

VOL. 2

NO. 24

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 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, this morning the President of the NTA, Mr. Noseworthy, wrote me a letter, which I think has been made public in a Press Conference that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association had this morning and I guess all hon. members are aware of that letter. It says "Dear Mr. Premier: I understand you stated to the News media yesterday that our Association is seeking a contract containing a wage restraint programme of only nineteen months and other issues which will cost your government tens of millions of dollars. You know this is not so. Let me clarify. There is no question of the fact that twenty-four months of restraint without provisos will be in our new Collective Agreement when it is signed." Of course, that is the first time in writing that the NTA has recognized that and has acknowledged it and indicated that they are willing to go along with it.

"In relation to other items such as length of day, preparation time, class size, we can provide language in the final version of the agreement that will guarantee there will be no costs related to these provisions, either in capital expenditures for classroom space or in additional allocations of teacher salary units. The language can also guarantee that there need not be any reduction in current school programmes nor in the ability of the School Boards to manage the system.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

"I trust that our current efforts to reach an agreement with the assistance of a mediator will continue and hopefully a way will be found to forge an agreement and end the current dispute before any further damage is caused the education of the Province's youth. Sincerely yours."

This afternoon I replied to Mr. Noseworthy's letter. "Dear Mr. Noseworthy: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 20th in which you accept Government's two-year Wage Restraint Program unconditionally.

"With respect to the other outstanding issues, I see no meaningful change in your position. And I think the important thing is meaningful change. As we have stated many times in the past,

PREMIER PECKFORD: "Government is not prepared to accept commitments on workload and class size that it cannot reasonably meet. To recognize as desirable goals"- in an agreement"-items which both sides agree Government cannot reasonably implement would be morally dishonest." There is no point for us to put goals, especially in a contract, if they cannot be met because obviously you have to move towards meeting them.

"Specifically, your letter attaches so many conditions to certain of your demands" - all the conditions of no cost here, no cost there, no cost somewhere else-" as to render them meaningless in the context of a collective agreement." I mean, the provisions become meaningless with all those provisos on them. "Obviously, then, the arguments you make lead to the conclusion that such matters should continue to be handled at the local level, as provided for in the existing contract"- to be handled between the principal and the staff and the superintendent as is being done now. "The Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower advised us yesterday that grounds did not exist for a resumption of negotiations. Specifically, he advised us that your Association has no flexibility on the substitute teacher issue. I note that there is no reference to this issue in your letter."

"I suggest that if your Association has significant changes in all outstanding issues to put forward, please contact the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower so that he might evaluate these and again assess whether or not any basis exists for a resumption in negotiations."

So, what we are really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we believe that if now rather than just do it through letters like, that if the NTA has changed on some of its

PREMIER PECKFORD: positions, which on the wage restraint programme it seems that they have, and are willing to change on other items, they should meet with the mediator, whose mediation had been suspended, so that he has an opportunity to objectively go through that and then a mediator can come back and talk to government then we can see whether in fact there has been significant changes in positions to allow for meaningful negotiations to resume.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am again disappointed that there seems to be no resolution to this teacher contract dispute. It seems to be sheer madness, Mr. Speaker, by this government that they have not resolved this dispute. It seems to me the NTA's response this morning to the Premier was a most reasonable response and they have again made it crystal clear that they have agreed to accept the twenty-four month restraint programme, which they have said

MR. LUSH: time and time again, and the Premier refuses time and time again to recognize this, to accept the reality of this situation, that the N.T.A. have indeed accepted it. Today they do it formally, they do it by letter, they say that they have accepted this position with no strings attached. Now, Mr. Speaker, what more does the government want? What more do they want? The N.T.A. have said that the other items, relating to class size and length of day and preparation time, they said they could phrase these in a way that would be of no cost to the government, no cost at all, Mr. Speaker. So why is it that the government is holding up this contract? Why is it that they are keeping our students out of school, depriving them of their education going on two weeks now, Mr. Speaker, for one item, and that is the substitute teachers. And, Mr. Speaker, the government understands very well that this was a matter of contract stripping. This was agreed to, and you are not going to get any union in the Western world that would agree to contract stripping. It is a matter of principle. The N.T.A. had been very reasonable and now the government should follow that reasonable stand and they too should give a little. The N.T.A. have given.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: This government have not given a bit, have not given one bit. The N.T.A. have demonstrated that they understand the negotiation and they told the government about their willingness to accept the twenty-four month restraint programme. Now why does not the government in man-fashion, why do they not in man-fashion acknowledge the fact that they are guilty of contract stripping and get the deal signed today so that our kids can get in school tomorrow, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, today being the first day of the lobster season in the Province I have a statement to make in connection with the lobster fishery. Mr. Speaker, despite the recent meetings that I held with the companies involved in buying lobsters in this Province, and in a recent meeting involving the companies, the Fishermen's Union and the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, the companies have refused to negotiate with the Fishermen's Union to establish prices to be paid to Newfoundland lobster fishermen this year. Because of this and, because I am determined to see that the fishermen get a fair price for their lobsters this year, I will be issuing a statement to all of the companies and buyers who, over the next couple of days, the next twenty-four hours or so, will be issued the necessary licences from the Provincial Department of Fisheries to enable them to buy lobsters in this Province. The buyers licences will be issued to all of these 108 buyers who bought lobsters in Newfoundland last year, in 1982, and the statement to be attached to the licences will clearly indicate the position of the Department of Fisheries with regards to the buying of lobsters and the prices to be paid to fishermen. That position is: (1) That the companies and buyers will have to practice consistent buying practices; and (2), It is the

MR. MORGAN:

opinion of this minister and the Department of Fisheries that fishermen should receive a price for their lobsters that is at least 70 per cent of the Boston, U.S.A. Canadian dollar wholesale price. This price, Mr. Speaker, has been established based on five years of research on lobster prices carried out by the Fishing Industry Advisory Board.

This Canadian dollar wholesale price for lobsters in the Boston market indeed does fluctuate throughout the season. However, weekly Boston Canadian dollar wholesale prices should be and, in my view, must be reflected in the prices paid to our fishermen. For example, at the present time in the Boston market, the Canadian dollar wholesale price for lobster is \$4.30 per pound, Canadian. Thus, our lobster fishermen should receive 70 per cent of this price for their lobsters in this case equalling \$3.00 per pound. And again, for example, Mr. Speaker, if the Boston Canadian dollar wholesale price drops, fluctuates and drops, for example, from the present \$4.30 per pound to \$3.30 per pound, our lobster fishermen again should receive 70 per cent of that price equalling \$2.30 per pound.

Some of the companies who will be issued licences to buy lobsters in this Province are presently buying lobsters in Nova Scotia. At the present time, as of today, these companies are paying Nova Scotian lobster fishermen \$3.50 per pound, as of today. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this and the position I have taken to ensure our fishermen receive a fair price for their lobsters, I have established a daily lobster price monitoring system. This monitoring system will cover prices in the wholesale

MR. MORGAN:

US market, in Boston in particular.

It will pay the prices paid to the Nova Scotian fishermen on a daily basis and it will cover the prices paid to Newfoundland fishermen by the various companies, again, on a daily basis. The companies will be issued the necessary licences from this department within the next twenty-four hours.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to work in close co-operation with the Fishermen's Union, the fishermen through their union, on this matter. Again I want to say I will not hesitate to review the situation at any time throughout the season

MR. MORGAN: if it is felt that the wishes of the government and the Department of Fisheries are not being complied with. And again I want to reiterate what we are saying is that the prices in the market place, that the buyers get for the lobsters they buy from fishermen, should automatically reflect back to the fishermen in the price that they receive from these buyers. In other words the market dictates the price paid to fishermen. That is what we are saying. And whenever the price in Canadian dollars in the Boston market where practically all of our lobsters are sold, that when these prices are firmly established each and every day, from three different sources we use in the monitoring process, not just the Boston blue sheet, but three different separate sources. We establish these prices on a weekly basis and we say to the buyers in Newfoundland, "You must pay the Newfoundland fishermen 70 per cent of the price you are getting on the wholesale market in the USA." We think it is fair to the companies and fair to the fishermen. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am responding to the ministerial statement because my colleague, our spokesman on fisheries, is travelling on some very important business and I am sure if he were here that he would say the same things that I am going to say. And I am also speaking for my colleague by the way, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who represents the district where the lobster fishery is probably the largest in the whole Province.

We concur with the action taken by the hon. gentleman. It is not very often we get an opportunity to agree with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), this is one of those rare occasions. The lobster prices, I

MR. NEARY: suppose is a topic that has been bandied about this House now for a good many years. It has been talked about more I suppose than anything else in this House.

I do not understand, the minister did not make it clear, why it was 70 per cent of the Boston prices. Why was it not 60? Or why was it not 80 or 90 per cent? Perhaps the hon. gentleman, when he gets an opportunity can clarify that.

That is our position,

Mr. Speaker, we concur with the action of the minister. It appears to be drastic action. It is probably unprecedented. I would hope that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the Department of Fisheries, will have the courage to follow through. I hope that they will cancel licences immediately when they discover that buyers are not paying the required price laid down under the conditions of the licence, that there be no hanky-panky, no beating around the bush, it will just be if you are not paying the price your licence is cancelled, that is it.

And another point I would like to make before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe in the long-term that we are going to have to look at a better system for purchasing and marketing lobsters. We have talked about marketing of other species of the sea on a number of occasions in this House. We contend on this side that the terms of reference of the

MR. NEARY: Canadian Saltfish Corporation
should be expanded to include the marketing of all
the products of the sea. Perhaps the minister might give
some consideration to that. And then there is the matter of
holding the lobsters for the time when the fishermen can
get a better price. That is something worth looking into
to, Mr. Speaker. But we welcome this Ministerial Statement
and we welcome the fact that the lobster fishermen will get
a better price for their lobsters this season, and we hope
that the hon. gentleman will follow through and take drastic
action in the event that some of the buyers do not follow
the rules that are laid down by his department.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question
for the Premier. Mr. Speaker, would the Premier not agree
that the negotiating process is one of give and take? The
NTA have certainly indicated their willingness to give. They
have accepted in no uncertain terms the government's condition
of accepting the twenty-four month restraint programme. The
NTA have emphatically and clearly demonstrated their
intention to do this. They have indicated that the matters
of preparation time, class size, these matters, will not
cost any money and they say they are prepared in the
negotiations to come forward with that kind of language.
Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems as though the big matter that
the government will not accede to is the substitute teachers.
I want the Premier to listen very carefully. He obviously
knows that this is a matter of high principle with the
NTA. This was a matter that was agreed to and it seems as
though the Premier is trying to push the NTA right to
the limit, to cave in on a matter that is of very great

MR. LUSH: importance to a union. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of give and take. The NTA have given and would the Premier not agree to give in on this very insignificant matter of substitute teachers, Mr. Speaker?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are not going to negotiate across the floor of the House and neither do we want to negotiate in public in an exchange of letters. At the end of my statement a few minutes ago I indicated that it is the government's feeling that, given the letter back from the NTA this morning and our response, and whilst we are disappointed that they never even mentioned the substitute teachers situation, which was a critical element for them, it would seem - and the question of the twenty-four month wage restraint, I mean, the government's position is we had to be fair and equal to all

PREMIER PECKFORD: the people who receive funds or salaries from the government. I mean, it is only today that we have in writing from the NTA the acknowledgment that that twenty-four month wage restraint programme will be accepted by that association. This is seven or eight days after the strike began. So, you know, it has been a very difficult course that both of us have been on over the last week or so. Without the acceptance of that as a given, we had all kinds of problems.

So I think the approach now to take, rather than exchanges of letters which I or the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) or the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) or the acting President of Treasury Board or somebody else would send to the President or somebody else in the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, that the proper course now to follow - I mean, we had a mediation process in place, it did not work; there was a lot of hope built up that it would work to me the way to proceed now would be for the NTA to contact the Deputy Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Blanchard), sit down, go through that letter, go through all the points, that of the substitute teachers and on some of the other points that are not in that letter that the NTA have mentioned during the mediation process, which they had mentioned were very important and which are not there. So, you know, it is not just that letter.

So to me the way to proceed now is for the Newfoundland Teachers' Association people to contact Mr. Blanchard, sit down and have a meeting and then Mr. Blanchard can sit down at a meeting with the government side and then we can see whether in fact there is a meeting of minds or enough common ground for both sides to get together eyeball to eyeball and settle

PREMIER PECKFORD: the dispute. That is the way we would like to see it go from here rather than getting back and forth into class size or preparation time or lunch period or length of day, and whether it should be in or not in the contract, the kinds of wording that they are talking about. So, you know, I think that is the next approach now for the NTA to take, because I do not think we can negotiate this contract or any contract with any group through an exchange of letters like this that are made public or across the floor of this House even though I appreciate the question from the Education critic for the Opposition.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the Premier insists on saying that this is the first acknowledgement by the NTA of accepting this twenty-four month requirement, the restraint programme. In a press release this morning - and I happen to have a copy of the press release given by the President of the NTA - at one point he makes that statement that they will be accepting this wage restraint programme. And he says, 'This, of course, is nothing new. We have told Mr. Peckford this at the bargaining table as far back as January through the public media and most recently through the Deputy Minister of Labour.' So the President says

MR. LUSH:

that he let the government and the Premier know this back in January. So, Mr. Speaker, you know, let us not carry on with this. I mean, why carry on with this? The N.T.A. have accepted it, they have said so again today very clearly.

Another question, Mr. Speaker, regarding the mediation process. The President of the NTA today, again in that public statement, said that he was surprised by the Premier's announcement yesterday to the effect that the process of mediation had failed to bring about a final agreement in the dispute. And he says, 'The provincial government ended those mediation efforts with the announcement that talks had broken down'. It says, 'The announcement came as a surprise to the NTA'. Now, Mr. Speaker, this again seems to be a very questionable process of carrying on negotiations when the one side, the major side, the people who are concerned, do not know anything about it. Their understanding was that the mediator was back here talking to the government team and the next thing they knew was the Premier made this statement in the House. Can the Premier comment on that set of circumstances?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, let me just deal with first things first and that concerns Mr. Noseworthy's statement again this morning about he had always accepted the twenty-four month wage restraint programme. I mean, this is one of the problems that we are only having with the NTA. We have not had it with all the other union groups.

MR. NEARY: Creating new problems.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Wait until I explain the problem so that you will know what I am talking about then you will know whether it is the same or different

PREMIER PECKFORD: than another one. That is how you bargain, how the bargaining process works, and both sides put positions on the table, and it is that position which is the position of that group. Now there is a lot of talk that goes on in between that, verbal jostling back and forth on different issues. But the final written formal position of the NTA when negotiations broke off between the government and the NTA was the position of a nineteen month wage restraint programme, and that they would only go to the twenty-four month, that had already been announced last Fall by the government and had been accepted by 10,000 other workers, on condition that they go some other things in the agreement. We kept saying that it was a non-negotiable item. The other items were negotiable, this was non-negotiable because it was public policy. We have the nurses coming up for new negotiations soon, other groups coming up and we have to treat them in exactly the same way as we treated the teachers otherwise what is the point of dealing with the government at all if they are going to do one thing for one group and something else for another?

