

VOL. 2

NO. 25

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.

THURSDAY, APRIL 21, 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, I just wish to inform the hon. House and the people of the Province that I personally believe the widespread perception that the Government of the Province is very inflexible as it relates to the dispute between the Treasury Board and the Newfoundland Teachers' Association on the problems that we are having, and I think that is unfortunate there is that perception, but I suppose in the public domain perception very often becomes a reality and I have to, as Premier, deal with that in as forthright and as honest a manner as I can. Therefore I want to inform this hon. House that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador are in the process of formulating a brand new position that we will put before the Newfoundland Teachers' Association executive- we cannot put it before the teachers of the Province directly, or one on one, or group on group- but we are in the process of formulating a new position and hopefully within the next few hours we can have that position completed and put before the Newfoundland Teachers' Association executive and negotiating team, before the people of the Province and before the teachers, So I thought I should inform this hon. House that the Government understands and appreciates the concern that a lot of parents have, the concern that a lot of teachers have, concern that I have personally as does the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge),

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the Acting President of Treasury Board, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the whole government. People may think we are inflexible, unmovable, somehow hiding away from the reality of the situation, and to try to demonstrate, because you cannot get all the perceptions out from what went on with the mediation process and so on to the teachers especially and to the people of the Province, we are in the process of developing a brand new position which, hopefully before twenty-four hours anyway, either tonight or tomorrow morning, we will be ready to present to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association executive and negotiating team in an effort to solve this thorny and very delicate, sensitive, unfortunate circumstances.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to know that the government is certainly willing to change its position. In the last couple of days, of course, public opinion has been swinging towards the teachers tremendously in this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: -because the people recognized the inflexible position of the government. They have seen it is very hard to keep up with the Premier because he has been shifting ground and advancing new positions so often that they have seen that the government was flexible. So, Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to know that the government now is willing to change its position because of the tremendous swing in public opinion towards the teachers. The Premier mentioned yesterday in the House that he was not willing to negotiate publicly, and today, of course, he comes in and advances the new positions. Of course, he does not put any meat on it.

But yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the Premier should have allowed the mediation process to continue quietly to get this matter resolved. We are delighted, Mr. Speaker, and we hope this latest move by the government will see the students back in the schools on Monday so that they can continue their education, and see the teachers back in the school as well, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, hon. members are all aware that the world-wide severe recession that we have been experiencing has had a devastating effect on employment in the mineral industry right across Canada. The work force in the mining sector in Canada has dropped from a high of some

MR. DAWE: 193,000 in 1981, to a current level of about 140,000.

This Province has been sharing the burden of the downturn in the mining sector and we have been struggling, as a government, to find ways to relieve the painful symptoms of unemployment in this part of our economy.

There is one mining operation, in particular, about which not a great deal is heard but which has been a continuing source of income for many families in three communities in Western Newfoundland. Two of these communities are in the district of St. George's. I am referring to the gypsum operation of Flintkote which is part of the Genstar Company. The open pit operation is located at Flat Bay and the stockpiling facilities as well as the deep water shipping terminal is located at St. George's. The company supplies the gypsum consumed in the Atlantic Gypsum plant and North Star cement plant in Corner Brook.

During the past year Flintkote had closed one of its two wallboard plants in the U.S.A. This closure resulted from the drop in demand for gypsum products in the housing construction industry and the company decided to close down its open pit mining operation at Flat Bay. In place of the quarry operation, a tailings treatment plant was to be installed to produce the greatly reduced quantity of rock that would be required. The work force would have been reducing to about thirty.

MR. DAWE: I am very pleased to report today that the Flintkote situation has completely turned around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

MR. DAWE: The Department of Mines and Energy and the company, in consultation with local management and other involved parties have been working during the past year toward resolving the problems of the gypsum operations.

I have had discussions and meetings with all the parties involved. My predecessor who was responsible for the Department of Mines and Energy, the hon. Neil Windsor, worked diligently toward the satisfactory outcome which I have the privilege to announce today.

