidelines for twenty-four months, the same as everyone else, if strings were attached. Before that, and to this moment, officially the NTA has only ever said that they would have the guidelines for nineteen months,

MS VERGE: from September 1, 1982 until March 31, 1984. Either position is different from that of the 10,000 other public servants who have abided by what the people of this Province regard as a fair and reasonable and necessary wage restraint programme so that we continue to have enough money to maintain all our necessary programmes for the people of the Province. So unfortunately, since Question Period yesterday, the NTA has not made any approach to anyone in the provincial government or the Federation of School Boards to resume talks. There has been some rhetoric on Open Line radio programmes about the NTA wanting to resume negotiations but that rhetoric has not materialized, neither has the NTA changed its position rejecting government's wage restraint programme, a programme that has been accepted by 10,000 other public servants.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: The minister must have anticipated a question a little further along the way because I did not ask any question about the wage restraints, but maybe I will get to that if I have time.

The question, Mr. Speaker, was what has the minister done or what has the NTA done, or whether there was any exchange of olive branches? Now, the minister indicated that there were no moves by the NTA. Well, the question I have to ask the minister is did the minister herself make any moves in the last twenty-four hours? Did she offer an olive branch to try to bring both sides together in the interest of solving this critical problem that we face in Newfoundland today?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as I said publicly before, I and the other members of this government, the officials of Treasury Board and the Department of Education, the members of the Federation of School Boards and the full Employer Bargaining Committee stand ready to meet with and talk with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association executive or bargaining committee when the NTA request such an exchange, when the NTA indicate a willingness to accept the financial realities of this Province today, when the NTA indicate acceptance of government's wage restraint programme for the full twenty-four months or two years of their contract term, the same as all the other public servants.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what does the minister think her responsibilities are? Is it not the responsibility of the minister and of the administration to get the schools open, or has the minister just given up, abdicated her responsibilities, just thrown up her hands in a hope that the problem will just disappear? Is it not

MR. S. NEARY: the responsibility of the minister and the administration to keep these schools open?

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have a responsibility to all the people of this Province, the students, their parents and all the other people - the old people, single people, unemployed people, fish plant workers, mill workers, miners, lawyers, public servants, everyone-to prudently manage revenues at the disposal of the provincial government so that we maintain a good education system which I am sure we can do with the do with the \$260 - odd million we have allocated for teachers' salaries in the next year, so that we maintain a good health care system, so that we maintain decent social services, so that we upgrade our roads and, Mr. Speaker, I feel that in carrying out that obligation to the people of this Province that I and this government cannot be blackmailed by the Newfoundland Teachers'

Association who are attempting to use students as pawns -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - who are attempting to carry out a strike as a lever to extract -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MS. VERGE: - from this government money that we do not have, money that we would have to get by raising taxes, by adding to our deficit or by taking away from the budgets for Health, Social Services or roads. I would like to ask the Opposition member, does he favour giving into the demands of the NTA by raising taxes? Should we have a 13 per cent sales tax so we can pay more to the NTA?

April 12, 1983

Tape No. 877

MJ - 2

MS. VERGE: Would the Opposition Leader (Mr. Neary) like to add to our deficit? Should we have a \$50 million deficit this year? What is another few million dollars, he might say. Or should we take away from the hospital budgets? Or should we spend less fixing up roads so that we can divert more money to add the teachers' payroll? Should we pay more than \$260 - odd million dollars to teachers next year? Because those are the only options available to satisfy the present unreasonable demands of the NTA.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister asked me a question and I will answer her by saying that I would not try to balance the budget, I would not try to recoup the deficit on the backs of the teachers and the children in this Province as the administration is attempting to do. This is a plot. It is a plot, Mr. Speaker, to force the teachers out of the classrooms and use the countervailing savings -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - to wipe out the deficit.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously making his speech. This is the Question Period.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. minister asked me a question and I was merely answering the question. And I was ending up by saying that the administration is forcing the teachers out of the classrooms, using the countervailing savings to wipe out any deficit in current account.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Basic purpose of the Question Period, in my understanding, is normally for the Opposition to ask questions of government and not the reverse. The hon.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary)

was entering into the realm of debate. Perhaps he would

like to pose a question to the hon. minister.

MR. NEARY: No, I will yield to my colleague.

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

MR. LUSH: Hopefully the minister in

responding the next time will retract her statement about

the teachers blackmailing the government. But anyway,

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is this: Does

the minister not see her role in this critical situation

right now as a mediator? Does she not see herself as

a mediator, not adopting the confrontational attitude

like her senior ministers? Does she not see herself as

a mediator and, if so, what steps is she going to take

in the next few hours to try to resolve this dispute,

to try to get both sides back together to get negotiating

so that we can have a satisfactory resolution to this

problem and get education back on the tracks again?

MR. TULK: Never mind using terms like

'blackmail'.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) of this Province today and the education critic opposite (Mr. Lush) yesterday have played politics with such an important and sensible issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, we have all just heard the Leader of the Opposition stand in his place in this hon. House and say, when I suggest that he knows full well the difference, that this government is taking some pleasure in saving money at the expense of students as a result of this teachers' strike.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You are! You are!

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as I said repeatedly this government has provision to pay next year 8,500 teachers an average salary of \$30,000 making a total payroll of \$260 million plus. That money is budgeted for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask the members opposite to tell everyone in this hon. House, and to tell their constituents, to tell the general public, are they suggesting that we pay more to the teachers next year? Is that what they are suggesting? And if so, Mr. Speaker, would they tell us where we are going to find that extra money? Should we get it by raising taxes? Should we get it by adding to our deficit?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: Adding to the deficit, is that the solution? Or should we get it by taking it from the budgets of other government departments? Mr. Speaker, if these members opposite are going to do anything to aid the resolution of the present regrettable conflict that is harming students, then the members opposite are going to have to stop

MS. VERGE: their negative, destructive criticism and come up with some positive, constructive alternatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have teamwork, the old one-two. They used to call it the old one-two. Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing in Newfoundland today is the virtual collapse of the education system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour made a ruling,

I believe there a few minutes ago, about silence when a member is speaking, Mr. Speaker. We would like to have the same rules enforced on that side of the House, Your Honour. Could we have the rules enforced on that side too?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I do not know if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is inferring that the Chair is being partisan or not and not enforcing the rules of the House.

MR. NEARY: No. No. No. No.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is correct in saying just now the Chair did say that an hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: Right.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing in this Province at the moment is the virtual collapse of the educational system. I am going to ask the minister a very serious question because, judging by the answers that my colleague is getting and the answers that we have been getting on this side of the House in the last few days, the minister does not seem to be aware of what her responsibilities are, so I am going to ask her to tell the House what she thinks her responsibilities are in this matter. Does she think her job is to sit back and do nothing? Does she think that her job is just to make rude remarks and cast aspersions and insults at the NTA? Does the hon. minister feel that her responsibility is to try to intervene and get the schools opened? Would she tell the House what she thinks her duties are responsibilities are?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I said before that I feel that I have many responsibilities as a member of this government. As Minister of Education I have important responsibilities to students to safeguard their right to a good education. Mr. Speaker, I also have responsibilities to those same individuals, their parents, their grandparents,

MS. VERGE: to all the other people of the Province who need all kinds of other services and programmes from government. And as a member of the administration of the Province, as one of the team which makes decisions collectively for the overall well being of all the people of the Province, I have an important responsibility to see that a fair and reasonable amount of money is dedicated to education, and that a fair and reasonable salary arrangement is made for teachers. And, Mr. Speaker, I believe that I and all the other members of this government have discharged that responsibility in very difficult times by providing for the addition of a number of full-time teaching positions in this Province for kindergarten through high school, from the present 8,000 at an average salary of \$28,000,

MS. VERGE: to a new high of 8,500 teachers in September at a new higher average salary of \$30,000 for a total teachers' payroll next year of over \$260 million. And, Mr. Speaker, the addition to the number of teachers in this Province has to be related to the number of students they are going to teach. Next school year, Mr. Speaker, we are making provision for 8,500 teachers to teach about 146,000 students, which will give us an actual pupil/teacher ratio of 17.2 students for every teacher. This government is planning to pay a salary averaging \$30,000 for every 17.2 students due to be in our schools in September and, Mr. Speaker, using the same statistical indicator for all the other provinces of Canada, we will have -

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

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe one of the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, is that you have to give brief answers. Your answers should be as brief as possible. The question I put to the minister had to do with her duties and responsibilities. Now she has entered into a great debate, Mr. Speaker, about the educational system, how we finance it and so forth. If I wanted to I could tell the minister where to get money to pay the teachers - if I wanted to. I am not the government so I am not going to do it. But what the minister is doing, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: But you will deal with it.

MR. NEARY: Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with it later on maybe this afternoon. I will give the minister a few suggestions of where she can find some of the money to help meet the commitments to the teachers. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that her answers are long and

MR. S. NEARY: repetitious and tedious. The hon. the minister sounds like a voice from the grave over there and I think that she should get to the point and answer the question that was put to her to tell the House what her duties and responsibilities are.

MR. WM. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President of the Council on that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, the question asked the hon. minister was what were her duties and I sure the hon. the minister could talk all day as to what her duties are. This administration is different from the one the hon. gentleman belonged to in which if he were asked such a question it would be 'Sit down, Steve', or, 'Sit down, Max' or whatever there duties were.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Also, Mr. Speaker, since the hon. gentleman is on a point of order, if he wants to quote authorities and Beauchesne, one should not multiply with slight variations a similar question on the same point or repeat in substance a question already answered or to which an answer had been refused. That is Beauchesne, the little red book for the hon. gentleman on the opposite side.

So, Mr. Speaker, that was the nature of the question that the hon. gentleman asked and the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) was merely replying to the question that he asked.

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

MR. MORGAN: He has got the green book now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Here he goes! Here he goes!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port on a point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I can see that the government benches are desirous of interrupting Question Period as much as possible.

MR. CALLAN: Now you can see why they do not want television in the House. What a bunch of fools.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: It is becoming a problem more and more in this House of Assembly that ministers answering questions do not deal with the subject matter from which the question is asked.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question asked of the Minister of Education was what her duties were in relation to this strike and it is quite clear if the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. HODDER: the devil can always quote from scripture and the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) always quotes Beauchesne to his own advantage. But it does say in Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, that answers should be as brief as possible, which certainly is not a practice in this House, and should deal with the subject matter raised. And the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) particularly takes every opportunity possible to give us a whole lecture and run-down on the Department of Education instead of answering questions, which she is incapable of doing anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

It is correct, of course, that the Question Period is designed basically for short questions which should require short answers. It is also correct that sometimes, by the very nature of the question asked, it may require a relatively longer answer than might be necessary. Perhaps the Chair may be a little negligent in not suggesting that some of the questions are not in order and that they could be placed on the Order Paper because they do require long answers.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for

Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: The minister in responding to questions a moment ago talked about how I and my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), were trying to make politics out of this. Well, I can tell the minister I never received so much correspondence in all my life, never received so many phone calls from teachers all over this Province complimenting me for how skillfully I have been handling this job for them over the past couple of weeks -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: - Mr. Speaker, and complimenting me for keeping politics out of this. It is heart warming, Mr. Speaker, to have the support of all of those teachers. But, Mr. Speaker, back to the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: The Premier in his statement today, Mr. Speaker, said that the teachers are still formally demanding a nineteen month contract, whereas the President of the NTA has been saying that the NTA have notified the government formally that they will accept the twenty-four month wage restraint programme. As a matter of fact, just quoting, Mr. Speaker, it says: 'Noseworthy said the teachers are willing to accept the government's wage restraint programme if the government would agree to the rest of the items the NTA wanted in the contract'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is negotiations, that is what collective bargaining is all about. So my question to the minister is this -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair just finished saying

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): that Question Period is designed for short questions which require short answers. I think the Chair has been more than lenient with the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and the preamble to his question.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is simply this: Since the government are saying one thing and the NTA are saying another thing, where is the truth, Mr. Speaker? Are the government telling a lie or is it the NTA, or is the truth somewhere in between? Will the minister indicate to this House what is the truth with respect to these two positions, the government saying one thing and the NTA saying another? Where is the truth?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to give this hon. House the correct information. The Newfoundland Teachers' Association have not until this moment said anything to the provincial government or the Federation of School Boards formally other than an acceptance of government's wage restraint programme for a nineteen month period from September 1st, 1982 until March 31st, 1984.