Now, in that January 26 meeting, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), myself and others, when this had been alleged in the press by Mr. Noseworthy, we checked with our negotiators and at one point

PREMIER PECKFORD:

in the meeting of January 26 one of the members of the negotiating team mentioned this business of the twenty-four months and that they might be willing to accept it, but it was never advanced as a position from the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Now we got to understand that. You cannot go picking up loose comments. I mean, in the same way I can pick up on a comment made by one of our negotiators and release it to the public to show our reasonableness and flexibility on a given issue but that is not the point. The whole nature and process of negotiations is what your position is is put on the table. You talk away about the issues and then you jostle and then you either amend your proposal or you do not amend it. You are looking for openings, you are looking for flexibility. So, I mean, that is neither here nor there, that does not deserve any further comment. The long and short of it is that until this morning we have not had a formal position from the NTA saying that they accepted the twenty-four month wage restraint programme. It is no good to into verbal discussions that went on between the two sides in the negotiating process. There is a position and only one position; that is the position submitted in writing on the table by that given party. That is all, that is the only position. You cannot have positions based upon a verbal conversation between one individual of one party to one individual of another party. That does not work. That is not the way the negotiating process works. It works on a position that was put forward and that was the position that was put forward, so, that is all I can really say on that.

Now, as it relates to yesterday afternoon, the mediator came to my office to meet with me and the committee and presented the statement that I tabled in the House indicating that he had done up a statement, that he had it sent over from his office, and he did not see that there

PREMIER PECKFORD: were sufficient grounds for negotiations to begin, and that really the mediation process might have been a bit too early or whatever, there did not seem to be enough flexibility and that he was suggesting that to me and that he was then leaving me and going to contact the NTA and to let them know the same thing. So then we immediately prepared our statement and submitted it to the House before 6:00 P.M. along with the statement that the mediator had given to the press some time before that. So, I mean, I do not know what Mr. Noseworthy is talking about. I can only, for my part, know that the mediator came and saw us, told us that there was no grounds for negotiation, that the mediation should be suspended for the time being, and that he was issuing a statement that he had done up to the press, and he gave me copy. So we went and did our bit and piece and

PREMIER PECKFORD:

presented it to the House before it closed, after the mediator had given it to the press. And, as I understood it, he left then and called and informed the other side of the same information. That is all I know about it. It was fair, decent, honest, straight and, you know, any allegations to the contrary, are completely unknown to me. I was just carrying out my functions as I saw them to the Legislature in releasing our position, after the mediator had contacted the press, so that the House would be informed and the people of the Province would be informed on it.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Premier in response to one of my questions made the point that one could not carry on negotiations through letters, and I agree. Yet in the meantime the Premier certainly indicates or points out the government's position. His letter to Mr. Noseworthy points out that he acknowledges the N.T.A.'s acceptance of the two year wage restraint programme, but then goes on to say that, with the other outstanding issues, they see no way that the government can negotiate with these; in other words they said the N.T.A. has not changed their position.

Then he goes on to say you have not mentioned the substitute teacher issue. So obviously the fact that the Premier has raised this shows that they are very firm on this matter. And, as I say again, this is a matter of principle with the N.T.A., and it is a matter of hitting the organization where it hurts most on this matter of high principle, Mr. Speaker. And, as I said earlier, now this could concern an insignificant matter because, when the announcement was made in the first place that they were reducing the pay of the substitute teachers, I think, the reason given was to cut down costs and to

MR. LUSH:

save \$2

million for Grade XII or whatever other educational purposes
they needed the money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we may as well face the facts, the government have that money. The strike has been going on now for - what? seven days.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Seven days.

MR. LUSH:

They have that money.

As a matter of fact they saved upwards to \$9 million and the substitute pay was only going to be \$2 million.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is making

a speech;

MR. MARSHALL: it is not a very good speech but it is still a speech. Standing Order 31 (c) "In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as many be necessary to explain the same". There is ample authority in Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, with respect to making speeches. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order, He is on a supplementary question, he should get to his question if in fact he has one.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Leader of the Opposition, to that point of order.

MR. NEARY: We all know the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker. We gave the Premier over there an opportunity when he was answering the question to be long-winded. We did not object because this is a very serious and crucial matter; we would like to see it resolved. And my colleague was making some valid points and I thought, because of the serious nature of this topic, Mr. Speaker, that the House would agree to allow a little latitude so that the points could be made adequately. We know what the rules are. We do not have to be reminded by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, when the government is getting in trouble, gets up on points of order and tries to bail them out. In this particular instance, the hon. gentleman should have let it go.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, it is correct, of course, that a supplementary question should not need any preamble whatsoever. The Chair has been fairly lenient with the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), and with the hon. Premier in his answers. But for all intents and purposes the question should be brief and the answer should be brief.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question then is in view of the fact that the goals announced for reducing funds for substitute teachers have now been more than reached, that the government now have \$9 million.-they have \$7 million more than they should have had, they now have \$7 million more.-in view of this and in view of the fact that this is a very high principle with the NTA, would the government not negotiate, Mr. Speaker, this substitute teacher clause?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, when I answered earlier I indicated to the hon. member that I cannot here in this House of Assembly negotiate a component of a collective agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. That is impossible. I cannot go doing that, that is not the way parties negotiate.

The member for Terra Nova

(Mr. Lush) knows the difference of that. He knows I cannot get up here, as Premier and head of the government, and start talking about what we are prepared to do on this component and not prepared to do on that component. That is not the way negotiations occur and the hon. the member for Terra Nova knows the difference of it. We cannot do it that way.

You know, talking about money and so on, I mean, the situation is not a question of money this year. We are talking about an educational system which is costing a lot of money and will cost a lot of money over the next number of years. In order to continue to assist in paying for some of the new programmes we brought in, as much as we did not want to get involved in any elements in Education, we were forced to. We have

PREMIER PECKFORD:

had to close down hospitals . North West River is being phased out, Markland is gone, there are other hospitals that are going to have to be phased out or closed down or whatever it is over the next few years. All segments of government departments are being affected in order to manage. You know, we have a larger responsibility. It is not a question of whether we have saved enough money now, it is a question of trying to budget properly over the next number of years. This is not a one year deal so that we have the money this year and we worry about next year next year. I mean, that is not the way a government with any credence or credibility is going to operate its finances and its planning. So that in my view is not a very fair question to ask because we are talking about trying to save money to improve and continue educational programmes this year, next year, the year after and so on. So, I mean, that is where that is. But as for the substantive nature of the hon. member's question, will the government now do this or do that with a given component that is an outstanding issue between the two sides, that is for the negotiation process. And we are saying in our letter to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, the process is there, Mr. Blanchard is available, and if you have other positions that you want to put on various items let us be cautious, let us go through this independent mediator that both sides trust and then allow that mediator to suggest to both sides whether in fact we can get back to the table. And I think if that started again now, if the NTA sees that as still a legitimate and honest process, then I think that is the way for us to proceed from here rather than exchanging

PREMIER PECKFORD: letters back and forth on different things. Because as I said to the hon. member, and I do not want to say this, you know, the whole process forces you into indicating things to protect your own creditability. I mean, the NTA yesterday and the day before through the mediation process put a number of items on the table that hitherto - or not on the table, I should not say that, mentioned to the mediator certain items which up until then had not been mentioned as problems through the last three or four months of negotiations. Now I am either telling the truth or I am not telling the truth, but all I am trying to do is say to you what is in this letter is what is in that letter. But there are other items that are also of crucial concern to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. So the best way to handle it is not through me saying something and Mr. Noseworth saying something, even though I appreciate that the Opposition has a role to ask the questions. But we have to get back to some kind of a process which is away from exchanging letters and trying to protect one another's own position in the eyes of the public.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the only way to solve this is not through writing letters back and forth. The Premier should not be engaging in those games even if the NTA want to do it. The way to get this dispute solved is get back to the bargaining table and not to be pulling the rug from out under the mediation process as it looks like the government did. It looks like it was not the NTA that pulled the rug from under the mediation process,

MR. LUSH: the government did, and it looks like it was not the NTA who pulled the plug in the mediation process. The question, Mr. Speaker - you know, this letter seems awfully stupid.- the question is where do we go from here? The Premier ends up his letter by saying, "I suggest that if your Association has significant changes in all outstanding issues to put forward" - and, Mr. Speaker, they wrote the Premier telling what the issues were and what they were doing. Now, the Premier comes back again and says, you know, 'if you have significant changes'. They have given their changes. Also, Mr. Speaker, is this going to be the Premier's move? Is this going to be the move that is going to resolve this or is the Premier going to do something else? Is the Premier trying to bring both sides back and is the Premier going to go down and face these teachers this afternoon?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: How many questions are there? I do not know how many questions are there. The hon. member has been given an awful lot of latitude in a supplementary question - not an original question but a supplementary. And that is fine, I do not mind, we will bend the rules for the hon. member so he can ask his question and get his few shots in. That is fine and dandy.

MR. LUSH: Where do we go from here?

PREMIER PECKFORD: All I can say to the hon. member is is that we are suggesting in that letter that perhaps it is time, given what they say in the letter for them to contact the mediator and see whether we have common ground for negotiations to begin.

Now, the other thing is - and I want the hon. member to understand this - that the letter does not include all the issues that they have

PREMIER PECKFORD: been talking about. But I do not want to be saying that over and over again to somehow provoke the executive of the NTA. I mean, I am serious about it to protect my position here, because I have to protect it now under this kind of interrogation. And that is why we say 'all the issues' because they do not address the substitute teacher thing at all and other issues that they have been, you know, verbally talking about to the mediator which are not in the letter. So the thing for the NTA to do, so that we get back to some process which is legitimate, is to go back to the mediator and say, 'Okay, as a result of the letter we sent to the Premier this morning, here is where we are on these issues,' then he brings it to us. Then, if there is enough common ground, we sit down and try to negotiate something.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

 In view of the fact that the Fire Commissioner has issued a close order on an apartment building, McFadden's apartments in Happy Valley - Goose Bay some several weeks ago, and since there were sixty-six outstanding deficiencies in this apartment building and the fact that at the present time there are still four families including, I think, eleven children, still left in this building that is unsafe, has the minister decided to move those families out of this building that, according to the Fire Commissioner, is unsafe?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is quite correct. On April 6th or 7th, one of those dates, there was an order given for closure with respect to these apartments. That was later modified or amended to a compliance order on the understanding that the owner, who lives outside the Province but has a local manager up there, would agree to put in the improvements required by the Fire Commissioner. They included a sprinkler system, repairs to exit lights, repairs to the electrical system, cleaning up debris and also to keep a night watchman on duty until those things had been affected. Some work was done and it is our understanding, the understanding of the Fire Commissioner that work has now ceased. The building, therefore, has been closed for occupancy and I understand there are four families left who have not found alternate accommodation. The Department of Justice, through the Fire Commissioner's office, has been in touch with the local Social Services office and they are endeavouring to find alternative accommodation for those four families. I understand the position is being monitored very carefully by the Chief of the Happy Valley - Gosse Bay Fire Brigade acting in his own capacity but also, of course, he and other Fire Chiefs act as assistants to the Fire Commissioner.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is shocking to know that Department of Rural Development officials knew about this several days ago, in fact, did weeks ago, that this dangerous building was still being operated in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, but very

MR. WARREN: little until the day I got in contact with the Fire Commissioner. And I am glad that the minister and the Fire Commissioner have decided today to take the necessary action, but it is only now that the minister has been advised that they are trying to move the four families out of this house.

I would like to ask the minister another question. Will those families, left in this dangerous apartment building in Happy Valley, be moved within a matter of hours? That is my question to the minister.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: A slight correction on the hon. gentleman's preamble. It was not just today; as soon as it came to the attention of the Fire Commissioner, that was around the 6th of April, then action was taken and the compliance order was given, work commenced and it was when work was discontinued then that the building was ordered to be closed. The Social Services Department is doing, I understand, everything possible to find alternate accommodation for those four families.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I would assume they would find that accommodation in a very brief and reasonable period of time. But obviously it would be impossible to say here in St. John's when they will find it but I know they are making every effort and I have no doubt will find it, but I could not say at what moment they will find it.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the Fire Commissioner did not know until I spoke to him today, did not know that work has ceased on the building. The Fire Commissioner advised me today that the first word he heard about work ceasing on the building was today. Still and all the officials in the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development knew that this building was still occupied for several days with no work being carried out to correct the deficiencies. So I am just asking the minister, now that he does know, although he has said that they are looking for alternative accommodations, if the Department of Social Services cannot find alternative accommodations, will those four families be moved out of this apartment today and moved into some other accommodations in Happy Valley - Goose Bay? That is the question to the minister.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly the government departments concerned will do everything possible to find appropriate accommodation for the people. That is about all I can say.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we have only a minute or two in Question Period. Perhaps I could ask one brief question of my friend the Minister of Health (Mr. House), who has had an easy time of it the last little while;

EXTRANEIOUS NOISE

MR. ROBERTS: The tides of revolution are lapping around the base of Your Honour's Chair out there. The line goes from here back to the Holiday Inn.

I would like to ask the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, if, in the light of the appointment by him and his colleagues of the Royal Commission headed by Mr. Orsborn - by the way, I think they are three excellent appointments, those three men - if he is prepared to give the House a commitment that the government will not initiate any action to close any hospital in this Province until the Royal Commission report has been received?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the Commission will be reporting in less than a year, I think it is in February, and we have announced the closure of a hospital and we have no plans to -

MR. ROBERTS: I was not speaking of the North West River Hospital.

MR. HOUSE: Pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: I was not speaking of North West.
That is a fait accompli, that is dead now.

MR. HOUSE: The mandate that the Commission has
is to look at health care costs and to make some recommendations
to government, and that has nothing to do at this point in time
with the closure of any hospitals. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, we
are not going around happily looking for hospitals to close. So I am
not going to give any commitment that we would do this or that
until the Commission reports. I am saying simply and plainly
that we at this point in time have no intention of closing
any hospitals.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I will permit one more question,
The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Just a supplementary growing
out of that; I will have some more another day. So the
minister then, just so we are all crystal clear, is not
prepared to give a confirmation in behalf of the government of
which he is a part, leaving aside North West River, which is
as dead as the administration's political career
is, leaving aside North West River, that the
government will not initiate any action to close any
hospital in this Province between now and the period of eight
or nine months from now whenever this Royal Commission does
report? That is the administration's position, that all bets
are still open, is that it?