Within the past ten days the company made a decision to put its second plant, in New Jersey, back into full production and it has also reached agreement for sale of rock for certain cement operations. It will also continue to supply gypsum to the wallboard plant in Corner Brook and to North Star Cement which is located in that city. In addition, a wash plant is being installed at Flat Bay to extract gypsum from the large tailings pile what has been built up over the years. There will, therefore, be an open pit operation and a wash plant operation which this year are scheduled to produce in the neighbourhood of 750,000 tons of high grade gypsum, as compared with 473,000 tons last year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: The work force in the two facilities will be up to the level reached in former successful years and resumption of operations is scheduled to get under way immediately. It is a particular source of satisfaction to me as member for the district in which

MR. DAWE: the mine is located and as Minister of Mines and Energy to be able to announce this turn-around in one of our important mining operations which now promises continued employment for many Newfoundlanders.

The reserves of gypsum in St. George's Bay are enormous, the total reserve estimated to be in the order of a billion tons, and the quality is as good as can be found anywhere. The operation is conducted by a very experienced and capable work force drawn from the St. George's Bay area and managed by a highly qualified Newfoundlander, Mr. Harold Foster.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is indeed good news for the people of Flat Bay and St. George's and surrounding areas. But the good news, Mr. Speaker, emanates from the United States. The hon. gentleman who just gave the Ministerial Statement obviously is trying to get a little credit for the administration, for his colleague, for being able to announce this good news today. It just goes to show how dependent we are in this country on what happens in the United States. If the economy improves in the United States, Mr. Speaker, it will overflow into Canada and the economy of Canada will improve. The fact that Flat Bay is going to increase its production has nothing to do with this administration, has nothing to do with the minister, and has nothing to do with the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), It has to do with a decision that was made in the board rooms -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentlemen do not like the truth they can just go outside and have a smoke or have a coffee. They are a government on the run, as we found that out in the statement the Premier made this afternoon. The Premier is obviously on the run. His administration is on the run. That is fine. I mean, it is good news, we are delighted to hear it, but give credit where credit is due. The credit has to go to the company for opening up another plant in New Jersey, Mr. Speaker. I have knowledge of Flat Bay because every time I go back and forth to my district I pass through St. George's by Flat Bay, so I am very familiar with the operation.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) please restrain himself? I am very familiar with the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the decorum of this House, you know, leaves a lot to be desired since this administration got elected a year ago, got forty-four members. They have become so arrogant. And that is what the people were concerned about in this Province, with a lop-sided majority how arrogant they were going to become, and that they would misuse and abuse their power.

But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I started to say I am very familiar with the Flintkote operation, but I am also very familiar with the gypsum operation in Corner Brook and the North Star Cement mill. If hon. members will recall, these were two Liberal projects that have been very successful. And part of the raw material from Flintkote -

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is just going on. He has nothing to say with respect to the statement or he has exhausted whatever he had to say about the statement the hon. minister has made, and he is now entering into the realm of debate. His response to Ministerial Statements is confined to the statement itself and he is certainly wandering in the area of debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was straying somewhat from the basic principle of the Ministerial Statement. I was about to rise and to advise him anyway that his time for response had expired.

MR. NEARY: I said all I wanted to say anyway.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Would the Premier please tell this Legislature who ordered the riot police, armed with bulletproof shields, helmets and night sticks, to physically abuse men, women and children of the Micmac Band Council during a peaceful demonstration at the Department of Northern Development downtown this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the situation that the hon. member mentions. Apparently a number of people from the Conne River area disrupted the normal flow of business of a department of government,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

if not two departments of government this morning. Obviously they were interfering with a normal, as I say, flow of work, interfering with people's right to work, and the Department of Justice and the law enforcement agencies of this Province went into operation to ensure that the people who were working down there, that their rights were protected, and therefore they took the necessary action to ensure that these rights would continue to be protected. I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) might have more information on the situation that the hon. member desires or requests, but for my own part, since the hon. member directed the question to me, I am aware of it and was made aware of it this morning. And when the Micmac band of individuals inhibited the rights of other individuals to their place of work to perform their duties, then we had a responsibility as a government to ensure that that right was protected and we took the necessary action. The Minister of Justice might have more to add to it. And we will always take that kind of action, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that the rights of all Newfoundlanders are protected, not only the rights of the people in Conne River but the rights of people who work for the various government departments, who have the right to work without being interfered with and intimidated.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary will be to the Minister of Justice. Would