MS. VERGE: At one meeting of the two negotiating teams in late January to which the NTA president, Mr. Wayne Noseworthy, referred in some radio interviews this morning, one of which I heard myself, the NTA representative said informally, indicated verbally, did not say formally, did not acknowledge in writing that the NTA would be willing to have the wage restraint programme apply for the full twenty-four months or two years of the contract term but only under certain conditions. That was said on that occasion at one meeting in late January and it has been trotted out again in the last few days in various news media interviews conducted by the NTA president. And, as I said right in the beginning of Question Period, since the big NTA annual convention last week there has been no approach from the Newfoundland Teachers' Association executive or bargaining committee to anyone in the provincial government or the Federation of School Boards to sit down and resume talks.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, to put this in its proper perspective, because this is an important point, is the minister saying that the NTA is not telling the truth when they say that they have agreed formally, that they have presented the government with their formal acceptance of accepting this twenty-four month restraint programme? Is the NTA not telling the truth? Have they not formally presented the government or the negotiating team with their offer to accept this twenty-four month restraint programme? That is the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: I think the member opposite, the education critic, is trying to manufacture a dichotomy.

MS VERGE: To my knowledge the NTA president has not said that he or the NTA have ever indicated willingness to accept government's wage restraint guideline for the full two year period. Mr. Speaker, the member opposite cannot read. The quote he just gave contains the word 'if'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS VERGE: The NTA president has been saying to news reporters and has been quoted by the news media that conditional acceptance of the wage restraint guidelines for two years is all that is contemplated by the NTA. I do not think the NTA president has ever said unequivocally -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - that the NTA will accept the wage restraint programme for the full two years.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, instead of the minister barricading herself in her office -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - listening to open-line programmes, would it not be better for the hon. minister to get in touch with the NTA and try to get back to the bargaining tables, instead of being paranoid about the whole matter?

Let me ask the minister this; as a parent I, along with all the other parents in this Province, are very concerned about what will happen to the children, if the children are out for a prolonged period of time - I am sure that the minister must have thought about this before the administration forced the teachers out, locked the teachers out of the classroom, the minister must have thought about this - how will they make up the time? How will the Grade XI students, for instance, how will they move on? They are going to be the first students to enter the expanded education system in this Province, how will they move on? How will my two children whom I have in school, how will they move from Grade IX to Grade X? How will their marks be judged? What exams will they do? It looks like the government are hellbent on keeping the teachers locked out and keeping the schools closed until September so they can get their deficit in current account back. If that happens, if that is the plot, if that is the plan, then how will the students fare off?

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is a foolish question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Listen to the dictator.

MR. NEARY: This is a very, very serious matter, Mr. Speaker.

The question is how will the students, if they are out until September, if they are out beyond June how will they move on? How will the schools base whether they are going to graduate or not, whether they are going to be promoted or not? How will all this take place? I am sure the minister must have thought about it when she agreed to lock the teachers out of the classroom.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, only because I know that a lot of people in this Province are seriously concerned about an answer to part of the question posed by the Opposition Leader (Mr. Neary) will I give a serious response and ignore a lot of the provocative and irresponsible and untrue remarks which he just made -

MR. NEARY: I happen to be a parent. I happen to be a parent with two kids in school.

MS. VERGE: - in directing that question.

MR. NEARY: How many children do you have in school?

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this government is not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - expecting or counting on schools being closed for very long.

MR. NEARY: I happen to have two kids in school.

MS. VERGE: We very much regret that the

MS. VERGE:

Newfoundland Teachers' Association have chosen strike as a tactic to try to extract more money out of this administration, out of this government, derived from the taxpayers of the Province, which we simply cannot afford.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the schools are closed for very many days, some students will be hurt, there is no way around it, because there really is no replacements for full-time instruction by teachers in their classrooms in a school setting. Some students, a certain percentage, a minority I would suggest, have the ability, have the initiative to study at home on their own, and some students may be fortunate in getting some guidance and supervision from their parents or other qualified adults or other people. Some students will be able to make up for lost time by learning at a more accelerated pace when they return to school.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no getting around the fact that there will be other students in neither of these categories who will be hurt by the strike. And, Mr. Speaker, I and the officials of my department are monitoring this situation and we will try to anticipate the duration of the disruption of services, and we will announce to the general public any steps that we can take at our disposal within our controls to try to give assistance to the students while their schools are closed as soon as that becomes feasible and desirable to do so.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to report the Committee on Social Services have passed Head XII - Environment; Head XIII - Education; Head XIV - Social Services; Head XV - Health; Head XVII - Culture, Recreation and Youth; and Head XIX - Justice.

o o o

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to move that the regular business of this House be suspended to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the virtual collapse of the educational system in this Province due to the lockout of teachers by this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: There is no lockout.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not need to quote to Your Honour the rules again warranting the passage or the acceptance of such a motion. I would indicate to Your Honour that this motion is out of order.

MR. W. MARSHALL: It is not, in the first place, a motion that is a matter of urgency of debate. There is a distinction between the urgency of a matter and the urgency of debate. And, secondly, Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of opportunity in the Orders of the Day for anybody to make any comments with respect to any of the subject matter of that motion.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, this is an urgent matter of debate, it is one of most urgent things that has happened since this House of Assembly has opened. The children of this Province are on the streets, children both of whose parents work, there are children whose futures are in jeopardy. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has shown today in the House of Assembly that she has no intention of taking any initiative to stop this. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a matter of urgency and, not only that, Mr. Speaker, but we are dealing with the estimates of the budget in the House on a very narrow and restricted field and we cannot debate this particular thing under of the Orders of the Day as they appear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sure the matter of the NTA problem with the provincial government is of great concern to everybody, the House has just spent practically thirty minutes of the question period talking about it. The Address in Reply is on the Order Paper, the Committee of Supply is on the Order Paper, there has been a very wide-ranging debate in the Committee of Supply and in fact the Chairman of the Committee of Supply is finding it rather difficult to rule on relevancy. I have to rule that this motion is not in order at this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. W. MARSHALL: Committee of the Whole on Supply.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

Before we continue with the Committee of Supply today, yesterday I reserved ruling on a point of order raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). I have checked Hansard on the wording referred to by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and I rule that there was a difference of opinion, not a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think I have a few minutes left from the speaking time I had yesterday afternoon. I would just like to use it to encourage the hon. gentlemen on the other side to use the time with respect to the considerations of the Committee of the Whole on Consolidated Revenue Fund to simply ask questions

MR. MARSHALL:

concerning the financial position of the Province. Now, that is a queer appeal to have to be made by the Government of the Province, to ask the Opposition to ask questions concerning the financial affairs of the Province.

They said, Oh, it was much better to have the estimates in Committee of the Whole, that what we were doing, we were assailing the very roots of democracy in this Province, that we precluded an indepth examination of the estimates and it could only be done in Committee of the Whole. Yet, Mr. Chairman, we spent all day yesterday and we did not get one single question concerning the matter before this Committee, on Consolidated Fund Services. For instance, why not ask some questions as to why there was an increase in the statutory interest provided under Heading 1? What about the Rental Purchase subsidy, how much is left owing on the Confederation Building and any other buildings? What buildings, in fact, are covered by Rental subsidies? How much is it costing the Province? Is it better to do it by hire purchase or is it better to do it by borrowing? What about the loan guarantees, Mr. Chairman, what loan guarantees are outstanding? What had to be honoured by the Province? What is it costing the Province? Were any of these questions asked, Mr. Chairman? Not one single one of them.

Debt management expenses;
What were the debt management expenses? How much was paid to underwriters? How much was paid to the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) favourite group of people, the lawyers? Not a question, not a single solitary question

MR. MARSHALL: with respect to it. What about the pensions? Why would they not ask about the pensions - what is the status of the pension fund? What is the pension fund?

PREMIER PECKFORD: How many are getting the pension?

MR. MARSHALL: The pension fund, as the hon. gentlemen there opposite know, was non-existent up to a few years ago, when we decided to capitalize the pension fund. What about asking a few questions as to the state of the finances of the pension fund. What about ex gratia payments that are set out here? What about all of the other myriad concerns that concern this Province, and the concern is so much seeded in this expenditure, Consolidated Fund Services? Because, Mr. Chairman as I explained, as patiently as I could, yesterday to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), this is one fund that cannot be touched, this is a fund which by and large is not voted by this Committee because it represents interest on commitments of government, both past and present. One of the ways to tackle the present situation in this Province, to provide more money for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) so that the Minister of Education will be able to provide more fully for educational facilities in this Province, and the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is to get the amounts of expenditure in Consolidated Revenue Fund down as low as they possibly can be. But, the hon. gentlemen there opposite Mr. Chairman, are not interested in that, they are not interested in asking questions on it. Now they have an opportunity to prove in Committee of the Whole what they have contended from time to time, that the changes in the rules which we made, which, by the way, were very beneficial, and have worked out extremely well in the individual committees,

MR. MARSHALL: . . . and we feel are more superior,
they contended that it would be better in Committee of
the Whole. Well, Mr. Chairman they have not

MR. MARSHALL:

given us any indication of the Committee of the Whole being any better than the individual committees, themselves. I think that the best way to show this would be to be able to read the record from Hansard of yesterday and the discussions that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was getting into yesterday, and the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). Not one single, and I repeat, solitary question was rendered as to why this amount of money was being spent, how come the revised expenditures are shown bigger than the budgeted ones for last year, how true are your budgeted figures this year, how much interest is this Province paying on the loans which it has encountered, how can we deal with the financial situation of the Province, how can we get more revenue, what are the sources of the revenue? The source of revenue is obviously the taxation of the people as the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) indicated today. The only that we are going to get, in the short term, more money to pay the excessive demands that are made on the public purse is to, at the present time, increase taxes. And the people of this Province have been taxed beyond limit. It is the aim of this government to do its utmost to see if it can bring the taxes down to at least the national average. But it cannot do it in the meantime, because it has to operate schools, has to operate hospitals, it has to pay the demands from the Social Services Department and the civil servants and on and on and on. So it is quite obvious that the only other place where we are going to get the revenue to put this Province on a firmer foundation is through our resources. Now the next thing you ask, 'Well, what are the chances of getting them from our resources?' We know what the situation is

MR. MARSHALL: with respect to hydro power in this Province. There is \$600 million a year being creamed out of this Province, reamed out of this Province, by the Province of Quebec as a result of a contract that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was in effect a party to some years ago - \$600 million.

MR. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. MARSHALL: It is true, Mr. Chairman. He was a member of the administration which very carelessly gave off the Upper Churchill River to a private company, BRINCO Corporation, and allowed them to peddle it off to Hydro Quebec. And with the willing agreement and connivance of the then federal government of the day, we were denied our legitimate rights, which is the right of any Canadian province to sell its commercial product, i.e. hydro power, through the provinces. Instead of that we had to sell it at the border. We did not really have to sell it at the border, Mr. Chairman, if we had had a government in that day which was a government like we have today, that is insisting on our rights, we would never be in the situation today with respect to the Upper Churchill that we are. Instead of the \$600 million going into the Province of Quebec the \$600 million would be here, we would not be paying out \$225 million a year in interest, as is reflected in the Consolidated Revenue Fund, instead we would have this money to be able to use it for purposes such as educational purposes, for health purposes and various other services. We would have it for the purpose of developing this Province, to see what we could do

MR. MARSHALL:

to bring Newfoundlanders along the same avenues as their counterparts in other parts of Canada, and see that they could have long-lasting job and good jobs with incomes equal to the average that is earned by their counterparts in other parts of Canada. That is what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his sad little band of people have done to this Province and we are seeing the results of that today when we labour under crushing costs such as are shown in the Consolidated Fund Services, and we are unable, therefore, to make the expenditures that are so vitally needed in the fields of Health, Education, Social Services and Development in this Province.

Then at the other side of the coin, realizing that the money has to come from somewhere - it cannot come from taxes, it has to come from resources - we cannot lose sight of the situation with respect to the offshore. I do not think I have ever seen the Opposition in such glee as they were when the Supreme Court of Newfoundland came in with its decision with respect to the offshore. They were in absolute and complete ecstasy about it, if you can believe it. They might call themselves Liberals, they would qualify for that, but they can hardly call themselves Newfoundlanders, with that particular type of attitude. They were and they remain in great glee over the fact that the judicial decision rendered by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland ruled in favour of the federal government on the offshore. And furthermore, Mr. Chairman, instead of standing up for Newfoundland and urging their federal counterparts in Ottawa to honour the agreement that was entered into in principle between Mr. Chretien and myself in December, 1982 and January, 1983,

MR. MARSHALL: which would have once again afforded a measure of income to this Province and would have enabled us to provide the services that we would like to provide in Health, Education and otherwise, and develop this Province, which would have enabled us to see the day when the young people in this Province would have been able to have that income, or 75 per cent of that income anyway, up to the time in which their own incomes equal the average of their counterparts in other parts of Canada, that would have seen us gain a measure of control that would have allowed us to determine how the development was going to take place, rather than see what we will see as time transpires - floating platforms being towed in from Quebec and Nova Scotia and what have you, while the federal government pays attention to the areas that have the largest number of seats and the heck with little Newfoundland that has seven seats. We saw a vivid example of it the other day in connection with the oil rigs. When we gave an order because of predicted weather conditions that drilling should cease, What did the federal government do? The federal government insisted, no, that will not be just because Newfoundland said it was to be. What happened afterwards? On two occasions they were forced to remove the rigs from fleeing ice packs.