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there is nobody
saying anything about all beds being open. The hon. member
was asking about hospitals closing.

MR. ROBERTS:

Yes, I meant hospitals.

MR. HOUSE:

I have no doubt that there will be closures of beds, but -

MR. ROBERTS:

I said 'bets' not 'beds'.

I said all 'bets' open.

MR. HOUSE:

Oh, I see, I am sorry. I did not hear it.

Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned, there is no intention of this administration closing any hospitals at this particular point in time.

MR. ROBERTS:

No intention! 'Goudie' learned of closing North West two days before it closed.

MR. HOUSE:

North West River Hospital, Mr. Speaker, had been under study for a number of years and I think it was a foregone conclusion by most people in the know that it would be closing at some point in time and, of course, this was the year for it.

MR. ROBERTS:

And the same with Placentia, Buchans and Botwood.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, there are studies going on looking at that status of a lot of these hospitals. I mentioned some time ago that

MR. HOUSE:

we were looking at a number of the cottage hospitals with a view to changing their role for them to give better service to the public, but we have no intention, as I have said, at this point in time, of closing any hospitals.

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to Question No. 54 from the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) asking a list of places where properties have been acquired by the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation for the purposes of land banking, giving acreage and so forth. We have some 7,700 acres of land held in the Province at the moment and the details of where they are and how much it cost and how we paid for it are all provided, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might revert back for a moment to Presenting Reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to revert back to Presenting Reports?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

MR. DAWE: As required by the Mineral Act 1976, section 3 (2), I would like to table mineral licences issued during the twelve months immediately preceeding the 31st. of March, 1982.

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, we shall proceed with Motion Number 3 on the Order Paper, to be moved by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the hon. the Premier stood in his place in this hon. House and stated categorically that the development of the five head waters in Labrador, for the purposes of hydro power generation, is not economically feasible, that the cost of developing these rivers would not justify the returns, in other words.

I find that information very depressing, Mr. Speaker, because if it is true it means yet another economic escape hatch for Newfoundland and Labrador has been closed because of the incompetence and delays by this administration in deploying our resources to their best advantage.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I am checking the Premier's statement for credibility, because quite frankly I find the statement that he made hard to believe so I am trying to have the facts checked out, to have them verified or otherwise as to their accuracy or inaccuracy and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the statements are inaccurate.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:

We are on

Private Members Day today and it is my understanding that what we are discussing is the hon. gentleman's resolution related to the offshore, which we all look forward to.

I do not know whether the hon. gentleman realizes we are on Motion 3 on the Order Paper, which was his motion.

He is now talking about the five rivers in Labrador, which is not related to it. I like to assist the hon. member at all times and particularly to make him aware of the fact that it is his resolution that is on the Order Paper.

That is why he got up. But he has to be relevant, at least, to his own resolution. I do not know why he brought it in in the first place if he does not know what he brought in, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order, the

hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

If the hon. gentleman would

just sit back and relax and listen, he would soon learn,

Mr. Speaker, what it is I am driving at.

MR. MARSHALL:

Are you speaking on the resolution?

MR. NEARY:

I am speaking on the resolution.

I am merely giving a preamble just to show, Mr. Speaker, how this government have waited and waited and waited in a number of instances, and I am leading up to the offshore, which will be dealt with in due course. So I think I am in order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order.

I will allow some preamble on what the Leader of the Opposition is saying, but we are speaking on the offshore motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, this is one example of where the administration waited and waited and waited and eventually the feasibility of developing these five rivers became impractical.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a little over a year ago, the Premier called an unnecessary general election and in that election he used one issue and one issue only, and that was that if he were given a mandate that he would negotiate an agreement on the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

I am afraid hon. members' hearts are outside the building today and, Mr. Speaker, I can assure members that that is where my mind and my heart is at the moment, outside this building.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Tory policy, the one plank in their platform a year ago, and the show that they put on to win this election, was the fact that they had one issue and one issue only, and that was to negotiate an offshore agreement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, during that election and leading up to that election, we heard all kinds of statements being made by the Premier, who went around the Province beating his chest and saying, "We will not be second-class citizens, we will not be robbed of our heritage, we will not go on being 'have not' forever. We will have our day in the sun.

'Have not' will be no more." Well, Mr. Speaker, that was a little over a year ago, and today what do we have?

MR. NEARY:

Well, we have 50,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are unemployed Mr. Speaker, whether or not they are second class citizens. They are unemployed. So, Mr. Speaker, whether 'have not' will be no more is something that the Premier will have to decide. 'Have not will be no more', Mr. Speaker, when translated into the grim, brutal reality of the 1982 election, I guess means we will have more unemployment in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, in a way, I suppose, if you wanted to you could show where the Premier actually delivered the exact opposite of what he promised in that election. He promised that 'Have not will be no more' in the Premier's world and that - I am trying to listen and talk at the same time. It is very difficult. I am like the former Premier, I am like Mr. Smallwood in that regard, that I cannot speak and listen at the same time. I wish I could.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, all kinds of things have happened concerning the offshore, but I think the main thing that happened was the fact, and I think history will record this, that there has been a whole string of failures in connection with the handling of the offshore resources, a whole string of failures, But I believe the most significant thing that happened, and I have said this before in this hon. House and outside the House, is the fact that the Premier, and I think he was probably more responsible for doing this than any other member on the other side, He may have been aided and abetted by the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), but I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier

MR. NEARY: unilaterally, just running a one-man show, in a dictatorial fashion bullied his caucus and the Cabinet into allowing him to put the offshore ownership question before the Newfoundland Appeals Court. And when the administration made that decision, Mr. Speaker, they made one of the most colossal blunders in the whole history of Newfoundland politics. What they did, they took the resource, they brought it to the three Judges of the Newfoundland Appeals Court and they said, 'Here is the resource, now you decide who owns it, you decide its future'. That is what the Administration did and, of course, we all know the result: The Administration gambled

MR. NEARY: and they lost. And now, Mr. Speaker, they sit there day in and day out like dummies. They have no input into the development of the resource, they sit there - I like to compare them to spectators at a hockey game, they just watch the play going back and forth between the oil companies and the federal government and there is not a thing in this world that they can do about it. They have no input, they are not up to date, they do not know what is happening with the development of the resource from one day to the next. They have to sit there and listen to announcements being made about job creation, about providing business for Newfoundland companies and, Mr. Speaker, there is not a thing they can do about it. Even the oil companies defied their orders to bring the rigs in from the Grand Banks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why, then, did I put this resolution on the Order Paper? Well, I put the resolution on the Order Paper in a hope that it is still not too late, Mr. Speaker, for the parties to sit down, as we have been trying to persuade the parties to do in the case of the teachers, sit down in all sincerity in an atmosphere of trust and good will and try to resolve this matter before we completely lose everything that we have.

The resolution before us today, Mr. Speaker, states: 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House of Assembly go on record, today, as supporting a negotiated settlement to this question at once', the offshore that is, 'which would provide maximum long term and short term benefits to this Province and to Canada'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask hon. members of the House, is that too much to ask? Is

MR. NEARY: that a lot to ask? Let our Premier call Mr. Chretien on the telephone, or Mr. Trudeau for that matter, and say, 'Look here, let bygones be bygones, let us forget pre-conditions and let us talk a deal'. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that too much to ask for? Is that too much? Is that a lot to ask for? I would love to be out there clapping and cheering, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman, his mind is wandering.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. gentleman for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: It is a long established rule in this House that members

MR. CARTER: are required not to read their speeches. It is all right for a person making his maiden speech, and this could, perhaps, be construed as the hon. gentleman's maiden speech, because it is the same speech he has been making for the last sixteen or seventeen years. But, nevertheless, he is reading a speech. He should be directed to table it if he is, and also to sit down and discontinue reading it, or to debate from his mother wit of which he does not seem to have very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member is correct that that is a point of order, but it also is correct that in this House a member can use extensive notes. I rule there is no valid point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not reasonably convinced, Mr. Speaker, that what I am suggesting will not happen, that the Premier, unfortunately, cannot accept the fact that he was wrong, that he was blatantly wrong and tragically wrong and fatally wrong and historically wrong in what he did. And he knows that, Mr. Speaker, but he just will not admit it. And the first thing that has to happen is that the Premier of this Province will have to admit, first of all, that he is wrong, that he has one failure after the other in connection with the offshore. Now, once he admits to himself he does not have to come into the Legislature and bare his soul, or he does not have to take to the radio or television from the Conference Room on the eleventh floor. All the Premier has to do is admit to himself that he is wrong, Mr. Speaker, but he will not admit it. So no wonder, Mr. Speaker, there is dissent in the backbenchers on the opposite side, and I refer to the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) who has taken a very statesmanlike stand in this whole matter, who has made a suggestion similar to the one that I am making here today, and that is that the parties

MR. NEARY: return to the bargaining table and negotiate a settlement.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, is becoming an embarrassment to those other forty-two members over there. They are ashamed to tell the people who they work for, and ashamed to say, "Oh, yes, I work for the Premier," Mr. Speaker, "yes, Sir, I work for him but I am not proud of him." Not one of them over there is willing to make that statement to a businessman in this Province. We have all heard what the Board of Trade had to say about the administration and the dictatorial actions of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, they are not prepared to make these statements to teachers, or to the students in this Province with any sincerity. Mr. Speaker, who can blame members on the opposite side who have turned their backs on the constituents and

MR. NEARY: on the teachers and on the students and on the mine workers and on the pulp and paper workers? Who can blame them for being ashamed to look their constituents and to look these groups straight in the eye and say that they work for the Premier of this Province? Who can blame them, Mr. Speaker?

I am appealing now, you may call it a last ditch effort, and I speak to each and every member on the opposite side, that if they have an ounce of decency left in their bodies, Mr. Speaker, if they have any sense of decency at all, that they will speak out in favour of this resolution and in favour of their Province, Mr. Speaker, which will enjoy the benefits of a negotiated agreement on the offshore resources. And if they are too ashamed to do it over there, Mr. Speaker, let them come on this side of the House, if they are true Newfoundlanders, come over here and join with us, Mr. Speaker. We will welcome any man or woman from the other side who is brave enough, Mr. Speaker, to speak out for their homes, for their communities, for their districts and for their own people, and stand up and be counted if they are true Newfoundlanders. Because if they stay on the disaster course that they have been on since the Tories took over in this Province eleven years ago, Mr. Speaker, then we are all going to go down the tube, down the drain with the administration.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a few moments ago, instead of delivering on the one issue in the last election, to deliver an agreement to the people of this Province if they were given a large mandate, we have seen just the opposite happen in this Province. Instead of delivering on an agreement that would give the people of Newfoundland

MR. NEARY: and Labrador prosperity, that would provide jobs for the unemployed, that would provide business for companies that are going bankrupt, especially small businesses, instead of delivering that agreement, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has done just the opposite. But that is not the first time that has happened since the Tories took over in this Province eleven years ago.

We saw examples of where projects were started by this administration, and probably the most obvious one was the setting off of the two

MR. NEARY: explosions on either side of the Strait of Belle Isle to commence the development of the Lower Churchill, and when the election was over, Mr. Speaker, that project was cancelled. The two fire crackers that they set off were worth about \$110 million, but it was written off as an election expense, Mr. Speaker, because that is all it was. And as soon as this election was over they forgot the mandate. What was the mandate, Mr. Speaker? The mandate was to deliver an offshore agreement. Now, if they do not deliver on that agreement what are the consequences? What are the consequences? Should we wait until another election is called in this Province before the electorate can get an opportunity to deal with the administration who hoodwinked them in that election? The reason you have forty-four members sitting on the opposite side, forty-four members there opposite, is because they were given a mandate to negotiate. And they failed to deliver, they failed to deliver an agreement to the people of this Province who placed their trust in each and every member sitting on that side of the House. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that hon. gentlemen in good conscience will, today, stand and support this resolution. As hon. members can see there is no politics mixed up in this resolution. I have not made a political speech. I have tried to steer away from partisan politics in order to try to entice some hon. gentlemen on the benches opposite to support my resolution. I think it is a very important resolution, Mr. Speaker. I really do not think that we should wait for the Supreme Court of Canada to hand down its decision on the offshore ownership question before negotiations resume. But obviously that is the strategy of the administration.

MR. NEARY: Not only are they going to wait for the Supreme Court decision, but it is obvious to every citizen of this Province, every man, woman and child, that they are also playing politics with this very, very important matter. They are hoping that a Tory government will be elected in Canada in the next election, Mr. Speaker, so they are continuing with the gamble. They are hoping that a Tory government will be elected. But even if a Tory government is elected they cannot give the resource back to Newfoundland once the court has made its decision, it would take an amendment to the Constitution to do that. And not only is it a gamble in that regard, but, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in this House, if Mr. Mulroney is unfortunate enough to become the Prime Minister of Canada, then, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you would see the screws turned a little tighter on this administration, because it is a well-known fact that Mr. Mulroney, and now Mr. Clark, has been stabbed in the back by one of his main supporters in this Province, the Premier. I would not consider him to be a very good friend of this Province. So, what should happen now, Mr. Speaker, is to forget all the things that have gone before, let bygones be bygones, vote in favour of this resolution, follow the advice of the member for Mount Scio, follow the advice given in the resolution, get back to the negotiating table, bargain in good faith, bargain in an atmosphere of trust and try to get this matter straightened out once and for all, Mr. Speaker, so that we can carry on with the development of our other natural resources and get on with the job and deliver an agreement for which the people of this Province gave the administration a mandate a little over a year ago.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Alyward): The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I want to have a few words to say on this resolution as brought down by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Let me begin my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying this: I very seldom say anything personality-wise about any member in this House. In fact, I do not recall that I have ever done it, although one is provoked from time to time and one might do that in the heat of debate. But when I see the Leader of the Opposition in this Province getting up and pointing at members on this side of the House and talking about decency, and talking about morality, and talking about honesty, and talking about backbone or the lack thereof, then, Mr. Speaker, I cannot let that kind of thing go unchallenged and unanswered. Because if there is anybody, if there is any politician in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who wants to talk about decency, then I suggest it is anybody but the Leader of the Opposition. I suggest that it is anybody except that gentleman. If there is anybody who wants to talk about backbone-and then he throws in the little thing about members on this side turning their backs. I wrote down the words 'turning their backs on their constituents'- and he makes the big list. One on the list is miners. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will have the Leader of the Opposition know, and anybody in this Province know, and all people in this House know that I am not going to stand here and have that kind of innuendo thrown across the House, 'turning your back on your constituents'. What happened to the Leader of the Opposition on Bell Island and his miners if you want to talk about turning your back. It certainly did not happen to me in Baie Verte. I did not run away. I did not turn my back. And then he gets up and he talks about decency and honesty and turning one's back on one's constituents and becoming turncoats. Mr. Speaker, it is scandalous, really, that when you get up to speak on a serious resolution like this

MR. RIDEOUT: you find yourself forced to respond to those kinds of political accusations coming from the hon. gentleman. And then he ends off his few remarks by saying that he made his remarks in a nonpartisan spirit, he did not want to be partisan. The resolution was nonpartisan. You know, you get in your flicks and your digs and then you try to paint it all over in the last gasp of breath that is coming out of your mouth, before you sit down, by saying it is nonpartisan, you did not want to get into a partisan battle. I wonder how naïve, Mr. Speaker, does he think people in this House and in this Province are?