MR. WARREN: the minister tell this hon. House if every attempt at discussion and negotiation failed before he or someone else ordered a riot police team into the Atlantic Place building this morning? Had every negotiation failed in the first place?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat typical that we hear the term 'riot police' and all of that. There are no riot police. They are the regular members of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. To listen to the inflammatory manner in which the question is asked, one would think that this were a quasi-military operation. We hear hon. gentlemen talking about 'storm troopers.' One of his colleagues uses the term 'riot police.' They were members of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. The operation was carried out in a most professional and sensitive manner. I am pleased to report that there was absolutely no injury either to the people who were illegally occupying premises or, equally important, to the people who were enforcing the law. There was absolutely no injury. There were thirty-one people involved in the occupation of the premises of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. I will give the facts now. Twenty-three were arrested. There were eight juveniles and they were not arrested or charged.

MR. NEARY: How many (inaudible)?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will give all the information.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So thirty-one people altogether, twenty-three charges, twenty male and three female, these were adults. There were an additional eight people who were juveniles and no charges were laid. The charges have been laid pursuant to Section 387 of the Criminal Code, which is a charge essentially of mischief, and the essence of that is obstructing or interfering with the lawful use of property. I do not want to get into details on it because, obviously, the matter is before the court, you know, details of that aspect of it. They are appearing, I believe, around 3:00 this afternoon. So the adults, twenty-three of them, have been charged. I repeat, there was no injury whatsoever to anybody involved in it. We made sure that we had medical and Social Services personnel available because we knew that there were some juveniles as well. I can also report that the juveniles were not separated from their parents and that all of them have been fed at Her Majesty's expense at the regular meal hour. I am not sure what the menu was, but they have been fed.

I am very pleased to point out that the whole operation was carried out in an extremely professional manner - no injury. And my understanding is the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary - not the Storm Troopers, not the S.S., not the K.V.D., none of these -

MR. NEARY: It was a SWAT team.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It was the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary who carried out this operation to be able to assure the lawful occupation of the premises by their lawful occupiers without any injury to anybody.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: A supplementary to the
Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

Can the minister advise the
hon. House if there was any shoving and pushing between
the police and the occupants of the building?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I draw the
attention of Your Honour to Beauchesne, the Fifth Edition,
page 130, in the hope of being able to stem the tide of
questions that ought not to be used and abuse of the rules
of this House.

The hon. the Minister of Justice
has given a report with respect to this and I think that
is where the matter lies. It says a question may not
be asked "which might prejudice a pending trial in a Court
of law." Now, Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear from what
the Minister of Justice has indicated that there have
been certain apprehensions and they are appearing before
the court, probably at this very moment. I think it is
most inappropriate, it is an abuse of the rules of this
House, it is an infringement of the rights of individuals.
The hon. gentleman ought to know better. If he did not

MR. MARSHALL:

know before, he ought to have known after the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) gave his response. But certainly he is out of order on his supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition to that point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, as usual the minister is grossly exaggerating. My colleague has every right to find out if the police were armed, if they were wearing helmets, if they had nightsticks. The House is entitled to know if this is the first time the SWAT team has been used in this Province. My hon. colleague is attempting to find out if every attempt was made at negotiation before the walls were knocked down, doors were knocked down by the police in order to get these people out of the building.