MR. MARSHALL: And when they were removing them, Mobil Oil was about to bring the rigs into Marystown where they should be, because they are drilling on our continental shelf that we brought into Confederation with us, and what happened then, Mr. Chairman? They were going to teach little Newfoundland a lesson so they would not allow them to bring them into Marystown. They were forcing Mobil, under the threat to Mobil that they would revoke their licences, they were forcing Mobil to bring them in to Nova Scotia. When we kicked up a fuss about that, what did Mobil do? Mobil towed them around on the high seas off the Province, did not bring them anywhere, and they are still being towed around, Mr. Chairman, avoiding the ice. In the meantime, what could and should have happened is that those rigs should have been in Marystown where necessary repairs could have been done on them. Instead, next Summer those repairs will be done and there will be people out of work and the hon. gentlemen there Opposite will be in their glee once again because of their subservient, slavish, Uncle Tomish support to the federal government. If we had had this kind of attitude when the hon. gentleman was in government, if he had had any gumption at all, we would not have these situations and we would not have the problems that we have associated with the Upper Churchill giveaway which is causing the financial situation we are in today.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what a narrow-minded point of view. We just heard another tirade from a bitter Conservative; a narrow-minded point of view. We have just seen another example of the hatred of anything that is Liberal. Mr. Chairman, the Board of Trade in

MR. NEARY: the most recent publication of their magazine wrote an editorial about freedom of speech in this Province and we just had an example of why they were forced, why a group of people like the Board of Trade were forced to write such a harsh editorial in their magazine. We just had an example from the hon. gentleman. If you do not subscribe to the Tory point of view, if you do not toe the Tory line, if you do not knuckle under the Tory leadership, the Tory way, if you do not do it the Tory way, if you do not do it the minister's way then you do not do it at all. That is what the hon. gentleman just said and nobody in this Province dare express an opposite point of view. Now their way, the Tory way has failed. In eleven years all you can point to in this Province is one failure after another, failure after failure, Mr. Chairman. You can point to greed and failure. We have the most greedy Premier we have had in our whole history.

MR. BAIRD: Yes, and the most stupid Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, greed and envy, and narrow-mindedness, that is all you get from the Tories. And that is the Tory way. We just do not happen to think that that way is the right way, Mr. Chairman. The Premier may be a good politician. Well, Winston Churchill was a good politician. President Roosevelt was a good politician. Mr. Smallwood was a good politician. But, Mr. Chairman, the difference in all these gentlemen was that they were good administrators. They could administrate. They could govern. That is the difference. The Premier may be a good politician, but he is a poor administrator. And I regret to have to say that.

MR. YOUNG: Who said that? I knew it was you.

MR. WARREN: The undertaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we do not need the interruptions from the undertaker at this moment. I am answering some criticism from the minister responsible for the offshore.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we happen to think there is another way. The majority of people in this Province happen to think there is another way to do things other than the Tory way, which is associated and identified with failure, one failure after the other.

Mr. Chairman, at least when Mr. Smallwood started the Upper Churchill he finished it. But that is more than we can say about the Lower Churchill. They set off two explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle to start the development of the Lower Churchill, which cost the taxpayers of this Province \$300 million or \$400 million on which we are paying interest.

MR. TULK: Who did?

MR. NEARY: The Tory Administration.

And then after the election was over they cancelled the project. At least Mr. Smallwood

MR. NEARY:

finished the one he started.

Then they nationalized the Churchill Falls Corporation and kicked out BRINCO, another \$500 million or \$600 million of taxpayer money and nothing accomplished, not a single thing accomplished and now we heard from the minister yesterday that the Churchill Falls Corporation is likely to go bankrupt. If they had left it with the private company, Mr. Chairman, it would have been better off than it is today, but they nationalized it, kicked out one of the best corporate citizens we had in this Province. And what was the other thing they did? They nationalized the Labrador Linerboard mill.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who did?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Crosbie. Another \$500 million of taxpayer money. Now, Mr. Chairman, put all that together and you are talking about upwards of \$1 billion that was added to the public debt of this Province by this administration, on three items alone, that was squandered and wasted and thrown away.

MR. NEARY:

You might as well have taken it and gone out on a binge. Mr. Chairman, how narrow-minded can you get? The hon. gentleman can get up all he wants with his buttoned-down mind in this Province, he is not going to intimidate the Opposition. Mr. Montgomery, the professor over at the university was right, this government has completely mismanaged the natural resources of this Province. They cannot point their finger to one success in eleven years, nothing but failure, one failure after the other. And they threw away the last opportunity we had for the offshore treasure. When the Premier threw that matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, he gambled with the offshore treasure, he lost. And, Mr. Chairman, hon. gentlemen on that side of the House seemed to be greatly relieved that the Newfoundland Appeals Court ruled in favour of Canada. They seemed to be relieved, because they can continue to play their little political games and blame things on other people. They do not have to do anything themselves, they do not have to do anything with that resource. They can sit back and keep blaming and blaming and it will get us nowhere, and people will continue to suffer and be unemployed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman gave us a lecture about getting the answers to some questions. Well, I will put three or four questions to the hon. gentleman and I hope the hon. gentleman will give me the answers. Copy them down. Give us a list of the law firms that are involved in bond issues in this Province. Give us a list of the law firms' individual lawyers involved in the transactions, not only representing the government, representing the bondholders and the government's fiscal agents. Also, tell us what bank handles the Newfoundland Government's accounts. Give us the name of the bank or

MR. NEARY: banks. And tell us, Mr. Chairman, how much the nationalization of CFLCo has cost the taxpayers of this Province?

MR. WARREN: That is three questions.

MR. NEARY: That is three questions.

I will gladly take my seat and give the hon. gentleman a chance to answer them, if he is so anxious to answer questions.

And number four, while the hon. gentleman is on his feet, instead of giving us the Tory view, the Tory way of doing things that has been a failure up to now, tell us about the Auditor General's comments on the pension plan in this Province, the Auditor General's concern about whether or not the pension fund is going to be able to survive and look after all of those who are retired or who will retire in the future?

MR. DAWE: If you were so concerned you would have funded it when you were in power.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman was supposed to be down in Wabush yesterday but he did not make it, and they are pretty sore with the hon. gentleman down there. The hon. gentleman used the excuse that he had to stay in St. John's to get his estimates approved. What a load of hogwash!

MR. NEARY: That could have waited until tomorrow or the next day or next week. The hon. gentleman did not have the courage, he was too cowardly to go down and face the people down in Wabush and Labrador City and let his colleague go down and make a fool of himself. We will be dealing with that at another time. But there are four questions for the hon. gentleman to answer.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are exhausted.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are exhausted.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not exhausted, I could go on for a week.

So, Mr. Chairman, let us hear about - and who are the bankers, by the way, for the Crown corporations? Is it one bank that handles all the government's accounts and the accounts of the Crown corporations like Newfoundland Hydro and the Liquor Corporation and so forth and so on? And what lawyers represent these banks? What law firm? These are questions that I hope the hon. gentleman will address himself to. And I will gladly take my seat, Mr. Chairman, and wait for the answers.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I will deal with his specifics first, the questions that exhausted the poor chap, Mr. Chairman, before I get on to his general comments, because I want to say a few words about the Board of Trade.

The law firms and the bond issues: Last year there were the following issues: the \$75 million Euro/U.S. issue, the \$100 million U.S. and a \$50 million Canadian. It has been our practice where possible to discontinue any local legal services in these areas unless they are absolutely required. In the Euro

MR. MARSHALL: \$75 million one, the note I have is there were none. In the Canadian issue there were none. In the U.S. issue the amount paid out for legal fees, and the hon. gentleman should not gulp because they were not all local, I can tell you that, it was \$51,500 on a \$100 million -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: Just one second now until I proceed. These were paid through and were engaged by the bondholders themselves, Merrill Lynch, I believe, is the financial agent down in the United States. And if they used local counsel, I am not quite sure but I can furnish a name of local counsel. But I can assure the hon. -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman -

MR. MARSHALL: Just one second, I am not -

MR. NEARY: - I thought the hon. gentleman was prepared to answer questions

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MARSHALL: I know, for instance, in one instance, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: Tell the hon. gentleman if he sits down he can get up again, there is plenty of time. But I believe that Mr. Fintan Aylward, on one occasion, was one, yes.

Now the bank of the Newfoundland Government is the same bank that has been the bank since 1922, I believe, which is the Bank of Montreal.

MR. NEARY: Who represents them?

MR. MARSHALL: Not the same person who has represented them since 1922.

MR. NEARY: Who represents the Bank of Montreal?

MR. MARSHALL: The banks for the Crown corporations are different banks. As a matter of fact, all of the government business, both in the government and in the Crown corporations, is distributed pretty well evenly throughout the banks in this

MR. MARSHALL:

Province. And I am not quite sure whether the one that has recently come on, the Continental Bank, shares to any great degree, but it has been the practice of the government to share all banking with all of the banks that are operating in the Province.

The nationalization of CFLCo is a matter of record that the hon. gentleman should be aware of. I believe it cost \$160 million, as a matter of record. Thirty million dollars of that was attributable to the assets which BRINCO had in Labrador, the rights it had in Labrador, and \$130 million was attributable to the shares and that is being paid for by committing the dividends that are payable with respect to them. The Auditor General made a comment with respect to the Pension Plan. He questioned, I believe, as to whether or not the government should be borrowing from the Pension Plan itself, that it should be represented by government bonds.

The Auditor General is a very competent individual and he does a very fine job. We have an Audit Committee, a Committee on Public Accounts, which goes into the things the Auditor General observes from time to time in a great deal of depth. He gives his opinions - they are opinions. There are times when he gives his opinions that he has one side and other reasonable people have another. We do not presume, and neither, I am sure, does the Auditor General presume that he is the Holy Writ on every kind of business arrangement or governmental arrangement in the world. The fact of the matter is, that this is the practice formed in other jurisdictions and will continue here until we see good reason to the contrary, which we have not as yet.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet, I want to refer to what the hon. gentleman said, too,

MR. MARSHALL: about the Board of Trade.

The Board of Trade, in the hon. gentleman's paper this morning, on page five: "Board of Trade - Freedom of speech is threatened," and the hon. gentleman took the advantage to quote from it. I do not know whether the quote is right or not, but presuming it is, first of all, the Board of Trade scored both governments, the federal and the provincial governments. With respect to this business of freedom of speech referred to by the Board of Trade, I will say to the Board of Trade, and particularly the President, who has been very prone to criticize this government on any basis --

MR. YOUNG: She is a good Newfoundlander.

MR. MARSHALL: - that she has the right to criticize, as any group has, and we welcome criticism, we welcome suggestions that are made, but it is a two-edged sword; it does not mean that if somebody criticizes the government that the government cannot respond. And

MR. W. MARSHALL: the government, unfortunately, has had to respond, particularly on the offshore, many times with the Board of Trade because the Board of Trade, it would seem to us, has given the stage at all times to the federal government and has put the federal case before the people of this Province because, quite frankly, it appears to be in the best interest of a lot of people in the Board of Trade, and certainly in the business community which is hurting, that you have an agreement and you have development. But we have to look at it, Mr. Chairman, from the point of view that there cannot be development at any price; the offshore does not belong to the Board of Trade but it belongs to all of the people of Newfoundland and we are going to see it is developed for that purpose. I do note though, and I would just like to point out this because the hon. the gentleman gives me an opportunity for it, and I quote The Daily News of this morning; when they talk about the federal government the Board of Trade says, 'The federal government also comes in for a share of criticism regarding', quote, "lack of total honesty" from politicians. It said that when former Energy Minister Marc Lalonde addressed the Board of Trade at a meeting last year, "we were misled about the best offer then made to the Province on the offshore. Touted as the best deal in the world, Mr. Lalonde presented information that other members soon realized was incomplete and inaccurate at best." It goes on to say that Jean Chretien, Mr. Lalonde's successor, "has proven that if anything he is far slicker in his negotiating deals. He has not proven that he has had a better deal for Newfoundland.'

MR. TULK: Read the rest of it.

MR. MARSHALL: No, that is the quote.

MR. TULK: Read it all.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

That is the end of the article.

Now they say, Mr. Chairman, that they were misled, but the fact of the matter is that this was a very responsible body, the Board of Trade, and is a very responsible body and it invited Mr. Lalonde to speak to them and Mr. Chretien, I believe to speak to them, and immediately this body, which everyone presumes has certain knowledge, embraced everything that they said. Mr. Lalonde's federal offer to us at the time, they said, was the best deal; I think no less a personage than the Mayor of St. John's said he was thrilled with the offer. And the fact of the matter is that the offer—today they said they were misled. Now, the point is that it is all right for certain people to say they are misled, but a concern like the Board of Trade that presumes to speak on matters of grave import such as this to the people of this Province, I do not think afterwards, after the fact, can say particularly on two occasions, with respect to Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Chretien, that they were misled. The fact of the matter is they have the wherewithal before them to answer the positions that are put before them and they should have been able to analyse it, the positions that were put before them, rather than giving the mistaken impression that the offer was fair and good for Newfoundland when now they are, after the fact, forced to turn around and say they were misled.