MR. RIDEOUT:

The hon. gentleman spent the first five minutes he was on his feet talking about the headwaters of the five rivers in Labrador and the development of those rivers. What on earth it had to do with the Resolution that he himself put down I do not know. It seems to me that it has no bearing whatsoever, no bearing whatsoever on the Resolution that the hon. gentleman put down on the Order Paper. Then he goes on to take another five minutes talking about an unnecessary election. Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province did not think that the election was unnecessary, they went out in numbers unprecedented, the turnout at the polls last April was one of the highest we have ever seen in this Province -

MR. WINDSOR:

He wanted another one a couple of weeks ago.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, he wanted another one a couple of weeks ago. Is the hon. gentleman calling the people of the Province fools? What is he saying? Talking about an unnecessary election, I would say to the hon. gentleman that the election was unnecessary for one group and one group only, and that was the group that he leads, the Liberal Party in this Province. That is the only group that the election was unnecessary for. Then he talks about the blunder, the blunder made by this Government in putting the question into the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, it is awfully easy to try to be dishonest with one's self. The last refuge, I suppose, of a skunk is when one wants to be dishonest with one's self. Everybody in this Province, everybody in this House, knows how the question came to be in the courts.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is no secret, Mr. Speaker. Everybody knows that it was the Federal Government which asked the Federal Court of Canada to expand the question on the SIU case into a full-blown ownership case. Everybody knows that - the people of this Province know that and they knew that in the election last April. How many times, Mr. Speaker, has it got to be said that it was not this Province who went to the Courts first?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: How many times has it got to be said? So nobody, Mr. Speaker, is being fooled by that kind of statement, and nobody out there, in the four corners of this Province, are being fooled by that kind of statement. The only people being fooled by that kind of statement, Mr. Speaker, are the fools themselves who want to fool themselves and they are on that side of the House, they are not on this side. Day after day, Mr. Speaker, you hear that kind of thing said in this House, that this government took the decision to put the case in the courts. Well, that is not true. N-O-T T-R-U-E.

MR. WARREN: It is true.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is not true; it is to cover up for their political flunkies in Ottawa that they keep saying that. It is to cover up

MR. RIDEOUT:

for their masters in Ottawa that they keep saying that. Now let the truth be known, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, the truth is known.

MR. WARREN:

Why did you cross the House?

MR. RIDEOUT:

I can shout down the hon.

gentleman anytime, but I never said a word while the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was speaking. I know how to be courteous, that is the difference between me and some people on the other side.

MR. SIMMS:

No respect.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Then they talk about pre-

conditions about going back to the bargaining table, Mr. Speaker, pre-conditions. Is it wrong, is it unreasonable to ask that if there had been an agreement, and both ministers say there was, if there had been an agreement between both ministers, is it unreasonable to ask that that be written down?

MR. SIMMS:

No.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Are we going to have a

verbal agreement on the offshore, Mr. Speaker? How can we talk about Winter drilling regulations or revenue sharing or joint management if it is not written down? Is it going to be verbal forever more? Who is going to interpret it? What are the parameters? I mean, somewhere along the line you have to have the thing written down. There had been an agreement in principle between the two ministers and the time had come to write it down, and one side agreed to write it down and the other side did not. And then they talk about pre-conditions. I mean, what are we going to have, an agreement with our understandings on one side and nothing on the other?

MR. MARSHALL:

That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I mean, how silly, how ludicrous can you be? And when they did finally sit down around the table and try to put something down on paper, the verbal agreements, the agreements in principle that had been agreed on between the two ministers, you would not know them from a hole in the ground when you came to see the drafts, around the table.

So, you know, Mr. Speaker, it just cannot stand scrutiny, it just cannot stand the light of day. It is time for the hon. gentlemen on the other side to stop burying their heads in the sands of irreality, take their heads out of it and join with us, because we have been saying 'a negotiated settlement' for months and months and months. But you cannot keep going on with those political blunders that the hon. gentlemen are going on with from day to day and still expect to have any credibility left. Talk about the courts, talk about unnecessary elections, talk about pre-conditions, talk about what you like, they cannot stand scrutiny, Mr. Speaker. And the hon. gentlemen know they cannot stand scrutiny but yet they get up day after day, week after week, month after month, and they still mouth the same things that cannot stand the light of day in this House and in the Province. It is time for that to be over. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants to talk about non-partisan and that kind of thing, it is time for that to be forgotten about; throw out that foolishness and get on with something reasonable and something new.

Now, talking about non-partisan, Mr. Speaker, let me have a look at this resolution,

MR. RIDEOUT: let us have a look at the resolution to see if it can stand the scrutiny of a non-partisan look at it. Let us have a look at it. 'WHEREAS on February 12, 1982 the Premier of this Province announces that the provincial Cabinet' - not even good English - 'announces that the provincial Cabinet has referred the offshore ownership issue to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal' - that is a fact. There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker, that is a fact. That is not partisan. The hon. gentleman got up and tried to lump in why it was done, but I have explained that again for the 17,000th time. That is a fact. We have no problem with that.

The second WHEREAS:

'WHEREAS the same Court did on the 17th day of February, 1983 rule that the resources in question do not fall within the meaning of Term 37 of the Terms of Union and thus do not belong to Newfoundland' - that is a partial fact. It is not the whole fact. It is not exactly what the Court said, but it is fact enough that we can accept it as a fact. And our accepting it as a fact does not necessarily mean that it is a fact, but it is factual enough to accept.

The third WHEREAS,

Mr. Speaker, talking about non-partisan resolutions, let us look at the third WHEREAS:

'WHEREAS this present administration has, by its own admission, no other reason to exist except that battle for ownership of the offshore now lost by that administration in the Courts' - no other reason to exist! That is non-partisan, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of recital that the hon. gentleman wants us to wrap our arms around. That is the kind of recital

MR. RIDEOUT: that he expects forty-four people on this side of the House to wrap their arms around and join with him in a non-partisan cause and vote for it, Mr. Speaker. How silly! How silly, Mr. Speaker!

Let us look at the next recital:

'WHEREAS this Province still needs an offshore development agreement to boost a desperately failing economy' - that is a fact, nothing wrong with that. We agree with that.

'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House go on record as supporting a negotiated settlement' and then,

'BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we dedicate the federal/provincial Winter drilling regulations to an offshore board.' You know, those things are not too bad.

But the hon. gentleman gets up in a 'holier than thou' attitude - and he is really bad, Mr. Speaker, reading a prepared speech. He is alright when he is up flailing his arms and going to it, he is interesting, but when he is reading a prepared text he is worse again. But he tries to wrap himself in the flag of innocence and asks us to support that kind of resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that that is not going to happen.

Now, there is a lot in that resolution that we like. We like the facts of the resolution, we like the truth of the resolution but, Mr. Speaker, we do not like the purely political purpose of the resolution. We do not like the partisan, provocative statements in at least one or two of the recitals in the resolution. And we are not going to

April 20, 1983

Tape 1236

EC - 3

MR. RIDEOUT:

be duped, Mr. Speaker, into voting for that kind of resolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move an amendment, seconded by my colleague from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms). The amendment, Mr. Speaker, is simply this:

MR. RIDEOUT:

I move, seconded by

my colleague from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), to delete all the words after the second "WHEREAS", and the second "WHEREAS", of course, finishes up with 'and' after 'Newfoundland', 'Newfoundland and', to delete all the words after the second "WHEREAS" and to replace it by adding the following: "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House of Assembly go on record, today", word for word, Mr. Speaker, "as supporting a negotiated settlement to this question," practically word for word from the resolution that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) put down, "including a federal/provincial joint management board which would include in its terms of reference consideration of Winter drilling regulations."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that takes

the politics out of it, that takes the provocative statements out of it, that makes it a resolution that can be unanimous in this House and I submit it to Your Honour for consideration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! It appears to the Chair that the amendment is in order.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-

White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will see

the colours. Now we will see the colours of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the gentlemen opposite, because everything that I have proposed in this amendment, everything except the dirt which was contained in the third "WHEREAS", is in this amendment.

MR. RIDEOUT:

In this amendment,

Mr. Speaker, I am allowing the facts of the first and second recital to stand, I am allowing the purpose of the first "BE IT RESOLVED" to stand, and that is a negotiated settlement, I am proposing the purpose of the second "BE IT RESOLVED", which is to include a federal/provincial joint management board, and the terms of reference of that board will be to work out Winter drilling regulations.

Now that is the nuts and bolts, Mr. Speaker, of the resolution that the hon. gentleman has put down. That is what the hon. gentleman wants to talk about if he wants to talk about a non-partisan debate over this issue that is so vital to the future generations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Now, if the Opposition does not support this amendment, then, Mr. Speaker, we will know that the real purpose of this amendment was contained in the third rectial, we will know that the real purpose of this amendment was for nothing more or nothing less than a full-scale political diatribe, once again enunciating the position of the Liberal Party in Ottawa. That will be crystal clear. We will know that, because this

MR. RIDEOUT:

amendment that I propose includes the nuts and bolts of what the Opposition say they are talking about. Now we will see if what they say they are talking about is, in fact, what they are talking about, and if it is not, then that will become clear next Wednesday when the vote is held.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution as it is put forth, and now as amended, is very, very important to future generations of this Province. This Province has tried unsuccessfully month after month, year after year, we have the support of hundreds of thousands of people across the country. Our compromise proposal that was put on the table a couple of years ago, in January, has been scrutinized by the industry, by political leaders, by community leaders across Canada, and they say to a man and to a woman that it is a reasonable position. How come you cannot get a deal with the federal government on this? My God, how reasonable is your position! And we are asking the same question, Mr. Speaker. The people of this Province are asking the same question.

The hon. gentleman talks about an amendment to the constitution, whatever the Supreme Court of Canada decision might be. Does not the hon. gentleman realize, Mr. Speaker, that all provincial governments in Canada are on record, on the public record as supporting this Province on its offshore ownership fight. Does not the hon. gentleman realize that all of the political parties federally, except one, except one, is on side as supporting this Province.

MR. SIMMS:

Which one is that?

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is the party to which

the hon. gentleman has so much allegiance, Mr. Speaker. So why is it impossible to get a constitutional amendment, if all the provincial governments are on side, all the political parties

MR. RIDEOUT: federally except one are on side? Why is it impossible? Why do we need to amend the constitution of this country, Mr. Speaker? We need seven provinces containing — what?—51 per cent of the population, is it? I believe that is the way it reads, 'agreement of seven provinces containing 51 per cent of the population'. We have all provinces, we have all political parties federally except the present party that makes up the present Government of Canada, so why can we not, if that is what it takes, a constitutional amendment? I am not sure that that is necessary. That would be necessary to enshrine it in the constitution. That would not be necessary for an agreement but to make sure it is enshrined. It was done for the Prairie Provinces in 1930 by a Liberal Government, I might say, Mr. Speaker. But if that is what it takes, is that impossible? No, Sir, it is not impossible, because the political will in this country is there, everywhere but Ottawa, to do justice to Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMS: And over there. And over there.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is everywhere but in Ottawa which, of course, is represented in this Province by people on the other side, and the party

MR. RIDEOUT: on the other side. It is everywhere else to treat Newfoundland equally, to give Newfoundlanders and Labradorians equality within this Confederation, but the political will does not exist with the present political party in power in Ottawa. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker. It is not the problem of doing it constitutionally or otherwise, it is not the problem that this government cannot negotiate, it is not the problem that this Province has dug in its heels and will not talk, it is the problem of the political will in the political masters that presently control the government in Ottawa. And that is the message that has to keep going out to the people of this Province and to the people of this country. And, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition are sincere in what the leader enunciated today, then he and his colleagues will vote for this amendment and then this resolution as amended, because that is the message and that is the purpose of this amendment and that, therefore, will be the purpose of this resolution as amended.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):
Mountains.

The hon. member for Torngat

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the resolution and also a few words on the amendment. Now, after just listening to the hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) one would never believe that the hon. member, less than two years ago, was sitting over on this side of the House and that the hon. member, on a Private Members Day, basically had the same kind of a resolution that he was going to present in this House condemning the government that he is part of now.

MR. WARREN:

In fact, Mr. Speaker,

at a caucus meeting the same hon. member was very much concerned about the approach that this government was taking to the offshore. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I think the member, once again, as on many, many occasions, has spoken from both sides of his mouth.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution does give facts. There is no doubt about it, there are facts in the resolution. The resolution does say, "WHEREAS on February 12, 1982, the Premier of this Province announces that the Provincial Cabinet has referred the offshore ownership issue to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal. Now, that is true and

MR. WARREN: it is the first time that this ownership issue was referred to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal.

That is true. There is no doubt about that. The hon. member can get up and say, 'No, it is not true,' but it is true.

MR. DINN: What about the SIU case?

MR. WARREN: It was not referred to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal. It was not. This is true. It is the first time. And the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) knows it is not true. So, Mr. Speaker, you see that the hon. member, when he spoke just now, he did not tell the truth. The hon. member did not tell the truth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) just very clearly indicated that the hon. member who just spoke on this side, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), did not tell the truth. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that that is out of order, unparliamentary and the hon. member should be ashamed of it and should be asked to withdraw it. And if he does not withdraw it, of course, Mr. Speaker, he should be named.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: If the hon. the Speaker had the opportunity of reviewing what has gone in Hansard in the last five minutes, the hon. the Speaker would know that the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay has said this is not true concerning the offshore issue being put into the

MR. WARREN: Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal.
That is not true, Mr. Speaker, because this is the first time -

MR. DINN: Apologize.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, he is debating the point.
That is not permitted.

MR. WARREN: - that it has gone to the Newfoundland
Supreme Court of Appeal. It is the first time, Mr. Speaker,
I refer to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, I have to
withhold ruling right now until I can check Hansard.