There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. My hon. colleague is pursuing a very sensible, rational, reasonable line of questioning and he should be allowed to continue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I refer the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to Beauchesne, page 130. It is quite clear there that, "A question oral or written must not be asked which might prejudice a pending trial in a Court of law." The hon. the Minister of Justice has just indicated that the people concerned will be appearing before the court

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): this afternoon and I think it would be highly out of order to pursue a debate in this House with matters dealing with that. I have to rule the hon. member's question out of order.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier of the Province. It has been over a year ago now since the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development withheld money from the Indian Band Council in Conne River all because the Indian Band Council have refused to agree to special conditions added by the administration of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: It is normal.

MR. WARREN: The minister says it is normal.
Well, why is this government insisting on special conditions which are not part of the agreement that was signed between the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) and the Minister of Indian Affairs (Mr. Munroe)? Why are there extra, special conditions added to the agreement between the governments concerning the Indian Band Council of Conne River?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows different than what he has just said in his question. All tax money from this Province must be accounted for. I can hear the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) getting up in a Public Accounts Committee meeting or in an Estimates Committee meeting a year from now, big headlines in the paper, about a whole bunch of money

PREMIER PECKFORD:

that was spent by a group of people in Conne River with no accountability, that the government did not put in the proper controls to ensure that the money was spent for what it was intended for. The Minister of Rural, Agriculture, and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) and all ministers in this House, and myself, have taken the position that we are not going to find ourselves as a government and as an administration having accusations or allegations made by the Auditor General, or by a member of the Opposition through the Public Accounts Committee, that this government is not spending the taxpayers' money in the way it is supposed to be spent, that the money is actually spent on the projects for which it was intended. And all we are asking the Conne River Band Council to do is to agree to spend the money this way, that way, and something else; present your plan for the development of your community, present the projects that you want to spend the money on, and, through the Committee that we have established, to agree that the money will be spent that way. But the Conne River Band Council, or some members of it, wish to take the money and spend it how they see fit.

Now how can I as a Premier, or how can the minister who is directly responsible come into this House, go before the Public Accounts Committee, report to the Auditor General that we do not know how money that was collected from all the taxpayers in this Province is being spent down in Conne River. We have to be accountable.

So it is all right for the hon. member now— he wants to have his cake and eat it too— to ask this kind of a question today, but if we capitulated and said, 'You can take the money and spend it how you like,' then he would get up in the Public Accounts Committee next year and accuse us of not doing our job that way. So you cannot have it both ways.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You either agree that we are going to be an honest, fair, responsible government spending the money and being accountable before this House and before the Auditor General and before everybody, and all the taxpayers, or you are not. And the people of Conne River cannot expect to be treated differently than the people of Morrisville across the river, or the people of the Head of Bay d'Espoir or the people of St. Alban's or the people of Fogo, or the people of Nain, Hopedale, Makkovik or anywhere else. Everybody lives under the same rules. And if they are going to spend the money that has been collected from the Canadian taxpayer and the Newfoundland taxpayer, then they have to abide by the application of accountability. And that is what we are talking about.

Let us sit down through a Committee, say that you need four houses built, say that you need more money for sawmilling, say that you need money for recreation, say that you need money for roads, and spend it in those areas. We are the ones who are responsible. Mr. Wentzel, one of the leaders of the Conne River community who came here from South Dakota a number of years ago - and Mr. Wentzel is the guy who runs the show - and Chief Joe

MR. NEARY:

Chief Joe runs it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, sure! Mr. Wentzel came here from the United States a few years ago and went down to Conne River, and

PREMIER PECKFORD: now with Chief Joe and the other people in Conne River are trying to dictate to the duly elected Government of Newfoundland of how they are going to spend the money. Well, they did not collect the money, We are the ones who collected the money, we are the ones who are responsible to this House, we are the ones who are responsible to the Auditor General and we insist that if we are responsible to the people of this Province, not just to the people of Conne River, for their money then that money must be accountable to this House and to the minister responsible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: A supplementary to the Premier, Why would the Premier or the minister's department put special conditions on money that is given to the Indians in Conne River when at the same time the minister's department is giving out grants left, right and center to rural development associations in this Province with no strings attached? Why is it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No problem, Mr. Speaker, Because those grants are accountable, those grants are given and have to be spent in a certain way. If we give a grant tomorrow morning to the Indian Bay Development Association, it is a grant which is to be used for the upgrading of a fishing facility; it is to be used for the clearing of a block for trees, for the forest industry; it is to be used for a tourist craft center; it is to be used for whatever. It is accountable, it is specifically designated for a