MR. MARSHALL: Because it is not just an ordinary individual speaking, it is an organization such as the Board of Trade. It has a certain weight, and if it has a certain weight it has a duty to be accurate in the statements that it makes.

This Province today, Mr. Chairman, is threatened. The economic, social and cultural future in this Province is threatened. We are threatened with the prospects of an eternity of welfare payments and equalization payments. And it cannot be open for concerns like the Board of Trade, after the fact, to just say that they were misled. They should have great care to know what they are addressing at any time. Those proposals and those negotiations were crucial to this Province. The easiest thing for anybody, any group, or any individual to turn around - it is like motherhood - is to turn around and say there should be negotiations. And certainly nobody desires negotiations more than this Province and the government of this Province, to arrive at a negotiated settlement.

It is the easiest thing in the world to say. We were always eager to negotiate and we seized on the opportunity when Mr. Chretien, in December, indicated that the federal government's position was not going to be like the Nova Scotian agreement that Mr. Lalonde brought down, and the Board of Trade now says that they were misled, that they would entertain something else. And I spoke with him in about five meetings and we came to the conclusion, yes, they were sincere. The net result is we put our bottom line on the table. That is what we did because we trusted in them. So we are not going to go

MR. MARSHALL: back and negotiate from our bottom line at the present time, what we have done is we have put a letter before them asking them to confirm that these understandings were there, and if they confirm these understandings, well, we can put together an agreement based on that bottom line.

But the careless statements made by people from time to time, "Oh, you should negotiate," and all the rest of it, it is easy enough to say a pox on all your house, it is easy enough for the Board of Trade when they immediately hear Mr. Lalonde or Mr. Chretien to be enamoured of them and to immediately say everything is all right, but it is pretty devastating in the long run, and irresponsible when it occurs because afterwards they now say that they were misled. Well, if they were misled I think that what they really should do, and it is not a case of freedom of speech or anything, because I have freedom of speech and my freedom of speech to the Board of Trade is to say, if you were misled then you should say to the people of this Province now, clearly, that you were misled in the statements that you made and that the statements insofar as they were made supporting the federal government you will withdraw, And instead of that why will they not look at the proposals that we have on the table, the situation that was there in December and January, and with the great bulk of Newfoundlanders join behind us and insist that the federal government honour that agreement in principle.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, I talk to the Board of Trade in this Committee, Mr. Chairman, because I know there is no point in talking to the hon. gentlemen there opposite. Because they are Liberals first and Newfoundlanders afterwards, I do not even bother to waste my words with respect to the hon. gentlemen there opposite.

When the Board of Trade says today, some months after the fact, that they were misled I think that it is only proper for them now to come out with a statement as to what their position was because a concern of that nature should not have allowed itself to be misled. Newfoundlanders have been misled for 400 years, Mr. Chairman, and are being led down the garden path now by nonsense that is being emoted from the lips of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the other gentlemen there opposite, who jump with glee over the fact that we lose a case in the court which purports to take away from us what we brought into Confederation with us. And the kind of statements that the hon. Leader of the Opposition continues to make shows just what an Uncle Tom he and his colleagues are when they talk about - we threw it away. Well, we have not thrown it away no matter what the court cases show, Mr. Chairman. This Province is going to insist that we be treated like equal, average Canadians, no more, no less. That agreement in principle gave it to us, and everything that the hon. gentleman says in his praise of the Federal government and disregarding the future of this Province, is not going to deter us one iota. Fortunately, nobody takes him seriously.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman must be taking me seriously because I believe it is about six times now since yesterday I have had the hon. gentleman on his feet, and other hon. gentlemen. So somebody on the other side must be taking me seriously.

Mr. Chairman, it is amusing to watch the hon. gentleman in action. The hon. gentleman is talking as if the Newfoundland Appeals Court ruled in favour of the Province. The hon. gentleman is completely ignoring, blotting out of his mind, the fact that the Newfoundland Appeals Court ruled in favour of the Resource belonging to Canada. The hon. gentleman ignores that fact and he keeps talking and preaching and lecturing as if the Province owned the resource. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is living in a fool's paradise. When the Supreme Court of Canada hands down its decision, which no doubt will be in line with the decision made by the Newfoundland Appeals Court- I believe any right-thinking person would now believe that the dice are loaded against the decision made being in favour of the province. The dice are loaded, due mainly to actions and behavior and the attitude of the hon. gentleman, who took the matter and put it before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and in so doing gambled Newfoundland's future, threw it away. They went over with the resources and they said to the three Judges of the Newfoundland Appeals Court, 'Here it is, you take it and you decide what happens to it, you decide who owns it.' That is what they did and they will never get forgiveness for it. And the Premier's name will go down in the history books of this Province as the one who threw away that resource

MR. NEARY: by putting it before the
Newfoundland Appeals Court over a year ago. Now, there
is no way they can squirm or weasel their way out of
that. They got themselves boxed into a

MR. NEARY:

corner. There is no way that they can get out. They can go on the attack and on the offensive all they want, they can ridicule the Board of Trade, and the teachers, and the Government of Canada, and the Nova Scotia government, and the Quebec government, and the oil companies, they can blaspheme all they like, Mr. Chairman, but nothing is going to change. It is not getting us anywhere. We are just sinking further into destitution in this Province. The hon. gentleman went right down to the second last and the last paragraph. The Board of Trade criticized and strongly condemned the present Premier of this Province for his dictatorial attitude, for his one man rule. That is what they did. Read the full article, never mind quoting it out of context. What the Board of Trade did, a group of independent businessmen, they criticized, strongly condemned the attitude, the dictatorial attitude of this administration. If you do not kowtow and if you do not toe the Tory party line, you are no good, you are less than a Newfoundlander. That is what the hon. gentleman just said, that is what the Board of Trade is condemning the administration for. There is another point of view. There is a common sense point of view. There is the right way. Why should people kowtow to the Tory way which is the wrong way, which only leads to failure? A whole history of failures behind them, a whole string of failures, why should people subscribe to that point of view? It has been wrong up to now. It has failed. Why do they not change their policies and their strategy? Or have they got themselves so boxed in that they are inflexible, they cannot get out of the corner they are in?

MR. MARSHALL:

What do you suggest?

MR. TULK:

A multitude of failures.

MR. NEARY: What do I suggest? I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the right way to do it was to sit down with the Government of Canada and negotiate an agreement. Now, the hon. gentleman could have had that before the end of January, before the 31st of January, before the Premier's senior advisor pulled the carpet out from underneath the hon. gentleman's feet. I know, we hear stories, people of this Province are not dumb, they can listen, they hear about the reports that came out of Montreal and out of Confederation Building, where the Premier's advisors threw fits of temper and anger and threatened to resign. Mr. Chairman, that is all public knowledge. It is unfortunate. We wonder sometimes who is running this Province. Of course, we know who is running it. Nobody is running it. But we wonder who is running the administration. Certainly hon. gentlemen there opposite are not.

MR. NEARY: The hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) used to be a man of, or so he used to tell us in this House, a man of high principle in this hon. House. On a number of occasions he stood up and told us that, that he would be a man who would stick by his principles.

MR. TULK: Did he say that?

MR. NEARY: Yes, he did.

It did not take him long, when he got on the other side of the House, Mr. Chairman, to forget about his principles. He has no principles left, none left.

I asked the hon. gentleman a few moments ago to give us the name of the law firm that represents the government's bankers, the Bank of Montreal. The hon. gentleman has criticized us for not asking questions. Did I get a straight answer, Mr. Chairman? Let it be recorded I put three or four questions to the hon. minister and I did not get a straight answer to either one of them. So why should we waste our time, when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is soaking up the sun, to address questions to the President of the Council who will only answer by being rude and nasty and blaspheme Ottawa and Quebec and Nova Scotia and the Opposition and the teachers and the hospital workers and the nurses and the public servants? They have not got a friend left in the Province. There is not one group in Newfoundland that I can think of that is not against this administration. The pulp and paper industry, the mining industry, two-thirds of the public service, the nurses, the teachers, the unemployed, the welfare recipients, there is not a group that you can name that they have not had a row with. Not one.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman again -I will ask him two questions,

MR. NEARY: two very simple questions, Will the hon. gentleman tell us, give us the names of the law firms that represented the bondholders in these transactions? And make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, the lawyers are recommended by this administration, not Merrill Lynch, Merrill Lynch does not pick out the law firms, as my hon. friend for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) is aware, it is the government who recommends -

MR. TULK: The Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) through his colleagues recommends the law firms.

MR. TULK: Oh!

MR. NEARY: And what is the name of the law firm that represents the government bankers, the Bank of Montreal? - two very simple questions, Mr. Chairman. And I am going to sit down now and eagerly await the answer from the hon. gentleman, if he is so anxious to give the House information.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I would like to have a few moments to make an observation or two.

MR. NEARY: Try to get the heat off him now.

MR. CARTER: No. This is an attempt to make a serious remark.

I would like to be corrected if I am wrong, but as I understand it and as a lot of other people understand it, the Supreme Court of Newfoundland ruled that the offshore resources belong to Canada but the reason that they belong to Canada is that the Commission of Government failed to establish or talk about or exercise its right over the Continental Shelf when they could have done so. And also, the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) hero, when he was misnegotiating the Terms of Confederation, did not give a damn about the Continental Shelf and I do not think there is any mention of it at all in the Confederation agreement. And, curiously enough, to my perhaps twisted mind, it seems to me that this could be construed to be in our favour. Because if the Supreme Court of Canada feels that it should rule against us, it will only be able to rule against us in a nit picking sort of way. It will have to say, 'Just because an official did not bother to establish the right, just because he did not bother to write a letter about the Continental Shelf, just because of a mere oversight, therefore we do not award jurisdiction of the Continental Shelf to Newfoundland.'

MR. CARTER: This is a point that I would like the more learned members of the House of Assembly to comment upon. Obviously, you cannot predict how a judge is going to vote or how a judge is going to rule and it would be wrong, for instance, to try to predict what Bora and the Supremes will do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: Nevertheless, I am not as pessimistic about their judgement as some others.

MR. NEARY: Denny Dimwit! Denny Dimwit!

MR. CARTER: I am absolutely appalled by the attitude that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) takes. His whole theme ever since he has been elected Leader of the Opposition is that this government should give everything away, especially give it all away to Ottawa. Well, I want to give something to him. I do not think he gets paid enough and in recognition of his services, I would like the Clerk to present him with these thirty pieces of silver, because I think his income should be increased by that much.

MR. NEARY: I will take a package of savory instead. How is that?

MR. CARTER: So if the Page would come over and take this bundle from us. And I would like to point out that these thirty pieces of silver are not mine alone, but have been collected from practically every member of this House.

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

MR. J. CARTER: Therefore, if the Page would come and pass over this package I would appreciate it.

MR. S. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: I know, Mr. Chairman, this is a comical half hour we are having now with the hon. gentleman, but I believe that is against the rules of the House. what the hon. gentleman is attempting to do there, Mr. Chairman, and I do not believe the Page should go within an English mile of the hon. gentleman, afraid the Page would get contaminated and polluted.

MR. W. MARSHALL: It is not a bomb.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman did not say table something, he said bring something over. The hon. gentleman need not be afraid, I am sure the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) did not send him over thirty bombs.

MR. NEARY: Put it on the Premier's desk.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, I think there have been items refused at previous sessions and I would rule that in order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am still waiting for the hon. gentleman to give me the answer to two very simple questions that I put to the hon. gentleman. He has been lecturing us now since yesterday afternoon about asking questions. Well, Mr. Chairman, either the hon. gentleman gives me the answer or we get the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) back from soaking up the sun in Florida so that we can get some answers. Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. gentleman started his remarks yesterday by telling this House that what the government needed was

MR. S. NEARY: more revenue, we had to develop our resources to get more revenue. Well, we are agreeing with that, but we are asking the hon. gentleman to tell us where the plans of the administration are to develop the resources. Where are the plans?

MR. TULK: And how well they have succeeded.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. TULK: And how well they have succeeded.

MR. NEARY: Yes. And give us a run down, going back three years, of the record of success of the administration. Where is all the industry and where is all the development in this Province in the last ten or eleven years? Would the minister please tell us, in addition to the two questions that I put to the hon. gentleman, would he tell us about plans of the administration to develop the Lower Churchill, to build a transmission line to bring a power line across the Strait of Belle Isle, to build a Trans-Labrador Highway, to develop secondary processing in the fishing industry to finish the product in Newfoundland, to set up a sealing industry in this Province so we can process the pelts -

AN HON. MEMBER: As proposed by who.