The hon. the member for Torngat
Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, this is the
first time that this offshore ownership issue was placed in
the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal and it was placed
there by this government. This government figured, this government
thought that after winning two decisions in the courts, 'Well,
we can win the third one.' But once in a while the judges
of the Newfoundland Supreme Court do not accept everything that
the Premier and his flunky from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall)
state, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. MARSHALL: - just in the hope of changing him.
I mean, you know, that is unparliamentary. I could not care
less what the hon. gentleman really may say but,

MR. MARSHALL: you know, there are rules in the House. Referring to people, you know, as being a flunky of somebody else is definitely unparliamentary. People refer from time to time to Beauchesne and the lists of words that are not permitted but, Mr. Speaker, as you will see if you look at that, that is not completely conducive, you know, does not answer the question. On page 114 of Beauchesne it says: 'It is impossible to lay down any specific rules in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate against particular members, or to declare beforehand what expressions are or are not contrary to order; much depends upon the tone and the manner, and intention, of the person speaking; sometimes upon the person to whom the words are addressed, as, whether he is a public officer, or a private member not in office, or whether the words are meant to be applied to his public conduct, or to his private character; and sometimes upon the degree of provocation', etc.

 The point of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, you know, you cannot list in a book, even though there is a fairly comprehensive list of words that are unparliamentary, but there is no doubt that types of derogatory references such as this are obviously unparliamentary, they are not conducive to the carrying on of parliamentary debate. And I think that the hon. gentleman should withdraw, I would hope he would withdraw voluntarily. If he does not withdraw voluntarily, I would ask Your Honour to request him to do so.

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

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

MR. NEARY:

I would like to refer Your Honour to page 104 referring to members in debate and all the unparliamentary words listed there in pages 104, 105, 106 and 107, Mr. Speaker, and there is no listing of 'flunky'. Now, the hon. gentleman's feelings may be hurt but I would say that that is unfortunate. It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague hurt the hon. gentleman's feelings. The hon. gentleman does not want to be considered as a flunky and everybody knows what a flunky is. It is

MR. NEARY:

not unparliamentary. And the hon. gentleman it not because his feelings are hurt, Mr. Speaker, that he has to get up and challenge what my hon. colleague said under the guise of a point of order. There is, indeed, no point of order, Mr. Speaker. And I would suggest that all the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is doing, the Government House Leader, is interrupting my colleague to destroy the momentum he has going and the trend of thought that my hon. colleague is pursuing.

So I would hope that Your Honour will not be swayed by the emotional appeal that was made by the Government House Leader, because, indeed, there is no point of order. All the hon. gentleman was trying to do was persuade the Chair through emotion, appealing to Your Honour's heart and not to the rule book. We go by the rules in this House, Mr. Speaker, and not by the fact that somebody's feelings may or may not have been hurt.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, although the word 'flunky' is not listed in the words that are listed as unparliamentary, I have heard the word used in this House of Assembly on other occasions and I will check the rulings in those cases to see if it was ruled unparliamentary in this House, and I will rule on it at a later time.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For some reason today, I suppose it must be because there are 4,000 teachers out on the steps of Confederation Building, the members on that side are awfully upset. They must be awfully upset, Mr. Speaker, and it shows. Here is an indication: The debate that we are having today, a Private Member's Resolution about the breakoff of negotiations between Ottawa and Newfoundland, it shows

MR. WARREN: the same thing as happened with the teachers of this Province. And this is the kind of government that we have to contend with day after day, a government that knows nothing about consultation, only confrontation. I noticed one of the signs out there said the same thing, confrontation. And this government have shown it. They closed down hospitals without talking to people. Without consulting anybody they just go in and do things, and they just broke off negotiations with Ottawa on the offshore issue, a very delicate issue, a chance, as the Premier says, a chance for Newfoundland and Labrador to have its a day in the sun.

However, this government did not see fit and for some reason, when the hon. minister responsible for offshore resources was in a hotel, in Quebec, the Premier could have one of his men, with spy glasses, across the street, seeing what was happening. I think the minister would have gotten a deal on the offshore. In fact, I have a lot of admiration for the hon. minister responsible for the offshore. However there is something that is a trigger point, but the trigger point is between the hon. minister and the Premier. The Premier was not satisfied with what the minister was doing and, subsequently, he has broken off negotiations. He did the same thing with the hon.

MR. WARREN:

the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the only difference being he flicked him out of the Cabinet.

This government cannot and will not negotiate anything.

The only way they will negotiate is on their terms or no terms. That is the attitude, that is the way this government will negotiate. The Premier said today in his letter that he wrote back to the NTA - I think I have a copy of it here somewhere - "in which you accept government's two year wage restraint programme unconditionally." The NTA said, "Okay, we accept the two year wage restraint." However, the Premier goes back and says, 'That is no good to me; unless you can do this and this and this and this, we will not even talk to you.' But I believe the teachers today have got their message loud and clear to government members. I notice they were up here with the windows open, listening to what was said down on the steps, because they know what those teachers will do with them. They know when the next election is called that they will not be blindfolded like they were last time. The teachers will remember. We will make sure that those buttons are worn when the next election comes around.

MR. STAGG: Well, I am going to give them a few things to remember now when you sit down.

MR. WARREN: Yes, I am sure you will, about the rent increases in the Harmon complex, I suppose, about the rent increase when you went campaigning over in Stephenville -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: - about the rent increase that they were told they were not getting. Why do you not tell them that? Tell them how you blindfolded them in

MR. WARREN: the last election. But again, they will remember you. They will remember you over in Stephenville the next time around.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who sat on this side until he decided to change his colours - everybody to his own liking - the hon. member got up and brought in an amendment to the resolution. And I agree, because the hon. member, with all due respect to him, sat on this side and he knows what we think. He knows how we think,

MR. WARREN:

and this is why he brought in this amendment, because this amendment, the last part of this amendment, is exactly what the hon. member knew we discuss in caucus day after day after day. This is why this amendment is a good amendment. And I must say, right from the offset, that I have no objection to voting for this amendment. I have not objection at all to voting for this amendment.

MR. SIMMS:

For a negotiated settlement?

MR. WARREN:

Sure, a negotiated settlement.

In fact, I will tell you what is wrong, it is that this government will not let them negotiate. That is the problem. And you are a minister of this government and you should know, too, that you should negotiate in good faith. That is all that is needed, that you should negotiate in good faith. Now, in order for anybody to negotiate in good faith there would have to be give and take on both sides. There has to be give and take on both sides. And we have indications, and the facts are on the table, which you can see afterwards, the facts are on the table that the offshore negotiations broke off - the hon. minister got a letter, I am sure he got a letter, everyone else got a letter, from the hon. Jean Chretien, explaining the position, and this government - oh my goodness, maw maw is in again - this government has decided to break off negotiations, break off negotiations because the Premier could not get his own way in the offshore oil dispute.

Now, that is number one, and here, today, the Premier comes into the House and reads a letter, and a Ministerial Statement at the same time, and breaks

MR. WARREN: off negotiations with the teachers. And I hate to say this, but I know it is a fact, in fact, all of Newfoundland and Labrador knows it is a fact, that the reason the negotiations broke off - you know, I do not think it was the reason that the hon. Premier gave in this letter. No, that was not the reason. The reason was here is another chance to save another million dollars tomorrow, and another million dollars the next day and so on. That is the reason. That is the bottom line. The bottom line, why this government broke off negotiations today with the teachers, is the more days the teachers are out of school naturally.

MR. NEARY: They have to get their -

MR. WARREN: That is right. We have to get our money somehow.

MR. NEARY: Use the countervailing savings.

MR. WARREN: We have to take care of Tiffany Place somehow, you know, so this is why.

MR. SIMMS: Do you think everybody thinks like you fellows? That is what you would do.

MR. NEARY: That is how the teachers, their wives, their sons and daughters, and their grandchildren and their uncles and aunts, and their friends and relatives, all think, that the government turned against them, forced the teachers out of the classroom, to use the countervailing savings to go towards the deficit. That is true.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that was true.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's Centre.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. McNICHOLAS:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to say a few words in favour of the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). I usually prefer to sit back here and listen to the pearls of wisdom mostly from this side, but the occasional pearl from the other side. So instead, today, you are going to hear the pearls of wisdom from me.

I think the subject matter of debate today is of paramount importance really to the government and to all of Newfoundland. I remember just after Christmas, leaving here terrifically optimistic. I felt that an agreement was around the corner. In fact I asked my secretary, down in my own office, to cable me when an agreement was made. And I must say I was a very disappointed man to get a cable from her shortly afterwards - because I was away and I could not get any news - saying that the whole thing had fallen through. You know, we all realize that the economy generally is in pretty poor shape throughout the world, the US, Canada, and here in Newfoundland in particular. I remember, just before going away, just before Christmas, going down to Water Street and being appalled at the depression down there. The first place I saw was the London, New York and Paris. I suppose that was a monument, if you like, of business for fifty years and it was closed down. Incidentally, I saw only very recently one of the building there was for sale for \$50,000 - peanuts.

MR. SIMMS:

Are you going to buy it 'Paddy'?

DR. McNICHOLAS:

Then a little bit further down I went and I saw Ayre's, that big department store that I remember City Council fighting about only two years

DR. McNICHOLAS: ago, wondering whether to allow the Bank of Nova Scotia to put up eight or ten stories and now it is there empty. I went along a little bit further to Hickman's and I think they were wondering if there was going to be one tower or two towers of office buildings. I turned back then to that famous district of St. John's Center and right in the middle of it Brazil Square, where I remember having a fight the Summer before last because developers were buying up that property there to convert into office buildings and I fought very bitterly to try and keep the houses there for my own constituents. I lost that battle but I am quite sure the developers have burnt their fingers in that because that again has been lying empty.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: Coming up West of City Hall, again I have been crying for the last four years for something to be done, that again is empty. I think all of this is an indication that there is a terrible air of depression in Newfoundland at the present time. I know very well if we had an agreement there in January all of that would have been transformed. While these talks were going on and appeared to be going very successfully, there was this terrific air of optimism and hope and suddenly it all fell flat. But one thing for sure, Mr. Speaker, I prefer to see it that way if, by having it that way, we have to have an agreement that was not one that gave us some real, meaningful, worthwhile control. Otherwise, what would we have? We would have tankers coming into the Grand Bank, filling up with oil, and off they would go to refineries in the U.S. and elsewhere. We would have absolutely no control on that, we would have exactly the same picture, but in a much bigger way, as we had in the Upper Churchill about twenty years ago. I am sure at that time that was the best deal that could be had. I think it is a very interesting book and I am sure most of you read it, on hydro - I do not know who the author is, I think Smith - giving the background history of that and Smallwood and LeSage and Quebec and financiers generally, and from reading that and from other comments I have heard, I am quite sure in my mind that that was the only way of developing the Upper Churchill at the time. I know it is easy to have hindsight but actually it was a stupid agreement. What happened? At the present time we are getting roughly \$10 million out of that deal, Quebec is getting \$600 million. Now that is bad enough but it is going to get worse, because wages, repairs, everything else will have to be taken care of by Newfoundland. So that \$10 million will go down and eventually we are going to be in the red, we will get less than nothing out of that, while Quebec will sit back and they will see their

April 20, 1983

Tape No. 1246

MJ - 2

DR. MCNICHOLAS: \$600 million going up and up
because they can change the price of power when they want,
or when the agreements that they have have run out. I think
that was a frightful deal. I do not know who is mainly
responsible for that, but why somebody

DR. McNICHOLAS:

did not think at that time of having an escalation clause in the agreement, I just do not know. I think that we would have been better off at that time if we had just let that water run to sea and even if it cost four times that an hour or five times, at least we could have an agreement that would be of real value to Newfoundland instead of being a noose around our necks. Now, here in this resolution today I think we have a somewhat parallel position, the only thing is it is a much bigger, colossal endeavour than even the Churchill Falls, which was a billion dollar deal at that time. This is a huge one. This is the largest oil well in Canada. This is one that was actually brought into Canada by Newfoundland in joining Confederation. It does not matter what the Courts say. We may have lost the court case here in Newfoundland, I think we may well lose the case in Ottawa, I do not know, I hope we do not but I think we may. But what do we want? All we want, Mr. Speaker, is just a fair share of revenue and we want sufficient -

MR. NEARY:

Seventy-five/twenty five is that a fair deal?

MR. McNICHOLAS:

I will get to that. We want some reasonable control so that we will not be left out in the cold again. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we had an agreement in principle, that we had an agreement, a verbal agreement. I believe that our colleague who negotiated believed sincerely we had, but I had some doubts myself about it, I am wondering if the agreement in principle was ever a real one, if it was a sincere one or was it just a game of bluff right from the start? I believe

MR. McNICHOLAS: that Mr. Chretien intended to carry on these negotiations, carry them on indefinitely, back us here in Newfoundland into a corner that would make it more and more difficult day by day to get out of that particular agreement. You might say, well, that is stupid - why would the Federal Government want to do that?

MR. NEARY: (inaudible) the logic.

MR. McNICHOLAS: That is perhaps the logic. And I given that quite a bit of thought and was wondering exactly that question myself.

MR. NEARY: Indeed you were.

MR. McNICHOLAS: I think I know the reason and it is not to do with politics. I think there is a very definite personal anamosity between the Prime Minister and our Premier.

MR. NEARY: Go on!

DR. MCNICHOLAS:

And why should there be?

I think the reason and the only reason and the real reason for that is that our Premier is a fighter -

MR. SIMMS:

Hear, hear.

MR. MCNICHOLAS:

- and up until this time we were depending purely on handouts. And that is the only reason. And because he is a fighter, and because this government is fighting and fighting rightly for Newfoundland rights, we are have a pretty rough time. We are having a rough time in hydro. This corridor that we have is, to my mind - it was held up anyway for six months, but it is a stupid thing that can never be implemented. I can never see that we can get rights right across Quebec, right down to New York or wherever we want to sell our electricity. We have the same in the offshore and the fisheries. Today, we have Kirby sitting - I do not know where he is sitting, but doing nothing definite for us here. We have had the same problem with the Northern cod and it is still there. Why does the Quebec Government get special fishing rights that we cannot get? Every conceivable thing that the federal government can do they seem to be doing. To take a relatively small thing like the syncrolift, I am convinced that we would never have gotten that here unless we had put up our own money. We had the same in the Shoe Cove Tracking Station, that was shifted out to Manitoba and another one put up in Thailand, but we could not be left our one here. The same thing is happening with our road grants. The same thing is happening with our fishery college. They wanted to put it anywhere except St. John's. And I am not even sure, today, that the money will be coming from Ottawa for that fishery college. Where is it? It has been promised but so many other things have been promised.

April 20, 1983

Tape No. 1248

SD - 2

DR. MCNICHOLAS:

Mr. Speaker, I could go on
and on but I feel that the federal government in Ottawa
is not neutral, it is not indifferent, I believe
that the federal government in Ottawa

DR. McNICHOLAS: is actively hostile to Newfoundland. So what are we going to do? Quite frankly, I am a pessimist about what we can do. I think we will just have to do the best we can and mark time for the next two years until we have a decent, honest government in Ottawa, a new P.C. Government. I do not think we are going to get 100 per cent, but I think we will be treated in a decent, honest way.