PREMIER PECKFORD: particular purpose. And we are saying the same to the Conne River Band Council, that if you are going to expect- and you should - to get money from the taxpayers of this Province through this Legislature, through the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), then it has to be designated what it is to be spent for. You cannot start using it and have the authority to transfer it from your sawmill to your roads to your recreation and so on. What are your plans for the development of Conne River? Submit them to the committee and then we will allocate the money based upon your demands, based upon your needs and desires, and then the money goes out that way. So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not know how the Department of Rural Development works. Money is approved through the Department of Rural Development to rural development associations or individuals or firms in this Province based upon a specific purpose. It is to be for a sawmill, it is to be for a pulpwood contractor, it is to be for a development association for this, that or something else. And we are asking for no more from the Conne River Council than we are asking from all the rest of the people in the Province.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier.

MR. WARREN: I understand that one of the big concerns with the minister's department is that the Conne River Indians are overspending. I think you gave an example where they asked for \$9,000 for a vehicle and they spent \$16,000. They overspent. Does the Premier realize that the minister's own department budgeted last year \$165,000 for air travel and spent \$298,000? That is overspending also, Mr. Speaker. The Micmac Indians in Conne River have agreed to account for their spending if the minister's department would also agree that they would account for administrative costs, Would the Premier lay on this table the administrative costs of the department of Rural Development, the \$63,000 that that department used last year for administrative costs for the Indians in Conne River? If the Premier would lay out that maybe we can get a negotiated settlement - the same thing with the offshore, the same thing with the teachers.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, come on now.

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

MR. WARREN: You did not negotiate, boy.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, of course not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, now that I have answered the member's questions and he has not got really a reasonable question to come back with, he starts to accuse me. You see, as soon as somebody gets cornered, what do they do? They start to get desperate and then they start to make wild accusations. Now it gets personal to me.

MR. NEARY: You are on the run, boy. You are a man on the run.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let us stick with the issue, forget about -

MR. WARREN: Forget about the teachers?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Are you going to ask a question on Conne River, or are you going to ask a question on the teachers?

MR. WARREN: You cannot negotiate with anybody. You have not been able to negotiate with anybody yet, boy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: There you go, see. You want to stick to the teachers?

Mr. Speaker, the people of Conne River are not a government, as much as they might like to think so. They established a number of years ago a government, but they are not a government. Now we report to this House. The Minister of Rural Development submits his estimates to this House. We are completely in the hands of this Legislature. We are completely in the hands of the estimates committees. So every bit of money that the minister spends he is accountable to this House for, accountable to every member of this House, accountable to the estimates committees. We have nothing to hide. We are not hiding anything. But if the Conne River Band Council and its leadership think that they are going to deal with this government on an equal basis, as if they are a government and we are only another government, they have another thing coming. They have another thing coming. Because they are not. We are going to deal with the people of Conne River the same way as we deal with the people of Fogo, the same as we deal with the people of St. Anthony, the

PREMIER PECKFORD: same as we deal with the
people of St. John's, no different. There is not going
to be two classes of people in this Province, the people of
Conne River up there, everybody else down there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: You can forget that. Politics
or no

PREMIER PECKFORD:

politics, everybody is equal. And we are not going to report back to Conne River our administrative costs, we are going to report to the Leader of the Opposition, to the Speaker of the House and to all the members of this House, who represent all the people of this Province. And if the Indian Band Council and the leadership down there think that they are on an equal footing with the Government of Newfoundland, they had better think again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Premier.