MR. NEARY: As proposed by our spokesman on this side on the fisheries. Now, there are five things. Tell us how the administration proposes to build a Trans-Labrador Highway so that great storehouse of wealth in Labrador can be developed. Tell us what they propose to do about the fishery, secondary processing, finishing the product in this Province instead of having it finished and processed down in Boston by two companies that were established by Newfoundland firms in Boston. Mr. Chairman, all we are doing is begging and pleading and asking the administration to lay on the floor of this House, outlined, plans they have for the future development of this

April 12, 1983

Tape No. 902

MJ - 3

MR. S. NEARY: Province. And last but not least,
the offshore agreement.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Clark the Tory
hopeful was in this Province recently

MR. NEARY: . . . and just for the information of members who may think otherwise, Mr. Clark was asked by a reporter, "What will you do with the offshore resources if you are elected Prime Minister, will you give it back to Newfoundland?" What was Mr. Clark's answer? He said, "Hold on now, the rules of the game have changed since I was here last." He said, "I cannot give it back to Newfoundland. Even if I wanted to I could not give it back. If the Supreme Court rules in favour of Canada, the Newfoundland Appeals Court has already done that, if the Supreme Court rules in favour of Canada then," he said, "there is nothing I can do. Because in order to give the resource back to Newfoundland, I would have to get an amendment to the constitution. And," he said, "that would be very difficult. It would be very difficult to get the agreement of Ontario and Quebec and all the other provinces. Once the Supreme Court of Canada makes its determination, makes its decision, it would be very difficult to amend the Constitution, to pass back the resource. The best we could do," he said, "is a management agreement."

Well, that is what we are getting now. That is what we are talking about now. Why wait? Now, Mr. Chairman, the game they are playing now, it is obvious to everybody. I mean, let us not beat around the bush.

MR. TULK: . . . And it is kind of stupid.

MR. NEARY: . . . And it is rather stupid, and they are gambling again with our future. They are hoping that a Tory Government will be elected in the next federal election two years from now, a year and a half or two years from now, and then they will say to the people, "Now, if we

MR. NEARY: can get the Tories elected we are going to get a better deal." They told us that when they went to the Appeals Court, we had a strong case, but they lost.

Mr. Chairman, do hon. members of this House really believe and think that if Brian Mulroney becomes -- for instance, to use him as an example -- becomes Leader of the Tory Party and happens to become elected Prime Minister of Canada, with Mr. Moores in the back room, the Mr. Moores who planned Mr. Clark's downfall, Mr. Moores with his hatred for the present Premier of this Province for stabbing him in the back, does the member for Exploits (Mr. Twomey) really think that Mr. Moores and Mr. Mulroney are going to give this Province a better deal than Mr. Chretien? I mean, do they really believe that? If they do, Mr. Chairman, they are awfully naive. Because if Mr. Mulroney happens to become Prime Minister of Canada, with a man like Mr. Moores in the back room, the Premier of this Province will think a steam-roller went over him. Because, Mr. Chairman, everybody knows that Mr. Moores and his cohorts are out to get the present Premier for what he did to him after the government changed.

MR. TULK: What about the House Leader?

MR. NEARY: Oh, he will get the House Leader too. But they need not expect any favours from Mr. Clark

MR. NEARY: or Mr. Mulroney. They need not expect any favours. And the best that Mr. Crosbie can do is to get himself 175 votes or 180 votes and hope that he can secure a good position in the Cabinet. That is the best that he can do.

MR. BAIRD: What has that got to do with what we are talking about?

MR. NEARY: It has all to do with it. It has all to do with the gamble, the gamble that is taking place. Our future is now being gambled. We lost it in the court, threw it away. Now the Premier is playing another dangerous game.

MR. BAIRD: Get rid of Pierre and we will not have to worry.

MR. NEARY: Ah, there it is. That confirms it, Mr. Chairman. So I am hoping that the hon. gentleman now will give me the answer, the answer to the two or three questions that I asked the hon. gentleman. Tell us what plans the administration have for the development of our natural resources. Lay it out and be specific. Never mind ridiculing and blaspheming anybody, because people are fed up with that, never mind attacking people, never mind squabbling and arguing and fighting, tell us give us the hard, cold facts, what plans the administration have to deal with the economy, to help the unemployed, to help develop our natural resources. And while he is up tell us who represents the Bank of Montreal, what law firm. And what law firms were employed by Merrill Lynch on the recommendation of this government to handle the bond issues for this Province?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I want to give the hon. gentleman a lesson first if I can. I will try once again. Now, when you talk about people and that, you talk about insulting people or ridiculing people or addressing

MR. MARSHALL: people, but the word 'blaspheme' is left to the relationship between one and one's Maker. In other words, if you say you blaspheme someone you are blaspheming God. Now, in the hon. gentleman's vocabulary he uses the word 'blaspheme' all the time in relation to Ottawa. He warns us we are blaspheming Ottawa. So I would therefore conclude by that simple logic that the hon. gentleman puts the people in Ottawa on a pedestal and looks at them as if they were gods. And I do not think - you know, it is sort of like a Freudian slip that the hon. gentleman makes from time to time but he keeps talking about, 'You are blaspheming Ottawa'. One of these days he will be sitting down there in his chair with his two fingers in his ears screeching out to us to stop it, stop it, do not be talking about Pierre or Mark or John or Matthew or any of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Chairman, he wants to know what plans we have, the Lower Churchill. Imagine having the consummate gall to sit here and stand in this House and ask us what plan we have for hydro development in Labrador when the hon. gentleman and his cronies there opposite visited the disaster that they did some years ago on the people of Newfoundland in hydro development.

MR. MARSHALL: With respect to the Lower Churchill - we have already covered the Upper Churchill and the fact that free gratis of the hon. gentleman we are losing \$600 million, \$500 million, ascending to \$700 million a year from the resource of the Upper Churchill. What are our plans for the Lower Churchill?

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to develop the Lower Churchill the output is more than can be presently used in relation to the Province's present hydro needs. So we would have to, for a certain period of time, export the surplus and it cannot be developed unless we have a means of exporting the surplus of the 1,700 megawatts that would be generated from the Lower Churchill. So that brings us back to square one, the same position that this government is in, that that government was in a few years ago. Is this government, Mr. Chairman, going to turn around and give it away to the Province of Quebec, sell it to them for two mils, two and a half mils, going down to two mils for the next sixty-five years? Not on your life. What we have done, we have put pressure on the federal government to see that this Province gets the right to transmit its hydro power through the Province of Quebec in order to be able to sell that surplus to Ontario or to the United States, whichever place needs it, or for that matter, even to the Province of Quebec at a fair and reasonable return. We do not care where it goes, but what we insist on is that we get a fair return.

So what happened? The hon. gentlemen there opposite exulted in the passage of an act last year by the federal government which was a cruel joke on the people of this Province. It was billed as giving us the right to transmit hydro power through the Province of

MR. MARSHALL:

Quebec at long last, to recognize that right, but, Mr. Chairman, as I say, it was a cruel joke. What the people of Newfoundland were looking for was a sword to be able to project them through the territory of Quebec, and what happened instead they were given an ineffective needle which is going to be very, very difficult to operate with for these reasons, for these very brief reasons. I can give them very briefly, hopefully in baby talk so that the hon. gentlemen there opposite could perhaps understand them.

The first prerequisite of that act is this: You have to make an application to the National Energy Board to get a dedicated route through the Province of Quebec. Now, in order to make that application you first of all have to have

MR. MARSHALL:

your projected power sold, you have to have markets.

MR. NEARY: What is so unreasonable about that?

MR. MARSHALL: Nothing wrong with that, nothing wrong, if the hon. gentlemen there opposite could tell us how you could fix the price of power without first knowing where the route is and how much it is going to cost. Now it would be no problem for the hon.gentleman, because he participated in a giveaway once before. But this Province is not going to be forced into giving -

MR.NEARY: Is that so? And you set off two explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle and never finished the job.

MR.MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I will not say I blasphemed the hon. gentleman because, as I remind him,that is a discription of one's relationship with one's God. But I can say that I never thought that the hon. gentleman could be so -

MR.NEARY: You are losing that argument boy.

MR.MARSHALL: -could be so consummately stunned as to ask what is wrong with that. What is wrong with that is quite obvious. You cannot give the price for power until you know your dedicated corridors. So that is number one. Number two, even if this is possible to attain,what happens next? We have to expropriate through the province of Quebec the power. And instead of the federal government taking a hand and expropriating and saying to Quebec -now you do not mind complying with normal environmental requirements -and saying to Quebec, 'Now,you be reasonable . These people are Canadians and they are entitled to sell their power, their article of commerce in the same way as you sell you furniture in the Province of Newfoundland,without trade barriers.

MR. MARSHALL: Never mind your nonsense, let them put their route through.' No, they do not say that, They say Newfoundland has to expropriate it. And they have built in all sorts of things where it will be probably the year 2000 by the time you get through the intricacies and the complications and the environmental hearings and the stumbling blocks and the court cases and the trial divisions and the appellate divisions and the Supreme Court of Canada, as we have seen before with the province of Quebec. So that is why I say the only advantage of that particular act is at least it recognized the fact by the federal government - it was a recognition of the fact that we were entitled to a corridor through the province of Quebec. But it remains for them to give us an effective power. It is not an effective power and it should have been an effective power. I say the best way to describe it is, we asked for a sword and we got a mere little needle, that is all

MR. MARSHALL: And that is all we will get.
He asked, Mr. Chairman, what we are doing about such things as secondary processing in the fishery. Imagine having the gall after the way in which he reacted to the proposal which we put before the federal government in relation to the Kirby Task Force, a proposal which provides for keeping open all the fish plants in the Province of Newfoundland, that the hon. gentleman is against by the way, that the hon. gentleman has not supported and that he is against and that he has spoken against, that particular proposal - and he is against that and he asked what are we doing with respect to processing.

MR. NEARY: The Tory way is my way or no way.

MR. MARSHALL: My way or no way, look -

MR. NEARY: The Tory way or no way.

MR. MARSHALL: - I will tell the hon. gentleman the Tory way is not a giveaway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Well, the Tory way is not a giveaway like the hon. gentleman's way was. So he has got, as I say, the consummate gall to talk about the secondary processing in the fishery. Here we have an imaginative proposal before the federal government now to keep all the fish plants open, to make them viable, to increase their productivity, to increase their capacity to secondary processing, we have a proposal before the federal government which will at last have a proper type of Newfoundland marketing, of Newfoundland fish in the markets of the world, we have a process for the proper harvesting of the offshore effort through the combination of the trawlers in one company and

MR. MARSHALL: deploying them in accordance with their needs, and instead of that we are faced with a scheme that the hon. - one of his many schemes that the hon. gentleman proposes, because they support everything that the federal government - whatever the federal government wants they go along with, and one of the schemes of the federal government, in their proposal, was not a restructuring of the fisheries, it was merely a restructuring of companies, it was merely a concentration of the fishery power in Atlantic Canada in the hands of Nova Scotian companies, it was a further plan for the purpose of getting at our Northern cod and preventing the viability of communities on the Northeast Coast of the Province of Newfoundland. So the hon. gentleman is supporting these moves by Mr. Kirby, he is supporting these moves by his friends in the federal government, and he has got the consummate gall to get up here in the House, speaking out of the other side of his mouth, and asking us what we are doing with respect to the processing of fish.

The first thing we are doing

with

MR. MARSHALL:

respect to the processing of the fish is we are making sure that all the processing agencies in this Province are kept open, and at the same time making sure that all the communities that depend on them in this Province are kept open.

As to the offshore agreement, the hon. gentleman, you know, -

MR. NEARY: Are you going to sit there like a dummy and sulk all the time?

MR. MARSHALL: - asked what our next step is in the offshore agreements and anticipates we wait for a change of government. Well, a change of government will be beneficial not only for the offshore, Mr. Chairman, but for Canada as a whole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: Because the fact of the matter is, he can talk about individuals all he wants to but a change of government will result in a change of philosophy at the central power which is to concentrate everything in the hands of the central government, which is to result in the exhibition that we have seen recently where, for instance, oil rigs have had - because of the federal government's control and not understanding the conditions down here, not being able to see the ice conditions, not caring about them, wanting to be the macho man, as it were, in the oil industry, flexing its muscles in what it perceives to be its new jurisdiction, what is the net result? The rigs have had to flee.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL: I will get back to the hon. gentleman after.