I think what we will have to have in this offshore is a political settlement. Every one of the candidates now for the P.C. leadership, I think, have promised that. And, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I feel it is better to have no agreement than to be taken to the cleaners again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. McNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, I have great satisfaction in supporting this amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I want to say that I was very disappointed in the speech of the hon. gentleman who just took his seat. I thought that the hon. gentleman had a much broader view, had a much larger perspective. I really did not think that he was one of the gentlemen caught up with this narrow, parochial political view that is held by most of his Cabinet colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: You are afraid of the truth, 'Tom'.

MR. LUSH: It is very, very disappointing.

Am I speaking loud enough, Mr. Speaker? I think hon. members can all hear my voice,

MR. LUSH: it carries very well and the context is always good, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I was very, very disappointed listening to the hon. gentleman attributing the kinds of motives that he did to the negotiating process so sincerely set up by one of the best Canadians in this country, Mr. Chretien, and suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the process was meant only to be a bluff, that it was just put up as a smoke screen practically, just to delay the process. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is ridiculous, that he should attribute these kinds of motives to such a great Canadian, a man who is concerned about the unity of this country, a man who is concerned with getting this country working in harmony and peace, one of the greatest Canadians on the political scene today or in any segment of life, really.

MR. LUSH:

So, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the hon. member would take that approach.

MR. TOBIN:

Tell us about the dissension in the party, boy.

MR. LUSH:

He gave another reason why the settlement - dissension in the party I can talk about that, Sir. There is no dissension in the Liberal Party, not one little bit, Sir, not one little bit. We have never been more united since I have been in politics, never been more united. There is not one ounce of truth, Mr. Speaker, to what the hon. member read today, but I am not going to get detracted by that. Just let me say that there is no dissension in the Liberal Party, none whatsoever. We are delighted with the way things are going. We are building the Liberal Party. And I will tell your hon. members they are going to get an awful scare when they find out what is going on in the Liberal Party.

Mr. Speaker, things are going so well, we are getting so many members now we can set up a screening process, We can screen, we can take our own people that we want, we can eliminate people. They are coming to us in the droves now. Mr. Speaker, we have no worries about that and the hon. gentleman will know all about that sooner than he would like. So, Mr. Speaker, there are no problems there.

But back to the resolution -

MR. STAGG:

Back to the amendment.

MR. LUSH:

Back to the amendment. I will get to the amendment in due course, Mr. Speaker. Again the hon. member came up with his reasons why he thought there was not a settlement, that it was because of the animosity, the personal animosity between our Premier -

MR. TOBIN:

(Inaudible) animosity for the Premier of Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of

order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for

Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) violates the rules of this

House more often than any other member in the House. The

hon. gentleman has only been here one year and he has added

tremendously to the lowering of the decorum of this House. Thirty

times in one session the hon. gentleman had to be brought to

order by the Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that we should allow this

to continue. It is not in the best interest of this House,

it is not in the best interest of the hon. gentleman's

constituents who sent him here, he is betraying their trust.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask that if Your Honour cannot enforce the

rules, make the hon. member comply with the rules and

listen to my colleague in silence, that he be named and removed

from the House.

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I was responding to the comments from the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) when he responded to it. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants to stand on points of order such as that or make accusations such as I interrupted this House thirty times, I think he should have to prove that to the House. He should not hide behind the truth, Mr. Speaker. Bring in Hansard and prove it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, I had only just come to the Chair and I did not hear these comments but any hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: And so, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was talking about the fact that the reason why we did not get an agreement was because of the animosity between the Premier and the Prime Minister. He went on to say, of course, he did not like the Premier because he was a fighter. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the problem with the Premier, that he is a fighter. That is his problem. He does not know when to stop fighting, and his fighting lacks class and style as well. He is a bully, Mr. Speaker. We do not need fighting, we need mediation, negotiation, this is what we need, conciliation, compromise, give and take, but the Premier thinks it is all fighting. And even with that he is much overrated, Mr. Speaker, he is much overrated as a fighter. He is something like Cooney, who raised our expectations - we thought he was a great guy - but what did Cooney do? Absolutely nothing. Now that is like the Premier. That is the kind of fighter that the Premier is and he gets everybody all excited, Mr. Speaker, gets the expectations of everybody up, but it becomes nothing, falls as flat as a pancake and that is what happens, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is an important resolution and it does not talk about fighting, which created the problem, but talks about getting a negotiated settlement, something that this government cannot do, something that this government is no good at-that is why we have the problem with the teachers. All they know, Mr. Speaker, is how to break off from negotiating, whether it is with teachers or whether it is with the federal government, and that is what this resolution is about, getting a negotiated settlement. It is a very important resolution and it was raised by this side here. We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, and we want to see maximum benefits from our offshore. But, Mr. Speaker, how long are we going to wait? Now, I noticed, Mr. Speaker, when speaking, he said again that he would rather see no deal, no settlement than to be taken to the cleaners. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is nobody being taken to the cleaners.

MR. LUSH:

Even if the provincial government signed the deal as it is today, nobody would be taken to the cleaners, so that is a lot of nonsense. Nobody in Newfoundland wants us to be taken to the cleaners. All of us want to get the full benefits from the offshore, all of us. But, Mr. Speaker, there comes a times when we have to be sane, sensible and sober. There comes a time when we have to do it in the Canadian way and negotiate.

The Premier likes to talk about the Canadian way, but he is the man who is always out of step, always out of step. The Canadian way, Mr. Speaker, is one of negotiation and compromise and this is what this government is no good at, this is what this government cannot do. They have one approach to negotiations, "Do as I say," Mr. Speaker. And they are giving the great example now to the teachers, they have given the great example to all people who are in negotiations, to hang tough, Mr. Speaker. The Premier is setting that example to all of the people in this Province who have to negotiate contracts by the way he is negotiating on the offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time has come, as I have said, to get down around the table and negotiate a deal. But these people do not know how to negotiate, it is 'Do as I say'. They do not believe in the process of give and take, it is only take. There is no giving, only take. And when that does not work, then they go to the courts. How many things have we got before the courts now? What is it costing this Province? We are spending enough money in the courts to pave half the roads in this Province, this money that we are spending in the courts,

MR. LUSH: all because this government does not have the ability to negotiate. They do not have the political will, Mr. Speaker, to get down and get this offshore settled.

Is it not insidious?

Is it not insidious? It is no secret anymore now, Mr. Speaker, what they are up to. I mean, everybody in the Province knows their political motives now. They know why the offshore was not signed. The hon. gentleman said so just before he sat down. He told us. Everybody in the Province now knows why the offshore is not negotiated is because hon. gentlemen want to wait and see if the PCs will get in Ottawa.

MR. STAGG: Not so.

MR. LUSH: Well, the hon. gentleman said it, that is what he said. Now we are going to bide our time, he said, "Mark time" are the words he used, mark time for the next two years, mark time until the PCs get in and they will give us everything. Mr. Speaker, as if the PCs were going to give this Province everything! How foolish! How silly! How inane!

MR. LUSH: What nonsense! Now we know it has all been a political game, making a political football of the offshore. That has been their game, Mr. Speaker, all along.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the amendment, the amendment, let me say, does not change this resolution. All it does is wipe out a few little things that hon. gentlemen did not like, a few correct statements about them. It says: 'WHEREAS this present administration has, by its won admission, no other reason to exist except that battle for ownership of the offshore now lost by that administration in the Courts'. They did not want to hear the truth, Mr. Speaker. Well, if they do not want to hear that, that is fine, we are easy on that. The amendment does not change the substance of the resolution. Mr. Speaker, we are concerned and just to demonstrate how we are concerned, we can live with this amendment, we can live with it, because we are concerned that we get a negotiated settlement. That is what we want. We do not want to play any political games. We do not want to go along bluffing our people. We want this thing resolved. We want this settlement successfully resolved for the benefit of this Province, for the benefit of our people and for the benefit of all Canada. That is what we want, Mr. Speaker. So we are not going to squibble or squawk over the amendment. All we want now is for this government, after this resolution is passed, to get down to brass tacks and start negotiations, start seriously at negotiating, get the thing signed. That is what we want, and let us not play games with it any longer, let us not play any political games. We have been playing games long enough, Mr. Speaker, so long that our

MR. LUSH: people are fed up to the teeth, they are saturated with this malarky that this provincial government have been making out of the offshore. They are fed up to their teeth, they are saturated with it. And, Mr. Speaker, they want it resolved, they want it settled. And it is time that the government got down and took this resolution seriously and that the main characters in this whole thing get down to brass tacks, call Ottawa, call Mr. Chretien and let us say that the negotiations are on again, let us say that we want to come to a quick resolution. That is what we want, Mr. Speaker. We agree with the amendment.

MR. LUSH:

As I say, it does not change the substance, it does not change the content, it does not change anything at all that we had intended in this resolution. And it says: BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House of Assembly go on record today as supporting a negotiated settlement to this question." That is what we wanted, Mr. Speaker. It is only the narrow, political, parochial view of hon. gentlemen that would cause them to make this amendment because the amendment is not necessary. It is, again, just their narrow, political, vindictive view that they cannot support anything that comes from this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. They cannot support anything that comes from this side of the House without trying to twist it and without trying to manipulate the words to somehow give the suggestion that 'This is our idea, this is our thing.' So, Mr. Speaker, it is a lot of nonsense. But we are going to be bigger than that, we are going to take the high road, Mr. Speaker, on this one. We are going to take the high road and we are going to support this amendment. We are going to support this amendment because, as I say, it does not change the substance of what the resolution said in the beginning. It does not change the substance, it just takes out a few truths that hon. gentlemen did not like, removed a few truths. And they did not like it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

You are speaking to the galleries now.

MR. LUSH:

I like looking at people. I cannot see the press. I am a person who has always got to see people to get going. I do not like looking at the hon. gentleman because he makes me mad every time I look at him, every time I look at the hon. gentleman, because he is the man who is responsible for the position that we

MR. LUSH: are in today with respect to the offshore, Mr. Speaker. And I would request the hon. gentleman now, today, Mr. Speaker, that he take action on this resolution, not just to give it lip service but to seriously get down to business, leave this place today, because it is still only early in the afternoon in Ottawa, to call Ottawa, to get Mr. Chretien on the phone and say to him, 'We passed this resolution today, Mr. Chretien, and out of respect and courtesy to hon. members and for the interests of our people I am calling you so that we can get back to negotiations again.' I do not even care, Mr. Speaker, where they go to do it. I would be agreeable to any spot at all. Not like the hon. gentleman,

MR. LUSH:

I could take a neutral place because this is pretty rough, you know. We could go maybe to - I do not know where we could go - we could go to Spain, we could go anywhere. If the hon. gentleman wants to get away from the emotions that have been created and all of this sort of thing, all the ill-feeling, I do not care where he goes, Mr. Speaker, I do not care where he goes but go somewhere where it can be done. And lock themselves in for three months if they have to, lock themselves in and do not come out until they have gotten this thing resolved, Mr. Speaker, because Heaven knows that we need this development. We need this development. And what next to hold up this development at this particular time, at this particular time when our economy is in a mess, when we have the highest levels of unemployment that ever we had in this Province, the highest levels that we have ever had! And the important thing about it, the significant thing about it is we have always had the highest unemployment rate in Canada, but the significance of it is the discrepancy in the percentage points between the highest and the second highest to us, which is New Brunswick. And we have almost got a full 5 percentage points difference in our rate of unemployment and in New Brunswick, which is the second highest. And, Mr. Speaker, that is very significant. And it demonstrates the need, Mr. Speaker, for this provincial government to get serious about this offshore so that our people can start reaping benefits from it, so that we can get our people employed, so that we can get the economy moving so that money will get back into the economy and turn the economy around.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we get this offshore negotiated, that we now stop playing politics because they have exposed themselves. We have not done it, Mr. Speaker. We have not done it. They did it themselves. They have the nerve, the effrontery and the audacity to acknowledge it themselves, to acknowledge that the reason why we do not have the offshore settled is because we want to wait for the federal election in Canada. That is what they said, Mr. Speaker. I have suspected it, Mr. Speaker. In my own mind, at times when I allowed myself to think maybe in a little bit of a perverted manner, I sort of thought that maybe this is why they were doing it.

But, Mr. Speaker, my best instincts -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - my best motives, would not allow me really to say that, I just thought about it subconsciously.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Your time is up.

MR. LUSH: Time is up. By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, they acknowledged it themselves today, they acknowledged it themselves, Mr. Speaker, but we will support the resolution as amended.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) if it is intended, because the amendment says that it will be voted on today, is it the intention of the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Does it say today?

MR. NEARY: Yes, it does.

MR. LUSH: Yes, it does, yes.

MR. STAGG: Today is tomorrow or next week.

MR. NEARY: It says: 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House of Assembly go on record, today, as supporting a negotiated settlement to this question'.

MR. STAGG: That is tomorrow and the day after that.

MR. NEARY: Now will we be voting today on this amendment because if we are I would like to know now?

MR. SIMMS: The resolution says the same thing.

MR. NEARY: I would just as soon pass it today because we seem to be unanimous here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: In other words, you do not want to pass it today?

MR. SIMMS: Everybody has a right to speak and express their opinion. That is what the House is all about.

MR. NEARY: But it is urgent. I thought the gentleman who moved the amendment -

MR. LUSH: Wanted it done today.

MR. NEARY: - wanted it done today.

We are quite prepared to pass it today.

MR. NEARY: So if the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) will agree, at twenty minutes to six I can conclude the debate and then we can put the resolution as amended.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: First of all, you do not ask hypothetical questions in the House. It is up to the Speaker to make rulings, not a member. This is a democratic assembly. It was made a democratic assembly in the past little while.

Now 'today', Mr. Speaker, obviously means at the time when it is passed.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see.

MR. MARSHALL: When it is passed then it will be today.

Now under the Standing Orders, a resolution on Private Members' Day is normally debated two consecutive Wednesdays. And I would imagine that there are a lot of people on this side of the House who wish to express their views on it. I think, Mr. Speaker, the reason for the point of order is obvious. Once again the hon. gentleman is embarrassed because they find themselves, despite the fact that they have eight in the Opposition, they only find themselves with 25 per cent of the people in the House and they have spoken.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The fact of the matter is the people on this side have very fixed views on the matter and they want to debate it. So the fact that the resolution says 'today' does not mean that it has to be voted today. 'Today' is taken in the context of when, obviously, it is passed. And the Standing Order is quite clear - I do not know if I have to quote it to you or not but it is there for Your Honour to see - that resolutions are debated for two Wednesdays.

MR. NEARY: In other words you do not want it passed today.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, it is traditional

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): to have two days debate on a Private Members' motion. Unless it is agreed on both sides, we will have two days debate.

MR. NEARY: Let us have the vote today. Could we have unanimous agreement to have the vote today?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You would rather stall and delay it for another week. That is sincerity for you.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, we have been subjected today to the interminable speech by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). I believe by approximate count that is the fifteenth time he has made that speech and he has yet to discover any new adjectives, so it is not particularly impressive.