The Premier gave us one bit of good news this afternoon, which we welcome. We welcome any good news to indicate that the Premier and his government are becoming flexible and conciliatory. So we welcome that news and only wish that the Premier had that change of attitude yesterday when the teachers were outside and he had gone down to see them.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the question about the good news is made necessary by the bad news that I heard today, and that is that the teachers of this Province did not receive their pay checks today, and, as the Premier knows, the Collective Bargaining Act requires that the teachers be paid every second Thursday. Today, being the second Thursday, it is my understanding that no teachers in the Province were paid today. When they checked back with their school boards, they found that there was no money there, that no checks had arrived from the government. I wonder if the Premier can comment

MR. LUSH: on that? What was the reason for this? Was this another attempt by the Premier to bring teachers further to their knees? Just what is the reason for the fact that teachers did not get paid today?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no reason for the hon. the member for Terra Nova to make the situation any worse than it is and to try to imply that somehow we are withholding money now to be hard on the teachers. I do not mind saying, if there is any person up in the galleries who represents the teaching profession and who somehow believes the innuendo that just came from the member for Terra Nova, well, you know, perhaps I will just up and leave the Province altogether -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: because it cannot be true, I mean, that kind of innuendo, You know, that is not a fair question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, in line with what the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains asked earlier, we are trying to run an efficient administration and we have now a completely computerized system, Mr. Speaker. We have spent a fair amount of money, which will save all that money and more besides over the next few years, on computerizing everything. We have even put forty or fifty people in the Department of Finance into special training over the last two years to bring in a whole new system that went into operation a couple of months ago. And I have been pushing it almost daily to get it into place because we can save money,

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, it is fed into the computer, the pay checks of every teacher in the Province and what the deductions are going to be for all the 8,000 teachers or however many teachers there are. Now, there is one day outstanding, as I understand it.

MS VERGE: Except for those who are out on strike.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, for those who are out on strike - well, that is what we are talking about, the others are being paid. Then there is, I think, one day's pay available to them. But the computer does not have the information and we have to redo the computer programming to put into the computer new information, because now their pay is different - right? - their full pays differ. It is a

PREMIER PECKFORD:

one day pay rather than a fourteen days pay, or whatever it is. So we have to feed a whole new system into the computer so the computer spits out the proper deductions, if any or none, and then gives whatever is due to the teacher. So we have to change that whole system around in order to pay them because obviously, as the hon. gentleman knows, their pay comes from the government. So, number one, there is no attempt, you know, to not pay the teachers. We are going to try to pay that day to the teachers as soon as we can, but we got a problem and we were not able to solve the problem by payday today but we will attempt to solve the problem. May I just say, while I am on my feet and to demonstrate that what the hon. member was implying, that somehow we were trying to be even more provocative with the teachers than is necessary or than we should - better said - is that we have had a number of inquiries, quite a few inquiries, from teachers who are sick around the Province, who were sick before the strike was called.

MR. NEARY: It is not yet a strike.
That has not been determined.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am trying
to explain something that is rather important.

MR. NEARY: Well, do not keep referring
to it as a strike.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will refer to it as I
like and the hon. member can refer to it as he likes.
That is too bad, you know,

PREMIER PECKFORD: if you do not like my choice of words.

MR. NEARY: You want to do what you like. A one-man show!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to point out to the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and to other members of the Opposition - I am quiet when they ask question, I never said a word, never opened my mouth, and I am asking for the members of the Opposition to show me the same courtesy as I am showing them. Now if that is too much to ask, well, then we have a problem in this hon. House.