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

MR. NEARY: I only wish that there were live broadcasts of the daily sittings of this House. If the 22.5 per cent of Newfoundlanders who are currently unemployed could have heard the hon. gentleman what would they have thought, Mr. Chairman? Fifty thousand Newfoundlanders and that is the official figure, by the way, released today by Statistics Canada. I think there are many more Newfoundlanders than that unemployed. But just let us say that it is 50,000, it is the highest number in our history. What would these Newfoundlanders and what would the teachers and what would the nurses and what would the sick people and what would the people on social assistance and what would the construction workers say? How would the public servants feel if they had been able to see and hear what the hon. gentleman just said? And remember the hon. gentleman was speaking for the administration. He was answering, he was the official spokesman for the administration. What did he say, Mr. Chairman? What did the hon. gentleman say? Where in all of the words that he used, where were the plans for the development of our natural resources? Where were the positive things in what the hon. gentleman just said in his presentation, speaking for the administration? I think now the Premier had better have a crack at it. The Premier better get up and have a go at trying to answer the questions that have been put to his administration and

MR. NEARY: not leave it up to the narrow mindedness, the buttoned-down mind of the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. TULK: Ask him what his lawyers said.

MR. NEARY: No, perhaps the Premier. We have been getting a lecture from the hon. gentleman these last couple of days about asking questions. I put two very simple questions - I put more questions than that, but two the last time I spoke. I asked the hon. gentleman to tell us the name of the law firm or the lawyers who represented the government's bankers, the Bank of Montreal. Did I get an answer? Did I get an answer to my question on what law firms were recommended by the administration to represent the bondholders, what names were passed over to Merrill Lynch to use in the bond issues? Did I get an answer? Let it be recorded, Mr. Chairman, that there was no answer. We had a continuation of the muddying up of the water, of the red herring tactic, of the diversionary strategy that we have seen in this House in the last year or so. They will do anything but answer the questions. They will do anything! They will drag in any kind of a red herring to divert attention from the real issues.

Mr. Chairman, we were told by this administration - and I know it is useless for me to get up this hour in the day even to debate in this House. The debates are not reported anymore from this House, unfortunately. That is what this House is, a place to debate and pass estimates. Somehow or other, the media think that all they have to do is report on the Question Period and that is it, the House does not exist after that. Some good debates have taken place in this House and will continue to take place and they should be reported.

MR. NEARY: Because after all, the media are the eyes and ears of the people of this Province and they should not be going out and editorializing and making snarky remarks that the first question that was asked was about the number of companies that tendered on the extension to Confederation Building, the first question, and here we have a crisis in the Education field. Obviously, the person who reported that was not listening to the concern that was expressed in this House about who was going to get that contract, was it going to be a mainland company or a local Newfoundland company? - Because all the sub-contracts and all the suppliers are local, we want them to be local. That was the concern. But he completely missed that point altogether.

MR. YOUNG: Who built this one?

MR. NEARY: Who built it?

MR. YOUNG: Public tender, I suppose.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that point was completely missed, that it is local bricks and local lumber, local labour, local this and local that that we want. If the government insist that they go ahead with that extension, I would prefer

MR. S. NEARY: to see the money spent upgrading hospitals and the like and that would also keep, I hope, the money in the Province. But the main point of the questioning yesterday had to do with whether or not the provincial government could legally jump over four mainland companies and give the contract to a Newfoundland firm and that point was completely missed. I would expect the hon. the minister to miss it, but anybody covering this House should not have missed it. They should have expressed concern. Everybody knows what the concern is: There is a vicious row going on about who is going to get that contract. The question is will the Public Tendering Act be applied legally. Can the minister overlook the Public Tendering Act? Can he legally, using the local preference policy, give that contract to a Newfoundland firm? That is the concern. We all want, if the extension has to go ahead, we all want Newfoundlanders to receive the salaries and wages, Newfoundland firms to get the subcontracts and Newfoundland suppliers to supply local material, and that was the point not, the fact that two weeks ago the minister made some kind of a silly announcement of how many people tendered. And if anybody is too stupid to understand that they should not be covering this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The reporting of this House has been the worst that I have seen in the twenty-one years that I have been here. There are debates, there are other things that happen in this House apart from the daily Question Period.

Mr. Chairman, I got a little bit sidetracked there because the minister interrupted me. I want to come back to the development of the Lower Churchill.

MR. S. NEARY: We were told once we had the power corridor across Quebec, that once the Parliament of Canada made it the law of Canada, that Newfoundland would be entitled to a power corridor through the Province of Quebec and our worries were over as far as the development of the Lower Churchill is concerned. Now, Mr. Chairman, we hear differently. Now they are throwing other obstructions in the way, now they are whining and complaining and moaning and groaning again. Now they are telling us that we have to sell the power, we have to find a market for it. Well, everybody knew that right from the beginning. The minister was told that by Mr. Lalonde two or three years ago, 'Go and find the markets, get ready because we are going to proclaim this legislation.' Now, they want the Government of Canada to do their homework for them. Not only did they give Newfoundland access to a power corridor across the Province of Quebec but now, according to what the minister just said, they want the Government of Canada to go and expropriate the land, to resolve the environmental problems and I suppose they want

MR. NEARY: the Government of Canada to build a transmission line for them. Mr. Chairman, these matters should be the subject of negotiation between the Province of Newfoundland and the Province of Quebec.

MR. TOBIN: There would have to be better negotiations than you had with Quebec.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the people down in Burin are still waiting for the answer from the Premier of this Province as to whether he is going to provide a subsidy to open their fish plant, and the hon. gentleman should address himself to that question and the hon. gentleman should, if he has the courage of his convictions, threaten to rebel, not to continue to support an administration which will not open these fish plants.

MR. TOBIN: You ask Lou Bailey who is responsible -

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes! 'Ask my brother if I am a liar.' He would be a nice one to ask all right. Yes, he would be a nice one to ask, Tory to the backbone.

MR. TOBIN: Oh-h-h-h!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Chairman, I would like to join this little debate here for a few minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was talking about wide-ranging issues dealing with the future of the Province and so on. I was very interested to hear what the Leader of the Opposition does not know about the Lower Churchill and about the corridor situation through Quebec. You know, it is all a matter of, sort of, foolishness almost, Mr. Chairman. We are either going to talk about things which are real or we are going to talk about things which are almost illusion. If we are going to talk about the Lower Churchill, the whole question now - Muskrat Falls and the Gull

PREMIER PECKFORD: Island site - is one which shows that the power is too expensive. You cannot develop Gull Island now or Muskrat Falls and transmit the power cheaply. You can get alternate forms of energy cheaper than you can from developing those two power sources. We have missed the opportunity for the next decade or so to develop the Lower Churchill basin, if you want to call it that, those two areas, those two sites, the Gull Island site and the Muskrat Falls. We have missed it. That has been missed because there was no co-operation or agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada to provide the necessary wheeling rights for the power through Quebec so that we could get on and develop it.

I was intimately involved in a lot of those negotiations when we were still trying to negotiate a package deal with the Province of Quebec. That broke down and continues to break down because the Province of Quebec only talked about packages, but when you start

PREMIER PECKFORD: getting into the package and getting the Gull Island and all the rest of it, Muskrat Falls straightened away, after some kind of joint development and sharing of the power, then they wanted the five rivers and then they said that, even though we started off by talking about a global or package agreement, it does not include re-opening the Upper Churchill contract. So they would take you all the way along until you got to the crunch of the matter, which was the Upper Churchill, and they were not prepared then to negotiate a full package. So what we have said since then, of course, is that now, if we are going to go back to talk to Quebec, the one that always was last must come first, and that is the Upper Churchill. You have always had it last in all other negotiations, now Newfoundland insists on it being first.

But not only do we insist on it being first now because it was always last, more importantly it is now the only power source that is cheap enough, because it is already developed and it is cheap at site, so that the transmission costs does not make the end cost prohibitive. So if we can get back some of that power, then we have an opportunity to do some development using that power.

The Lower Churchill is as dead as yesterday's breakfast. It is as dead as the dodo bird as far as developing it in the next ten years goes. It will not come on stream in the next ten years. It is only fantasy, and the sad part about it, Mr. Chairman, that we have to comment on today, is it is fantasy because we did not have a national government in this country that was willing to come to terms with an inequitable situation which allowed oil and gas at that same time, all through the

PREMIER PECKFORD: 1970s, to be transmitted across provinces from British Columbia and Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba and Ontario to Quebec, through the National Energy Board, because it is inter-provincial. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) cannot have it both ways. On the one hand he talks about having a strong federal government and the Province cannot be insisting and all this kind of stuff; well, if that is true, what the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Party's position is, he recognizes and is a believer in the concept of inter-provincial trade being federal. And if it is federal - which it is, and he has already agreed to that and everybody else has - then the federal government has a responsibility.

Now all during the 1970s, when the Lower Churchill was a viable proposition because OPEC had put up the oil prices but inflation was not there,

PREMIER PECKFORD: if we had got started in 1974-75 and had a 30 mil to 50 mil power situation on Gull Island - say 30 to 35 mils per kilowatt hour on Gull Island, somewhere around forty-five to fifty on Muskrat, so perhaps we would have gone with Gull first and you could have used all the power - then we could have gotten it going and we could have had a big development up there. We could have had a lot of jobs and a lot of economic development but the opportunity was missed, and the opportunity was missed because it was impossible to get the same kind of deal for people who live in Eastern Canada as they had for Western Canada, because one was oil and gas and the other was hydro power, and Quebec thwarted it because Quebec holds the power for the Liberal Party, which is the Government of Canada. Then finally they were embarrassed through the constitution and other means - and I argued with the Prime Minister over this, argued with him in his house before other premiers and publicly this very point - because you had the offshore sitting there which they were embarrassed about, they had the fishery which was there which they were not so embarrassed about but it was still an aggravation that Newfoundland kept bringing up to them, and there was this hydro thing which all the provinces and a lot of the federal ministers and members kept saying, 'This is something that you cannot ignore any longer because it just sticks out,' finally they had to do something. Now my preferred position on that, Mr. Chairman, when we got together a couple of years ago and forced the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Energy Department and the Prime Minister's Office to set up a team - we set up our team and they set up their team - we sat down and talked, and everybody from the federal side agreed that what we were saying when we proposed legislation - we actually gave them the wording of legislation to use - our preferred position - and I am sure the minister sitting next to me now, the President of the Council, the House Leader remembers - the preferred position was to have wheeling rights through the existing grid in Quebec, in the same way as now if there is a pipeline coming through Manitoba and Ontario, the Trans-Canada pipeline zones, and they are only using 60 per cent of the capacity of that pipeline, and somebody else comes along who has a gas well out in Saskatchewan or Manitoba or Alberta and applies to the National Energy Board, they can use that pipeline. They have to pay for it, they have to pay their way but they can use the pipeline. So our preferred position was wheeling rights. We would have to pay for our commodity being transmitted if there was sufficient capacity not being used on the existing grid, then we could use it and pay for it. That is no different than what they are now doing for Trans-Canada pipelines or Alberta Gas Trunk or whoever.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That was our preferred position, Mr. Chairman, not the power corridor. It was to use existing facilities if the capacity was there, and it was there and it is there to be used, and they turned that down. That was our preferred position, Mr. Chairman. So all they were prepared to do was a power corridor, and we did not know exactly how that was to be phrased and they would not tell us. And then, when they phrased it, they phrased it in such a way it changed the rules of the game for us. They changed the rules of the game. The Albertans and the Saskatchewanians and the British Columbians of this world, and those people who developed oil and gas in the peak times when oil and gas were developed in Canada, had one set of rules and now for Newfoundland, who has some hydro power to transmit, they are going to have a different set of rules. And not only are the rules going to be different - one does not mind difference - but the difference is negative towards us so that the power corridor is not a realistic option for us because, as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) pointed out, it means nothing, it is a hollow victory. First of all, it is interprovincial, as I talked about it earlier, and if it is interprovincial then the federal government should have an ongoing responsibility when a commodity moves from one province across another province. We are not the federal government, we are a province and therefore there is the transmission of a commodity, from one province across another province, for sale, and therefore the National Energy Board and the federal government should have the power to establish a process whereby they

PREMIER PECKFORD: can make possible an expeditious hearing route for us to be able to transmit our power through the Province of Quebec through a corridor. We as a Province should not have to go to Quebec. I mean, all of a sudden now the rules are suddenly changed. On the one hand the federal government talks about interprovincial trade, which is federal, and now, when it is hydro power to go through Quebec, suddenly it is the province that has to go in and defend itself in the Province of Quebec. So there is going to be all kinds of environmental obstructionist tactics used as we try to go from one piece of land to another municipality to another municipality to another county all the way through Quebec. It is an unrealistic obstructionist policy which was not in effect for other Canadians when they wanted to transmit their energy. So, Mr. Chairman, number one, the Lower Churchill is no longer a viable alternative right now - it will be again in

PREMIER PECKFORD: the future - and the reason it is not is because the national government of Canada failed, when it was a viable one, to allow us access through Quebec to sell that power. So that is why the Lower Churchill is not developed today. We wanted to develop it but we were prevented from doing so because we were not given the same opportunities to transmit our energy products as other provinces had to transmit their energy products. Nobody can doubt that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Hon. members of this House must be completely shocked at the news that just came from the lips of the hon. gentleman who heads up the administration in this Province. What an admission! What an admission of defeat and failure! Now the hon. gentleman tells us that the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls hydro development is kaput, finished, 'dead as a dodo,' he said. The hon. gentleman said it is dead as a dodo for the next ten years. Mr. Chairman, that is sad, sad news indeed. Now, Mr. Chairman, what logic, what argument -

MR. MORGAN: Ask the Prime Minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if I were the hon. gentleman, I would go out and look for fish markets, never mind interrupting. We have a good debate going here and the hon. gentleman should go and look after, peddle his fish while I deal with some of the statements just made by the hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Could I have order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should go peddle his sealskins, go out and peddle his cod tongues, Mr. Chairman, while I deal with the hon. the Premier here.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at some of the arguments put forward by the hon. the Premier. First of all he told us that the reason the Lower Churchill is not developed was because - he blamed it on the Government of Canada, the federal government. Now, is he blaming it on Mr. Diefenbaker? Is he blaming it on Mr. Clark? Is he blaming it on Mr. Trudeau? What federal government is he blaming it on? Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman should make it clear what administration he is blaming it on, because the administration that is there now granted the request from this Province and from one of the Prairie Provinces to allow hydro power to go across their borders for the first time in the history of Canada. The Parliament of Canada passed a law, made a law giving Newfoundland a power corridor across the Province of Quebec for the first time in Canadian history. So what administration is the hon. gentleman referring to?