We are here today and we will be here next week discussing this very relevant motion,

MR. STAGG: especially the amendment which has been so ably placed before the House by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

The Liberal Opposition has for years been attempting to perpetrate the myth that this government is not willing to negotiate. As a matter of fact, the former Leader of the Opposition, that is Mr. Stirling, not to be confused with the former, former Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Rowe, or the former former Leader of the Opposition, once removed, Mr. Roberts, but the former Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Stirling, one can recall the ringing clarion call that he made when he accepted nomination from the 300 or 400 people who were at the Arts and Culture Centre in 1979, or 1980, whenever it was he got the leadership- it was in November in any event - and he attempted then to build a constituency on the basis that this government here, this government, was unwilling to negotiate, that the Premier was a Separatist and we were all Separatists on this side and, he thought, anti-Confederate, all of these arguments. And in the context of Liberals, I suppose it fell on receptive ears. And since he only went around the Province talking to the converted- he had a lot of small meetings, mind you- but since he only talked to the converted he really felt that he had a certain constituency there. Well, it was obvious that the general public of this Province do not believe that. They do believe, however, that if you are a government in this Province of Newfoundland, with the regional disparity that we are living through and we have lived through for thirty-three years since Confederation, that you have to fight. Now the fight is a metaphorical fight, it is not an actual fight, but it is a fight whereby one stands up for one's rights.

MR. STAGG:

And in the recent Constitution of Canada that was passed by the Canada Act, 1982, the constitution, in effect, guarantees the right to fight and, in effect, indicates that both the Parliament of Canada and the provincial governments are dedicated to - and I read from Section 36 (1) "The Parliament and the Legislatures, together with the Government of Canada and the provincial governments are committed to a) promoting equal opportunities for the well-being of Canadians; b) furthering economic development to reduce disparity in opportunities; and c) providing essential public services of reasonable quality to all Canadians." Now, that is in the constitution. And I predict, Mr. Speaker,

MR. STAGG: that at some stage that that clause in the Constitution, Section 36, is going to figure prominently in the redistribution of political power and the doing away of regional disparity in this country, because it is unconstitutional the way Newfoundland is being treated by the Liberal government in Ottawa. It is unconstitutional, it directly flies in the face of Section 36. General terms you might say. Yes, it is a constitution, it is general, but it means an awful lot. So we submit, Mr. Speaker, that all we are doing in this Province as we continuously and with great difficulty restate the obvious time after time, day after day, that we are acting in the Canadian way. Now, what is the Canadian way? Well, the Canadian way took an abrupt about-face in 1968. When the history of Canada is written for the period from 1968 to 1984 - if he stays until 1984 - it will be looked upon as one of the bleakest periods in the history of this country insofar as the provincial/federal relations are concerned, and the political leadership of Canada, the Government of Canada, the federal government, literally brought Canadians to their knees, bringing us from a position of prominence in the world, probably second or third place in the world by the economic indicators that are used by the economists and the people who look at these situations - we were very high, next to Sweden, I believe, ahead of the United States - until now we are twenty-fourth.

MR. NEARY: That is when we had a Liberal regime in the Province.

MR. STAGG: Had a Liberal regime in the Province, yes.

MR. NEARY: And a Liberal regime in all over Canada.

MR. STAGG: We also had Mr. Lester Pearson in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: A good man.

MR. STAGG: Yes, Lester Pearson was a good man. Lester Pearson learned his diplomacy at the United Nations and was a true diplomat. From 1963 up until 1968 there was more done in Canada, as far as the Government of Canada is concerned, to reflect positively on provincial/federal relations than had been done probably before but certainly since. Unfortunately hon. gentlemen opposite have continuously aligned themselves with Mr. Trudeau and his cohorts. Now, I do recall one slip of the tongue made by the Leader of the Opposition, he thought it would not be caught but it was, when we were talking about Mr. Lalonde, then the Minister of Mines and Energy, and we said would not trust Mr. Lalonde and I recall distinctly the Leader of the Opposition saying, 'I would not trust him either' or words to that effect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. DAWE: "I would not trust him as far as I could throw him," he said.

MR. STAGG: "I would not trust him as far as I could throw him." It was well heard by hon. gentleman on this side.

MR. CARTER: It is in Hansard.

MR. STAGG: It is in Hansard: 'I would not trust him any further than I could throw him.' Now that is the same gentleman, of course, who spent \$200 million last night to save his political hide, the \$200 million man, Mr. Marc LaShort, as Mr. Crosbie calls him. Well, these are the people that hon. gentlemen opposite are unfortunately in league with. I do not know why they continuously do it, and they continuously bring forward these provocative resolutions. It says, 'WHEREAS this present administration has, by its own admission, no other reason to exist except that battle for ownership of the offshore now lost by the administration in the Courts.'

Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, that when the decision on the offshore was announced, when the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, the Appeal Court of Newfoundland announced its decision there were shouts of joy down in the Opposition Office, shouts of joy. I have it on very good authority that there were shouts of joy in the Opposition Office, "Hooray, hooray, they have lost!" And by inference, I suppose, that would build them up. Well they were delighted, absolutely delighted that we had stumbled, or at least, gave appearance of stumbling of that particular juncture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, number one,

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STAGG:

There is no point of order,

Mr. Speaker, I am getting right to his jugular again.

MR. NEARY:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STAGG:
the Chair, as usual.

He is looking for help from

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is it possible under the rules of this House that you are permitted to make untrue and incorrect statements like the one that the hon. member just made? If that is allowed to stand on the record of this House, Mr. Speaker, then anything goes, it would be just wide open from now on. That is an untrue statement the hon. gentleman just made. He knows it is not true, and he should withdraw it. If he has any decency or any honour at all in his body he would withdraw that because it is just not true. He just made it up. It may be a slip of the tongue, but the hon. gentleman should be man enough to withdraw.

MR. STAGG:
Absolutely not.

No slip of the tongue!

MR. NEARY: If he is trying to crawl into the Cabinet, surely he can find something better than that to use to try to endear himself to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. That sort of statement must not be allowed to stand on the public record, and I would like to have Your Honour's guidance on whether or not untrue and incorrect statements just made by the hon. gentleman are allowed to stand. I am saying that it is not true. I happen to be one of the people who spend a lot of time in that office, but I do not think there was anybody in the office, by the way, the evening the decision came down.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should be asked to withdraw and apologize to the House for making these untrue and incorrect statements.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

To that point of order,

April 20, 1983

Tape 1259

PK - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order,
the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not want to trespass
on the hon. member for Stephenville's (Mr. Stagg) time,
but the hon. member made a statement and -

MR. NEARY: He cannot back it up.

MR. MARSHALL: - all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is it has been backed up by the conduct of the hon. gentlemen there opposite in the House because every time it is mentioned they jump up and down, they exult in this House itself. That is a fact that the hon. gentleman cannot deny, he has a big grin on his face now.

MR. NEARY: No wonder you would laugh.

MR. MARSHALL: But the fact of the matter is it is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is a point of disorder where he is getting up and interrupting the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who is making a fine contribution to this debate.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): I rule there is no point of order, merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Now I would like to go back to January 25, 1982. Now that is a little over a year ago. There has been a lot of water under the bridge in Newfoundland since that time. But on the 25th. of January, 1982, Newfoundland put in writing its proposal for settlement to the federal government. This was released to the general public on the 16th. of March, 1982. The Opposition unfortunately did not bother to read it until the election was over, we had an election on the issue but the Opposition read it some time in June even though it was publicly available.

Well, I am just going to read from Page 47, or paraphrase from Page 47, read from my copious notes. The summary and conclusions on Page 47: "The Province entered these negotiations on the basis that the issue of exclusive ownership and jurisdiction was to be set aside." How uncompromising of a government to set aside the issue of exclusive ownership and jurisdiction, set it aside on a permanent basis, by both governments. "In

2749

MR. STAGG:

the Eastern Seaboard of Canada as far as fisheries are concerned. We disputed the mineral ownership and we still do, but Canada had practically no East Coast fishery until it got Newfoundland, we brought that into Confederation. We have been the greatest sharers. And what has Canada done with our offshore resource? I have already waxed eloquent on many days about how they treated the Japanese, the tender, loving care with which they treated the Japanese and the caplin roe which they needed for their libido, but I shall not deal with that in any more detail today.

So what we would like to know is where does the Opposition stand on all of this? Where does the Opposition stand? Is the Opposition stand the same as that of Mr. Chretien who says that the Nova Scotia agreement is an honourable agreement and Newfoundland should have a similar agreement? That the federal board, when it came down to Newfoundland, would gradually be assimilated by the Newfoundlanders because our people would go to school with their people and they would all be Newfoundlanders after a while. Is that the position of the Opposition? Is that what they want? Or are hon. gentlemen hoping against hope with their tongues in cheek, and their tails between their legs, that demonstrations like we saw outside Confederation Building today will somehow snowball into a situation whereby we will be thrown out of office and they will be thrown in?

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. STAGG:

That is the strategy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, I suggest to the hon. gentlemen -

MR. NEARY:

Do not get too cocky.

MR. STAGG:

~ I suggest to the hon.

gentlemen that it is a strategy that is fraught with a lot of difficulties, but that is the strategy of the hon. gentlemen.

MR. NEARY:

Do not get too arrogant now.

MR. STAGG:

The hon. gentlemen should

learn something about the Canadian way of doing things, the Canadian way, the way of MacDonald, Laurier -

MR. NEARY:

Would you repeat after me -

MR. STAGG:

What is that again?

MR. NEARY:

Will you repeat after me, 'I am

a proud Canadian'?

MR. STAGG:

Sure, I am a proud Canadian.

Right. The hon. gentleman is now attempting the same ritual that his predecessor

MR. STAGG: as Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Stirling, used. He used to say too, 'I am a proud Canadian.' He had it all written out it was a new slogan and he got over there and he thought by saying this that somehow or other he would embarrass us on this side, that we would be too embarrassed to say that we are proud Canadians. Well, we are proud and fighting Canadian Newfoundlanders. Yes, indeed that is what we are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the resolution also deals with the question of Winter drilling. Now, the analysis of what happened offshore Newfoundland this year as to who was correct with regard to Winter drilling has yet to be written because, I would submit, the real information is still not quite available. But it is readily apparent that the position of this government which was consistent with the highest of safety standards, was correct and Mr. Chretien, sitting in his plush office in Ottawa, chose to needlessly endanger the lives of the workers on those two drill rigs out of sheer political opportunism, to flex his muscles. Now, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa has been flexing its muscles considerably around Newfoundland. They have been playing the bully but at the same time masquerading as the pansy, and it is an interesting schizophrenic way of handling oneself. They seem to have gotten it down to a science. But the Winter drilling fiasco perpetrated on us this year by the federal government, the full story of that is yet to be written. And I submit we will know all about it at least within the next sixteen months, because there are dramatic events coming within the next sixteen months.

April 20, 1983

Tape No. 1262

MJ - 2

MR. WARREN:

Another election?

MR. STAGG:

Yes, an election. Of course
an election. That appears to be the only recourse left.
Obviously the hon. gentleman's friends in Ottawa are not
interested in dealing with Newfoundlanders as

MR. STAGG: equals in Canada, so the only thing to do with people like that is to toss them out of office. That is the democratic system, toss them out of office, and we intend to do everything we can to toss the Liberals out of office. And I suggest to hon. gentlemen opposite that when the next federal election comes around, they should take a sixty day holiday or a forty-five day holiday because they would not want to be caught up in the reflections on the federal candidates when that election rolls around.

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

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the amendment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you on a point of order?

MR. NEARY: No, I wish to speak to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.
It is there for Your Honour to see.

MR. SPEAKER: Standing Order 53 (2):
"Notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 49, no member may speak for more than twenty minutes in the debate on a private member's motion.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to speak on the resolution itself, I wish to speak on the amendment. Unless this Parliament, this Legislature is different from any other Parliament in the world,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when there is an amendment, unless we have closure, unless there is an attempt to muzzle the Opposition, on every resolution and every motion that is made in any jurisdiction under the British parliamentary system in the world, you can speak to the main motion and then you can speak to the amendment. What I want to do, Mr. Speaker, is speak to the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of order, the rules as stated by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) are correct in ordinary debate, but on Private Members' Day, rule 53 (2) stands. "Notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 49," it states, "no member shall speak for more than twenty minutes in the debate on a private member's motion."

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

MR. NEARY: I understand what you are saying and what you read there, Mr. Speaker, but I think it is a question of interpretation. "Each member's motion shall be debated for not more than two sitting days and at 6:00 P.M. at the close of the second sitting day the motion then under consideration shall be put."
Mr. Speaker, it does not say anything here about not

MR. NEARY:

following the ordinary rules.

"Notwithstanding the provision of Standing Order 49, no member may speak for more than twenty minutes on the debate on a private member's motion." Well, I am not speaking on the motion that was on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker - and I believe this is something now that we have to get straightened out - I am speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, and it is not clear in these rules if you can speak to an amendment or not. I think we should refer to the House of Commons debates and to Beauchesne. I think it is perfectly in order. It is in order in every organization in the world.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): I can straighten this out for the hon. member now.

MR. NEARY: Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: On March 25, 1981, the Speaker ruled in this House that it is twenty minutes total for members on the main resolution and the amendments, the interpretation being that if an hon. member had spoken for ten minutes on the main resolution he could technically have ten minutes remaining on an amendment. But twenty minutes in total on both.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does not want to know the rules. He does not want to operate by rules. The hon. Leader of the Opposition never ever operated by rules and procedures. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, when he was the Minister of Social Services never operated by any rules or procedures, never ever operated by rules and procedures. He operated by his own rules. Unfortunately this House is not going to be run the way the hon. Leader of the Opposition ran the Department of Social Services when he was minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in this debate because I think it is a very important resolution. And I know hon. members opposite do not want to debate this resolution for more than one day, they are sorry they put the resolution on the paper, they do not want to discuss the offshore. They do not want to be seen by the people of Newfoundland for what they are, supporting the federal position on the offshore, the Nova Scotian agreement, get out and sign it.

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) gets up in his place and he talks about unemployment and the fact that Newfoundland has the highest unemployment rate of any province in Canada, and we all know that, but he does not want to support the regulations for offshore that say that if Newfoundlanders are qualified they should have the jobs offshore. He stood up in this House many times, Mr. Speaker, to say that he does not support local preference on the offshore. That is his position. He supports Mr. Chretien and he supports Mr. Lalonde.

MR. LUSH: I support the (inaudible).

MR. DINN: I know. The hon. member is saying it again. He does not support local preference. He does not want jobs for Newfoundlanders. He wants to support Mr. Chretien and Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Rompkey, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH: I will defend him until I die.