The situation is we have a problem, a system problem in paying because the numbers are different and we have to feed different things into the computer and we will try to solve that as soon as we can, number one. Number two, to demonstrate that what the hon. member for Terra Nova implied, that somehow we were trying to hit the teachers and hurt the teachers unnecessarily, there is a question of sick leave and sick pay and it is very important for quite a few teachers in this Province who, through no fault of their own, became sick either very seriously sick or something wrong or broke their leg or whatever, and there has been a great dispute over the last two days as to who should get paid. And the general policy has been over the last while that if you got sick two weeks before the strike was called, the strike occurred, you would get your sick leave pay during the strike. Now we examined the situation of the NTA this morning and found that it was much different than most other bargaining units that we deal with.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So we made a decision this morning in the coolness of the Cabinet room and with all the facts that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the Acting President of Treasury Board and others presented, that we should pay all teachers who got sick, members of the teaching profession who got sick as of the day of the strike; they must get paid notwithstanding the two week provision that is there for all other collective bargaining units in this Province. So I just want to say to the hon. member, because I want to hit that issue head on, that we are not around here to try to somehow ram people into the ground because we have a dispute with them about various issues which exist between us on a collective agreement. And along those lines we are going to try to put a brand new proposal on the table before twenty-four hours are out - hopefully before eighteen hours are out - to the NTA executive and to the people and the teachers of this Province to try to resolve this so we can get back to the schools on Monday morning. I appreciate the hon. member's question, he meant it well. He is a good member of the House of Assembly. I have no arguments with the hon. members for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). All I just want to say is do not imply that somehow the teachers did not get paid today because we are trying to ram them into the ground.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: Never would I, Mr. Speaker, try to make any remarks that would make unfair or inaccurate accusations, or take actions to try to upset the Premier.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought computers were to expedite matters and I would have thought that the computer system would have been able to take care of any contingency that would arise.

MR. MORGAN: Question!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) wants to hear the question. It will come in due course. The question, Mr. Speaker, is accepting the fact that that was the problem, that it was the computer system, can the Premier indicate, one, whether this would have happened had the teachers not been locked out? And, number two, when can the teachers expect to get paid the money they are owed? And, thirdly, why was it that Adult Education teachers were not paid? They are not in a lockout situation, they are carrying on the same as usual, and they have not been paid either.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, that is a new one on me. I will find out before the House closes this afternoon and get the information for the hon. member and for the people of the Province. I do not know why the Adult Education instructors were not paid. There obviously is a reason, a legitimate reason. Now the computer is there to expedite things, but a computer is only as good as what you feed into it.

AN HON. MEMBER: There was nothing put into it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just a second now.

The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and the government have put into place a process anticipating the payday to try and ensure that the least amount of time is lost before the teachers get the pay they are due, the least amount of time. We were going flat out

PREMIER PECKFORD: anticipating this last
week that it still might be on, that the computer had
the wrong information and we had to feed into it new
information. So we are doing all we can to do it in the
shortest possible time. That was days ago we did that

PREMIER PECKFORD: and we will do it. So quickly as humanly possible we will provide the money that is due the teachers of this Province, no question. Why the Adult Education teachers were not paid I do not know. No one has mentioned that point to me. But I can assure the hon. member in this House that before the House closes at 6:00 we will have an answer, a reasonable, rational answer for the member and for those people who are wondering why they never got paid today.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker I would like to direct a question to the Premier. I would like to ask him what his administration has done about the task force recommendations on Buchans, if anything has been done? What is happening regarding the situation in Buchans where the employees of the company out there have been economically marooned? Has anything been done to implement any of the recommendations of the Buchans task force?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We have been working, Mr. Speaker on an ongoing basis, not only on that task force for Buchans but the task force that was presented from the people of the Baie Verte Peninsula, where they also have a problem relating to mining activity, and other areas of the Province where we have had problems. Some of the recommendations have been implemented and others of the recommendations have not been implemented. The Buchans area is a difficult area to deal with economically, as

PREMIER PECKFORD: the hon. member appreciates.

I think during his day, when he was in government, they did not do anything to expand the economic base of Buchans. Why did they not do anything?