Now, the hon. gentleman also used this argument - and I have heard him use it before: He said that hydro-electricity is not treated the same as other types of energy.

MR. S. NEARY: I believe I asked the hon. gentleman in this House one time before to give me one example, one only, and I will take it from there. Can the hon. the Premier tell me one instance where a province objected to a pipeline, one example only? To my knowledge, to my recollection, Mr. Chairman, there has never been an objection from any province of a pipeline crossing provincial boundaries. There was a dispute, the great pipeline debate, we remember that, but the matter was resolved; there have been minor disputes that have arisen, but there has been no adamant objection to pipelines, either gas or oil, crossing provincial boundaries. So the hon. gentleman is comparing apples and oranges.

Now, the hon. gentleman also said during his remarks that what Newfoundland wanted was wheeling rights. Now he is retreating from his position. We were told, the people of this Province were told time and time again, what we needed to develop the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls was a power corridor across the Province of Quebec. We were not told that all that was necessary was wheeling rights. The Premier, now that he has to face defeat and failure, is now retreating and saying the power corridor is no good. Or is he saying this, that if we had the power corridor ten or fifteen years ago the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls might have been economically feasible, might have been a viable project? Is that what he is saying? He seems to be talking out of both sides of his mouth. He is saying the power corridor now is useless because we cannot develop the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls even to market the surplus power for at least the next ten years, and that is sad, sad news indeed. So we may as

MR. S.NEARY: well rule that out. I am not so convinced, Mr. Chairman, as the hon. gentleman is. I would have to see the facts and figures. Nobody can convince me or anybody else in their right senses that hydro power is not more economical, it is not a lower cost type of energy than oil or gas. Since when, Mr. Chairman, did that happen? Since when did it become more expensive to develop hydro power than it is to provide electricity

MR. NEARY:

through oil and gas? It is still the cheapest. It is still the lowest cost energy that you can develop. It still is. And so I am not convinced, Mr. Chairman, I would have to see the facts and figures. I think they have just given up, they have abandoned hope on the Lower Churchills and the Muskrat Falls, the same as they have on the fishery, on the pulp and paper industry, the mining industry.

MR. TULK:

She is all gone.

MR. NEARY:

'She is all gone,' somebody remarked to my right. How true, Mr. Chairman, how true. She is all gone.

Mr. Chairman, I am flabbergasted, I am completely flabbergasted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon.

gentleman in the main dealt with the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls and gave us some bad news. The hon. gentleman did not answer two questions that I asked, and I am going to repeat them again for the sake of the record; What law firm or what lawyers represent the government's bankers, the Bank of Montreal? The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) has been lecturing us for the past couple of days to ask questions.

MR. WARREN:

The Premier never told you either.

MR. NEARY:

This is the fourth time I have asked that question.

MR. WARREN:

The Premier never told you either.

MR. NEARY:

And the Premier did not answer it. Neither did the President of the Council or the Premier answer my question about what law firms and what lawyers were recommended to Merrill Lynch to handle the government's bond issues.

MR. WARREN:

They do not know.

MR. NEARY:

They do know. They certainly do know. And neither one of the hon. gentleman addressed themselves to the fishery, I saw the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in his seat there a few moments ago. I do not know if it is true or not, perhaps he can confirm whether I am quoting him correctly or not, but I heard the hon. gentleman say a number of times in the last year that the big failure, one of the big problems in the Newfoundland fishery was a lack of markets, was a slump in the markets in the United States. Is that what the hon. gentleman said?

MR. TULK:

The consumption of fish.

MR. NEARY:

The consumption of fish in the United States.

MR. NEARY: Did the hon. gentleman tell us that people in the United States are eating more meat and chicken? I believe I heard the hon. gentleman say that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you agree with that?

MR. NEARY: I am just asking the hon. gentleman if I am quoting him properly because marketing is one of the big problems in the Newfoundland fishery. And perhaps the hon. gentleman can get up and if he can confirm that for me then I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he has done about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, I want to find out from the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) is not the Minister of Fisheries. I have been debating here all afternoon with the Premier and with the President of the Council and I have not been able to get any answers about what they are doing about further processing in the fishing industry, about the finished product, and whether we are going to continue further processing and finishing the product in Boston or are we going to do it in Newfoundland? And what plans they have, what plans the administration have to deal with that aspect of the fishery and marketing.

Perhaps the hon. gentleman can confirm this for me and if it is true that there is a slump in our markets in the United States, that people are eating meat and the consumption of fish has dropped drastically in the United States, what is the administration doing about it to find alternative markets or to develop a new product? What is being done about it? That is the kind of information we want during this debate. If we are going to broaden our basis of taxation so that we can get the revenue that is necessary to reduce our

MR. NEARY: borrowing -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: - we are going to have to have the answers to these questions, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: I have a few words to say on this debate as it pertains to the fishing industry and what we are doing as a government for the fishing industry. It seems to me that whenever we get involved in the marketing end and we go out to try to market our products, if I go beyond Port aux Basques, as soon as I am gone from the Province, lo and behold, the Leader of the Opposition is on every radio station. He is gone again! He is gone again! He should be here in the Province, He should not be out there in Boston or in New York or in Chicago or in Los Angeles or in San Francisco or down in any part of the USA. He should not be over to Europe, he should not be anywhere, he should be here!

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we had to depend on the consumption of our own people, half a million people, to help our fishing industry, even

MR. MORGAN:

if we had to depend on the 20 million Canadians, we would not be able to have sufficient markets for the products we produce, so we have to go out and promote. Surely when the Minister of Fisheries is out promoting fish products, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) should be out there saying, 'Yes . That is his role. He should be out there helping to develop markets.' But as soon as I leave the Province, lo and behold, every time he is going to be complaining, 'Oh, he is wasting the taxpayers' money and he is out there promoting fish in Alberta, or he is out there promoting fish in Winnipeg'. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am going to tell him this year that we are going to be out there again. I am going to be in Toronto next month, I am going to be in Montreal next month, and the following month I am going to be in Edmonton and I am going to be in Winnipeg and I am going to be in Calgary and I am going to be in Chicago and I am going to be in Boston. And all for what? I am going to be going out there with some companies with me with some of the top quality products we have in this Province produced by our own fish companies and I am going to be selling fish. This afternoon he made a snide remark, 'Oh, the fish salesman'.

I am happy to be a fish salesman, and the more fish I sell, whether it be for the company in Isle aux Morts or the company in Port aux Basques or the company in Bonavista or the company up in White Bay or down on the Burin Peninsula, the more fish we sell the better for the industry.

Unfortunately the government should really not have to be out there selling fish.

MR. MORGAN: They should not really. It should be the industry, the industry should do more than what they are doing in the market place, doing more promotions, doing more aggressive marketing. They are not doing enough of that. They are coming around in the quality of their product, yes they are, mainly because of the initiatives taken by both levels of government to improve the quality. So the quality of the product has been improved because if the fish products produced by companies in this Province is not going to be improved we will not have a market in the U.S.A. Now that is a very negative comment to make but it is a factual one because the production coming in from Iceland and from Norway is coming from sources of supply which is of excellent quality, there is no question about that. They spend millions of dollars, the national government spends millions of dollars, not just the individual local government but the national governments in these countries, the same as the national government of Canada should have some control in the market place with regards to marketing dollars. And, as a matter of fact, for the first time the present Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. De Bane has now indicated there will be some funds for marketing and I think it is an excellent step. But the only thing that I am worried about is the fact that Mr. Kirby's recommendations on the marketing are not good ones.

MR. MORGAN: I have said so publicly before, they are not good ones, they are not going to be able to do the kind of things that should be done if the Kirby recommendations are followed. For example, if we go out and spend millions of dollars on generic advertising and if these funds are spent in a general way in the USA, what will happen will be the countries that are producing the top quality product, like Iceland and Norway in particular, those two countries are going to capitalize on the advertising campaigns, on promotions put on and paid for by the taxpayers of Canada, and that is not going to be good for our industry.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what else are we doing? Well, my colleague from the St. Barbe Coast knows what we are doing. I travelled with him for the past three days - we went to Rocky Harbour, we went to Woody Point, we went to Parsons Pond, we went to Plum Point, we went to Anchor Point, we went to Flowers Cove, we went to Sandy Cove - and we held meetings in all these communities. Who did we meet with? The fishermen in all these communities. Who else did we meet with? The development associations, all three of them. What were we doing out there? Listening to what they had to say, and we were asking them, "What is your opinion about taking this licence from this company and putting it over here? What is your opinion about cancelling this lease on this property over here to that company and giving some other company the right to lease the premises." That is what we were doing.

We made progress. And I would say as a result of that activity in the past three days we will see approximately \$20 million pounds more fish processed on the Great Northern Peninsula this year than was processed

MR. MORGAN: last year. We are going to see approximately 650 people more working than were working last year.

MR. NEARY: Doing what?

MR. MORGAN: Doing what? Cutting and processing fish. In the next two days I will be announcing at least two more fish plants will be reopened that were closed last year. They are all inshore fish plants. And I will be working night and day to get these plants opened. But in the meantime I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that the man who is supposed to be the expert negotiator, who has been given the sole responsibility to negotiate the problems of the deep sea fishery will work as hard as I am working on getting these plants open.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Because the federal government has now appointed him. There are no ifs, ands or buts. There are no longer any ifs, ands or buts about who is now responsible for getting those plants opened, it is Dr. Michael Kirby, appointed by the federal government, the Prime Minister and the federal Cabinet. He is the man now leading the delegation or the committee to sit down and negotiate with all the parties, work out all the differences and hopefully - and I repeat - hopefully

MR. MORGAN: to implement the proposal put forward by this government which will see the reopening of all those deep-sea plants. Because there is not much point in this minister going down to the Burin Peninsula and saying, 'Yes, I can get Burin reopened,' or 'I can get Gaultois reopened,' or 'I can get Harbour Breton reopened or Ramea reopened.' I could go down and do it but the plant would not stay open very long, the reason being because there is not enough inshore fish, and we only have responsibility for the inshore sector. We cannot go out and decide how much fish is going to go into the Ramea plant or how much fish will go into the Burin plant. That is federal responsibility, there are no ifs, ands or buts. Mr. Chairman, Thursday before last, Mr. Kirby was given that mandate and I thought at the time from listening to all the parties, the federal government and some of the members of Parliament that there was a great urgency to get those plants reopened and to get the restructuring carried out. Well, that was Thursday before last.

Mr. Chairman, it is sad to say, very sad to say, that I have to stand in this House of Assembly almost two weeks from the time the decision was made in Ottawa with regard to restructuring the most important part of our fishing industry, the deep-sea fishing industry, and I do not know what the decision was. And lo and behold, today I checked with the other parties, the Bank of Nova Scotia does not know what the decision was that was made in Ottawa, no communications. And lo and behold, not one of the companies, in checking with the companies, not one of the companies has been told or even knows what the decision was that was made in Ottawa almost two weeks ago.