MR. DINN: To the day he dies he is not going to support a job for Newfoundlanders. No, Mr. Speaker, he is not going to do that. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that because of the regulations last year we had 1,409 Newfoundlanders working offshore. And, Mr. Speaker, we should all be proud of that. That helped the unemployment rate in Newfoundland. It did not drop it substantially but we had

MR. DINN:

some people working, The hon. member is not in favour of that, He is in favour of what Mr. Rumpkey says, whatever Mr. Rumpkey says has got to be what the hon. member has to say. He cannot be seen to be disagreeing with Mr. Rumpkey, or Mr. Lalonde, or Mr. Chretien, or Mr. Rooney, or any of the other fickle five that is up there espousing what Mr. Chretien says and what Mr. Lalonde says, not what the people of Newfoundland want. The people of Newfoundland want a just and reasonable settlement in the offshore case, Mr. Speaker, this year. We have not got a deal, so the feds are going to pull out and the oil companies are going to pull out and you are going to be left destitute. Well, that is not what the records show. The records show that this year there is the possibility of eleven rigs and semi-submersibles offshore, and seismic operations going on offshore. Hon members opposite are disappointed that these kinds of activities are going on.

We have a few problems now.

The Appeals Court in Newfoundland did not rule in our favour. It does not mean that is the end of it. Mr. Chretien says there has to be a negotiated settlement. He does not want one right now but there has to be a negotiated settlement. Well, Mr. Speaker, we negotiate on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, and we talk to the oil companies. We do not have any problem with Mobil Oil. This year Mobil will have the Sedco 706 out on the Grand Banks, out at Hibernia, and we will get 93 of the 110 jobs that are on that rig, and we deserve to have 93 of the 110 jobs. We have the qualified people here to do those jobs. Why should we not get those jobs? Why is the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) against

MR. DINN: those 93 Newfoundlanders getting jobs offshore, Mr. Speaker? The West Venture will be out there. We have negotiated with Mobil Oil for the West Venture and they say we will have 69 -

MR. NEARY: If he had a brain he would be dangerous.

MR. DINN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is now interrupting and I have warned the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he should not interrupt because we have a book here written about the hon. Leader of the Opposition that everybody in Newfoundland should read. This book is about how a minister should not operate, should not operate when he is in power. He should not do things like that. We have a book written about the hon. Leader of the Opposition and he stands up in this House, he has the colossal gall to stand up in this House and talk about hon. members on this side of the House, about their position and other things, and how they are not telling the whole truth with respect to -

What is the book called?

MR. DINN: It is called The Mifflin Report. It is a very good book on how not to operate.

I put this

MR. DINN: out for all members on the back-benches of this government who strive to be a minister in this government, to read this book because this book is a book about how not to operate as a minister in this government. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to sit here in this House and listen to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) spout off about how the ministry or how members over here speak or operate or whether they tell the truth or not. I am not going to listen to that foolishness, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: You are only a scummy corner-boy.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition is interrupting. Nobody interrupted the hon. the Leader of the Opposition when he was speaking in this House. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition persists in trying to make the rules of this House his rules but they are not. So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, the protection of the Chair to see if we can control the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I wish to remind members that the hon. minister does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. NEARY: The rules apply to both sides of the House,

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, addressing the offshore, the resolution is with respect to the offshore, and to address the offshore, the Zapata Uglund will operate off our coast this year. Of the 116 people who work on the Zapata Uglund, 85 will be Newfoundlanders. It may hurt the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), he does not

MR. DINN: agree with local preference in the offshore, he does not agree that Newfoundlanders should work in these jobs even though they are qualified. The hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) disagrees with the regulations. But, Mr. Speaker, we are going to sit down with the oil companies -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. DINN: - and we are going to negotiate with the oil companies.

MR. LUSH: You cannot negotiate.

MR. DINN: The hon. the member says that we cannot negotiate; well, we can sit down with these oil companies and negotiate a fair settlement with respect to employment in the offshore.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) obviously cannot take the pressure and when you cannot you have to get out of the kitchen. Mr. Speaker, we are having a little bit of difficulty this year; hon. members may not know this but we are having a little bit of difficulty this year. There are certain people flexing their muscles, Petro Canada, which is a tool of the Federal Government is starting to flex its muscles a little bit this year with respect to employment in the offshore. We are going to have the Pelbrin, the Pacnorse and the Neddrill operating off Labrador and we will employ Newfoundlanders because that was negotiated, Mr. Speaker, reasonably and respectably and just laying the register out and saying, 'Have a look at our register and see if you have people who can work in the offshore,' and they said, 'Yes, we will take the following people - this guy looks qualified, we will check him out'. There is no force, there is no holding the hammer or the

MR. DINN: gun to one's head, it is just a matter of saying, 'Here is our registry. Have a look at the registry and see if we have people there who qualify for what you are attempting to do out there and if we do then we would appreciate that you hire them.' But, Mr. Speaker, since the court case, Petro Canada is getting petulant, they are starting to get a little bit disagreeable. "We are going to talk to other people about this. We do not have to talk to the Newfoundland Government." Well, Mr. Speaker,

MR. DINN: for the information of Petro-Canada, with an attitude like that, in a couple of years, when we do get, and we will get, control of the offshore - when we do get control, not if we do - when we get control of the offshore, which we will, we will get our rights, we will get our just rights in this Canadian Federation, inside Confederation, as Canadians, and we will negotiate and get a deal that Canadians want us to have, not the deal that Mr. Chretien wants us to have or Mr. Lalonde wants us to have or what Mr. Trudeau wants us to have, but we will get a reasonable, respectable negotiated settlement. That will come. The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) need not fear, that is on its way. It will take a little time. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that we have eight members opposite, we are discussing an Opposition resolution on the offshore that they made the mistake of putting on the Order Paper and now they are not here to debate it, hon. members finally ran off into their corners because they know full well that the people of Newfoundland understand what we are talking about when we are talking about the offshore. We are talking about getting jobs for Newfoundlanders. We are talking about the business community being able to participate in the offshore. We are talking about Newfoundlanders who are qualified, who worked in the Beaufort Sea, who went to Alberta, who went to Spain, who went to the Indian Ocean to drill, Mr. Speaker, and rightfully should have the jobs offshore when we have 20 per cent unemployment. You should see the hon. member for Terra Nova get up in this House and wax eloquent about the unemployed, and he seems to delight every time it goes up a percentage point in this Province.

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the unemployment rate in Newfoundland, everyone has to agree, is really terrible, is really disgraceful at this point in time. Why is it? Is it because we are the only ones have a high unemployment rate? What happened in Canada last year? What is happening in Canada right now, the Nation as a whole? The unemployment rate in Canada increased by 49 per cent over last year.

MR. LUSH: It did not in Newfoundland?

MR. DINN: It went up in Newfoundland. Yes, it went up in Newfoundland but proportionately it did not go up as much as the whole Nation. Mr. Speaker, Alberta went up in unemployment more than Newfoundland did. Our unemployment rate would rise more if we listened to the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) because we would have no jobs offshore. Now, is it true that we would have no jobs offshore if we did not enforce our regulations offshore? Well, let us have a look at

MR. DINN:

the record. Last year we had a company come in here called Canterra. They came over here with a rig called the Petrel and they operated in the Davis Strait. The closest group of people who qualified to drill on the Canterra were right here in Newfoundland. They came over here to Newfoundland, left here and went to the Davis Strait. Under normal circumstances one would think that we would have some Newfoundlanders working on that, they operated under the Canadian regulations and we would have some Newfoundlanders working, we would get our proportion. I mean, it is only logical and reasonable to expect that we would get some Newfoundlanders working on that rig with so many Newfoundlanders qualified to work. But did we get them? Of 132 rig workers on the Petrel last year four were Newfoundlanders. What was the main criteria? The main criteria was not whether you were a qualified driller or whether you were a qualified tool pusher or whether you were a qualified roustabout or roughneck or anything else. "Do you speak French?" "No, I do not speak French". "Unfortunately, you are not qualified". "Do you speak French?" "No". "Unfortunately you are not qualified".

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did that happen?

MR. DINN:

That is right. So, what happened? So, the Petrel went up and it did its drilling and it said, 'Now, we have to go somewhere over the Winter. We have got to get in out of the Labrador Sea or get out of the Davis Strait for the Winter. So, we will ship down to Argentia and we will anchor there for the Winter in a nice, safe reasonable harbour'. And did they say, 'Well, we are going to need some maintenance crew down here in Argentia and obviously the closest people - I mean, the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) will stand up in

MR. DINN: this House and say how many people he has got unemployed down in his area and that he has people who worked on the offshore. He has certainly got people down there who are capable of maintenance. Should we not have a few of these people working on the Petrel or watching the Petrel or guarding the Petrel while it was anchored down in Argentina? It would be normal and reasonable to assume that we would have some Newfoundlanders working on it. Well, of the ten people, lo and behold, of the ten people who worked on the rig over the Winter while it was Wintering in Argentina, we had five from Quebec, four from Nova Scotia and one Newfoundlander, the same guy who could speak French. So we got our normal, reasonable and just desserts. If you do not go around with the big hammer, if you do not wave the big stick at these people, if you do not tell them, 'You have to operate under our regulations', what do they do? Do we get our normal and reasonable and just employment?

AN HON. MEMBER: In their eyes, yes.

MR. DINN: In their eyes, yes. But we do not.

So, Mr. Speaker, what is happening this year? Well, we had an unfortunate ruling from the Appeal Court in Newfoundland. What is Petro-Canada saying now? Are they saying, 'Well, you have the qualified people. We are happy with you'. Well I have a sneaky suspicion that the old thumbscrews are being turned on poor old Mr. Hopper and he is hopping. So, when we call Petro-Canada and say, 'Look, you have a possibility of the SEDCO 710

MR. DINN: coming over here and, you know, it is operating in Newfoundland waters. We would like to discuss with you how many Newfoundlanders you are going to hire this year on your rig, the SEDCO 710." And what does Mr. Hopper say? Well, Mr. Hopper did not say it. Well, what are his flunkies saying? His flunkies are saying, 'We do not have to talk to you guys. We will hire whomever we please.' 'Well, what about the registry? What about the people that we have here qualified who are unemployed? What is the matter with them? They were good last year when you were hiring.' 'Well, this year, you know, I cannot say for sure.' Is that because the thumbscrews are being tightened a little bit? Poor old Mr. Hopper will not answer his phone, he will not give any jobs to Newfoundlanders. Well, I can tell Mr. Hopper that in a couple of years, when we do get a rightful and just agreement on the offshore, that the old thumbscrews are going to be tightened the other way and Mr. Hopper is going to be sent hopping the other way because he has got to treat this Province reasonably. He is not going to push the people of Newfoundland around.

MR. MARSHALL: Who is telling Mr. Hopper what to do?

MR. DINN: And who is telling Mr. Hopper what to do? Mr. Hopper is not an unreasonable man. I would suspect that it is Johnny. Johnny Chretien is giving him a little call and saying, 'Now, listen here, Skipper, we have to grind those Newfoundlanders into the ground.' How are we going to do it?' 'We are not going to give them any jobs. They might have some now, we cannot kick them off, but the next rig that goes over there, no jobs'. And that is what Petro-Canada is saying. They did not say it last year. They wanted to co-operate last year.

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, it being six o'clock I adjourn the debate. Hopefully we will have some time to get back at it again next week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): It has been noted that the hon. member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) has adjourned the debate.

It being Private Member's Day,
I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

April 20, 1983

QUESTION 54: MR. CALLAN (BELLEVUE) - TO ASK THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF DEVELOPMENT TO LAY UPON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

LIST THE PLACES WHERE PROPERTY HAS BEEN ACQUIRED FOR LAND BANKS GIVING:

- (a) THE ACREAGE;
- (b) THE COST TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR;
- (c) DETAILS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S SHARE, C.M.H.C.'S SHARE, OR THE GOVERNMENT OF NEWFOUNDLAND'S SHARE IN PURCHASE OF THESE LANDS.

ANSWER: AT THE PRESENT TIME, NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR HOUSING CORPORATION HAS OVER 7700 ACRES OF LAND HELD UNDER BANKING. WHILE A PORTION OF THESE LANDS WERE ACQUIRED EITHER ON A PARTNERSHIP OR LOAN BASIS WITH CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT (EITHER SECTION 40 OR SECTION 42), THE GREATER PART OF THE 7700 ACRES WAS ACQUIRED STRICTLY FROM PROVINCIAL FUNDS.

(a) SECTION 40 LANDS (75%/25% FEDERAL/PROVINCIAL COST SHARING)

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ACRES ACQUIRED</u>	<u>COSTS</u>
BAIE VERTE	40.60	\$ -
BURIN	14.29	-
CARBONEAR	4.40	3,079.00
TREPASSEY	20.30	26,016.00
DUNVILLE	28.23	14,578.00
STEPHENVILLE	214.47	140,824.00
MOUNT PEARL	609.00	1,514,336.00

(b) SECTION 42 LANDS (90% LOAN FROM C.M.H.C. WITH THE PROVINCE PROVIDING A 10% EQUITY)

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ACRES ACQUIRED</u>	<u>COSTS</u>
ARNOLD'S COVE	597.69	\$ 3,684.00
BURIN GREENHILL	22.00	20,152.00
APPLETON	79.86	36,500.00
DANIEL'S HARBOUR	37.58	23,678.00
MARYSTOWN	24.07	22,036.00
CLARENVILLE	8.61	5,715.00
CORNER BROOK	91.00	193,939.00
GANDER	100.62	-
GLOVERTOWN	60.77	91,097.00
BONAVISTA	14.51	1,735.00
MOUNT PEARL	646.00	987,660.00

QUESTION 54:
CONTINUED

- (c) GENERAL (WITH THE EXCEPTION OF DONOVANS AND CARBONEAR WHICH WERE FINANCED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION, THE REMAINING LANDS WERE ACQUIRED AND FINANCED ENTIRELY OUT OF PROVINCIAL FUNDS)

<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ACRES ACQUIRED</u>	<u>COSTS</u>
ST. JOHN'S	560.50	\$ 1,723,342.00
DONOVANS	95.00	61,136.00
MOUNT PEARL	2,787.00	21,808.00
CARBONEAR	12.27	29,452.17
GANDER	44.23	27,380.00
WABUSH	73.90	-
CORNER BROOK	55.00	144,210.00
FERMEUSE	51.34	1,568.00
HAPPY VALLEY	375.00	-
DEER LAKE	46.00	71,020.00
ST. ALBAN'S	6.50	7,472.00
MILLTOWN	48.04	9,498.00
SPRINGDALE	6.07	27,492.00
GAMBO	65.15	15,047.00
POLLARD'S POINT	53.00	1,480.00
CLARENVILLE	366.68	-
OCTAGON POND	508.00	-
BADGER	3.03	3,030.00