MR. MORGAN: Maybe, maybe we will know tomorrow. Maybe. There is a possibility we may know tomorrow. But it is a very serious matter, because the so-called People's Conference that was organized by the Fishermen's Union, if the message was not there about the urgency, it will never be brought forward.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: The message came loud and clear from Ramea, the message came loud and clear from Gaultois -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. MORGAN: By leave?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. the minister have leave to continue?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, leave is not granted.
The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is sad indeed but it is not sad for the reasons the minister just gave, because it is becoming increasingly obvious that the Premier sits on information, withholds information from the hon. gentleman. Because the hon. gentleman

MR. S. NEARY: knows full well that Mr. Johnston, who is the Chairman of the ad hoc Committee of the federal Cabinet, Telexed the Premier over a week ago and outlined certain proposals to the Premier regarding the reopening of fish plants that are not considered to be economically viable. He asked the provincial government if they were prepared to participate financially in the reopening of these plants and so far there has been deathly silence, no answer. There has been no answer from the provincial government. Now will the hon. gentleman get up now and tell us what the answer is. Mr. Johnston did not get the answer. What is the answer? Will the provincial government whose responsibility it is to look after the social needs of these people, will they participate financially because the people in Burin are waiting for the answer, the people in Ramea are waiting for the answer, the people in Gaultois, Harbour Breton, Fermeuse and Grand Bank are waiting for the answer.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it \$500,000 million, a half a billion dollars, will be put up by the federal government to restructure the processing sector of the deep sea fishery in Atlantic Canada. The minister gets up in this House -

MR. G. TOBIN: That is one half of what they put into Dome Petroleum.

MR. NEARY: Well, how much is the provincial government putting in?

MR. TOBIN: We have \$61 million in it now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to deal with that because that is erroneous, it is completely untrue. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has tried to misled this House, and I am not saying that he deliberately did it, Mr. Chairman, but the minister reads out a list of plants that have gotten guarantees from the government, that have gotten financial assistance from the government,

April 12, 1983

Tape No. 922

MJ - 2

MR. S. NEARY: and the list that he reads out, Mr. Chairman -

MR. TULK: And the Premier quotes from it as well.

MR. NEARY: - and the Premier quotes from that very same list, the list that he reads out, Mr. Chairman, I would say half the plants on it have not received their guarantees. I can tell the hon. gentleman right off the top of my head four or five plants that are on his list that have not received their guarantees or have not received any assistance from this administration. And if the hon. gentleman wants me to give him the names of the companies I am prepared to do it. The hon. gentleman is trying to fool us, Mr. Chairman. How much? He says \$60 million. How much can that be reduced by by guarantees that were not carried out, commitments that were not executed?

Mr. Chairman, I heard the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) get up and talk about loan and guarantees to fish plants and he read off a list and I heard him mention names of companies, that have not received these loans and guarantees. As a matter of fact, the applications have not been processed and if they were processed no decision was made on a good many of them. The hon. gentleman knows that. Now I ask the hon. gentleman to be honest about it

MR. NEARY: and get up man fashion and tell us how many names should be stricken from that list. Statements made are not true. The restructuring of the processing sector of the Newfoundland fishery falls under the jurisdiction of this administration. It is the responsibility of the provincial government and they can try all they want to pawn off that jurisdiction, to pawn off their responsibility on Mr. Kirby and the Government of Canada. They are not going to succeed. The fishermen and the plant workers know, Mr. Chairman, they know the difference. They know that the minister and the administration are trying to con them. They know that they are being misled or that there is an attempt to mislead them. They know that. Having said that I would have to agree they do not care where the money comes from to restructure, whether it is provincial or federal.

MR. TULK: And neither should they.

MR. NEARY: And neither should they, Mr. Chairman, as my colleague says. But the provincial government has to be prepared to acknowledge its responsibility. We had one minister today during the Question Period who would not acknowledge that she had any say or any input into the crisis in education in this Province, the worse crisis we have had in our whole history. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has completely given up. Mr. Chairman, has the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) done the same thing? The Minister of Fisheries should be up in Ottawa or he should invite the federal Minister of Fisheries to come to Newfoundland -

MR. MORGAN: Your tactics not mine.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. He wants to get out of the kitchen now that the heat is on, Mr. Chairman. The Minister of Fisheries should not be out

MR. NEARY: marketing fish. That is a job for a marketing agency. Mr. Chairman, that is a job for -

MR. TOBIN: And I am with you.

MR. TULK: Let that (inaudible) leave the Province because if he is gone he will no longer have anything to do with the fishery.

MR. NEARY: Well I would say good riddance when he is gone but the minister -

MR. TOBIN: You should see the mail I get from (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Yes, and the hon. gentleman should see the mail I get from Burin-Placentia and the phone calls. Mr. Chairman, I tell you the hon. gentleman's blood pressure would be worse than it is at the moment if I showed him some of the remarks that are made in these letters and these phone calls about the hon. gentleman.

MR. TULK: He has given up smoking again.

MR. NEARY: Yes, he will have to give up more than that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TOBIN: You ask Lou Bailey now.

MR. NEARY: Yes, ask me brother, ask me Tory brother if I am a liar, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) the people of Burin will be in my lap.

MR. NEARY: Oh, is that so? The political game is catching up with the hon. gentleman, it is catching up with him. And pretty soon there will be a big rail in Burin and the hon. gentleman will be on the end of it, tarred and feathered, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Chairman, getting back to the restructuring of the fishery, and I did not want to get sidetracked into specifics -

MR. TULK: By the rabbit from Burin.

MR. NEARY: By the rabbit from Burin, that is right, the rabbit's tracks. But the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) knows full well that these plants can only be reopened through joint co-operation between the two levels of government. That is the only way they can be opened. The hon. gentleman, look, he is not going to develop another offshore issue. That is impossible, the people will not fall for that again.

Now, I asked the hon. gentleman earlier about the slump in the fish consumption in the United States. He did not address himself to that.

MR. TULK: He did not?

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman did not address himself to that matter. I want to find out what the present situation is in the United States. Is there still a slump in the market? Is the consumption of fish down? Are people eating poultry and meat instead of fish? Because that is what the hon. gentleman has been telling us in this House and telling us in this Province for the last year, that we cannot market our product because Americans are eating poultry and eating meat. Is this still the case in the United States? I would like for the hon. gentleman to address himself to that if he so desires, if he wants to get up again and speak again.

But, anyway, Mr. Chairman, we do not see any point in belabouring the Consolidated

MR. NEARY: Fund Services any longer.

MR. TOBIN: You finally spoke to it.

MR. NEARY: We have been speaking to it all afternoon in case the hon. gentleman is too ignorant to understand what it is we are doing, ignorant as far as the way the system works, ignorant of the facts, ignorant of what it is we are doing. The hon. gentleman is completely ignorant of what it is we are doing and saying here.

The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) raised the matter yesterday when he told us that we needed a broader tax base in this Province and the only way we could get it is through the development of our natural resources. And so that is what we have been talking about ever since. Please tell us how the government plans on developing these natural resources. And one of the things that we happened to get sidetracked into is the fishery.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I presume it is always good to be sidetracked into the fishing industry, one of our, if not one, maybe the most important industry we have in the Province. Now, Mr. Chairman, the reason why I rose the second time is I want to clarify and put on the record for this House of Assembly the facts with regard to this provincial government's involvement in the fishing industry, the financial involvement.

The hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does not understand when we talk about \$61 million. The \$61 million is only into four companies, four, just four, Fishery

MR. MORGAN: Products, the Lake Group, National Sea and Nickerson's. We have got \$61 million in those four deep sea offshore trawler companies alone. Now over and above that, the list he is talking about is where we offered eighteen companies last year, eighteen additional companies an amount that came to \$24 million in government guarantees. Now in the Lake Group we have \$5 million invested. We are shareholders in the Lake Group Company, the company that owns the plant in Gaultois, the company that owns the plant in Grand Bank, the same company that owns the plant in my colleague's district here in Fermeuse and in my own area as well, Bonavista. In that company we have a \$5 million shareholder position.

MR. MORGAN: I should not quote a figure unless I am sure of it but I will use the term, the approximate amount of \$16 million in the company Fishery Products and approximately the same amount in the company National Sea and we have a further amount in Nickersons, separate from National Sea. Now that is totally separate from the inshore fish plant companies. The \$24 million and the others we helped last year are all inshore plants. And if the need comes forward and if the companies can show that they are going to look after their operations in the proper way and do certain things and meet certain criteria we will do it again, we will help the inshore plants again. But we cannot - and I repeat - we cannot deal with the problems that these deep sea offshore plants have because the offshore allocations and the offshore fish stocks are strictly and totally under federal jurisdiction.

MR. NEARY: That has nothing to do with it.

MR. MORGAN: There is no point in opening a plant if we have no fish. We know when we open a plant in Anchor Point which I will be getting opened, I know when a plant opens in Flowers Cove and it will be opened, I know when a fish plant will be opened in Bartletts Harbour, Mr. Chairman -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: One second, Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues will hear me out now. I know when the plant opens in Barletts Harbour, where the fish is going to come from. It is going to come from the inshore fishermen in the area. So there is no question, we know the supply of fish. But we do not know where the fish are going to come from for Burin,

MR. MORGAN: We do not know where the fish are going to come from in Grand Bank. Why? Because there are no inshore fishermen in the area. A handful in Grand Bank maybe or Fortune next door, just a mere handful, not enough to keep a plant going one day a week or maybe half a day. So we know that it has to be addressed by the federal level of government. It has got to be addressed by the federal level of government.

Now the hon. gentleman is going to have a difficult time to follow me in the next three months in this Province, in the next number of weeks, with regards to fishing activities. Let me give you a little example of my activities. Let me give you an example. I would say to him in the next twenty-four hours I will be announcing a plant on the Avalon Peninsula which was closed all last year, be reopened. Why? Because we can deal with it alone as one government. That is why. I would say that the plant over in Port au Port, there is a good possibility that in the next number of days again there will be a positive decision on the reopening of that plant. And on she will go because we have the power and the jurisdiction to deal with them. But the deep sea plants we just have not got the jurisdiction to deal with them.

So, all we are saying to Ottawa is we want your involvement.

MR. MORGAN: Now, the hon. gentleman also has to be told the facts with regards to the telegram that came from Mr. Johnston. That telegram was made public by his friend and colleague, Mr. Rompkey. Before we got the telegram I think it was made public by Mr. Rompkey. He called his friends at the Daily News and his friends somewhere else in the media and says, 'There is a telex going to the Premier of Newfoundland and if they want to keep the plants open at Burin and these places well they have to put some money up'. Did they come and ask for money for St. Anthony? Did they? Oh no. St. Anthony happened to be quite different from Burin and Grand Bank for some strange reason. But that telex was sent to this government, to the Premier and to myself and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) should know this because if he is at all concerned - he is a Newfoundland, he must be concerned about the fishing industry, he must, he has to be. I mean, the fishing industry is important to his own riding. Now that telex came in from Mr. Johnston before the federal Cabinet committee meeting in Ottawa. There was no decision made, all he did was respond to in a general way the proposal. That same afternoon a five hour Cabinet session took place in Ottawa and, lo and behold, just at the last minute before the final hour of T.V. Mr. Rompkey had to sneak out and get a little interview with the CBC television up in Ottawa to get coverage down here and said, 'We have made the decision and we have assigned Mr. Kirby to do all the negotiations and I do not want to disclose the decision, that is the role of Mr. Kirby'. I phoned Mr. Johnston the next day. It was a holiday on Monday, he was not in. I got a call back from him Tuesday and he said the same thing,

MR. MORGAN: 'Mr. Kirby is the man assigned. He is now totally, fully responsible for looking after the negotiations to get those deep sea plants operating and to restructure the deep sea fishery'.

So now we are anxiously awaiting the man with all the answers, Dr. Michael Kirby, and the man with all the money we are assuming, the man with all the money. He is the man who made the decision last year when St. Anthony was closed. A snap of the fingers. Mr. Kirby came on the scene, a snap of the fingers, 'We will open St. Anthony. We will give it to a Crown corporation, they will open it up'. There was nobody asked us for money then.

So, it is important, Mr. Chairman, that we clear in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) because I know that he must be concerned because these plants are important to these areas. I mean if you close the plant at Ramea you close the community. You close the plant in Gaultois you close the community. You close the plant in Harbour Breton you close the community. And anybody up in Ottawa on a federal Cabinet committee who does not recognize that closing Gaultois plant closes the community,

MR. MORGAN: does not recognize that closing the plant at Harbour Breton closes the community, if they does not recognize that closing the plant at Ramea closes the community - and unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, they did not because before this Premier or this government here went to Ottawa and put on the Table a plan they were not planning to keep those plants open. The only plan today in Ottawa with the restructuring of the deep sea fishing industry to keep all the plants open is a plan from this government backed up by the fishermen's union and backed up by the committees on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. member's time is up.

MR. MORGAN: By leave. By leave.
Two minutes, Mr. Chairman, by leave.

MR. NEARY: No, no. That is enough of that silly -

MR. MORGAN: Oh, he does not want the information. Oh, ho, ho, ho, does not want the information.

On motion, Head 1,
Consolidated Fund Services, carried.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I move the Committee rise and report progress.

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 asked me to report the passing of Head 1, have made progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House I would like to advise the House that the Government Services Committee will meet at seven-thirty, not seven o'clock as is customary, this evening in the House of Assembly to continue its review of the estimates of the Department of Transportation. And the Resource Committee will meet tomorrow evening at seven-thirty in the House of Assembly to review the estimates of the Department of Mines and Energy and the Petroleum Directorate.

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

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