MR. NEARY: We built a road in to there.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The economic base, the road is there, but still the town is dying. The road has not meant that the town is going to live. What means whether the town is going to live is whether it has an economic base, whether it has a resource on which it can build some economic activity, and the resource on which the town was built was mining, and most of the people there are miners or related to the mining industry, and the task force report, that I was very much a part of during the years that I was minister of Mines and Energy and meeting with the Buchans task force, recommended a whole bunch of things. We implemented some of them as it relates to housing, as it relates to municipal government, as it relates to farming, there is very little you can do in Buchans on farming. The land base is just not there to develop a sound base for agricultural industry to employ the majority of the people of Buchans, so that is not an option. The forest industry is not an option. You move out of the forest line when you go to Buchans, as the hon. member knows. Because undoubtedly he has frequented Buchans many times, hundreds of times, no doubt, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been in Buchans, concerned about the economic viability of Buchans in the future when the ore would deplete, that he was, you know, very concerned about and have been there hundreds of times to try to

PREMIER PECKFORD: conjure up in his mind scenarios for economic development which would replace the mine once the ore had been depleted. So he is aware of where Buchans is and that it is outside of the tree line, if you will, and it is on a plateau where you do not have a base for extensive forestry production so you cannot do anything about that.

MR. NEARY: What about the road?

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is another road.
I am talking about economic activity.

MR. NEARY: Where do you stand on the road?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now just one second, Mr. Speaker.
I am not finished yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have tried to deal with agriculture, I have tried to deal with forestry. Now I am coming to transportation - if the hon. members will let me complete my answer in silence - and the South West Brook road.

Now let us look at the South West Brook road. If the hon. members are serious in that the people of Buchans will derive permanent employment opportunities on building the South West Brook road, if that is their position, I would say to them they are on very shaky economic ground, that is number one. Number two, if they want to see the South West Brook road go ahead, that will take hundreds of millions of dollars to improve what is already there, and complete the link between the Burgeo road and the road that is there, almost to the Burgeo road going East to West and it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars.

MR. NEARY: Are you for it or against it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Just one second, Mr. Speaker.
If we are to realistically try to do that, we have three problems, one; environmental. I do not hear any sound on the other side now.

MR. NEARY: No, we are waiting.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Environmental; two, wildlife; three; cost.

MR. NEARY: Cat Arm (inaudible)

MR. HODDER: Burgeo (inaudible)

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, no, no.

MR. HODDER: Caribou hunting (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, but then the road is not going to be used any more. The hon. member for Port au Port

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Mr. Hodder) knows the difference of that. The Upper Salmon road is not going to be used any more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: The Burgeo road is across a migration route.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That was Mr. Jamieson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) will say today that he is prepared to see money come from the Trans-Canada improvement, money come from the Trans-Labrador Highway that we are after from the federal government -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: I asked the hon. gentleman a sensible question, Mr. Speaker, I am not getting a sane and sensible answer, and I believe the time for the Question Period has run out anyway. And the hon. gentleman's time is rapidly running out.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier, to that point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The one thing that the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the Opposition have to understand is that if there is to be a Question Period, and they expect short answers, they must ask very concise questions -

MR. NEARY: Are you going to do away with that too?

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that demand short answers.

But the way the Leader of the Opposition asks his

PREMIER PECKFORD: questions, it gives me all kinds of flexibility and leeway to try to answer it, because you cannot answer the future of Buchans in two or three minutes, and that is what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked me.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

To that point of order, sometimes it depends on the question asked as to whether the answer is long or short. Technically the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was correct in that the time for the Question Period had expired. However, I think it would be very discourteous of this Chair to interrupt any person asking or answering a question in the middle of the question or the answer.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear! Good ruling.

MR. NEARY: When the time runs out, it runs out. That is it.

0 0 0

PREMIER PECKFORD: Could I have leave to give some information to the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. the Premier have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Then it is agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

PREMIER PECKFORD: All hon. members agree.

The hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) asked a question about the adult education instructors' cheques, and that somehow they were delayed with all the other regular teachers' cheques. I am informed that that is not true, that their cheques are being delivered as usual. So, obviously, the hon. member's facts were wrong. There is no foundation to the allegation that somehow the government has delayed the money to the regular adult education

PREMIER PECKFORD: instructors and the regular teacher cheques should be available to school boards. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I think this is important to make the record straight, the regular teacher cheques should be available to school boards this afternoon or early tomorrow morning. So it was all in the process, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH: That is how come the Adult's got their's too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, An Act To Amend The Law Society Act, 1977.

MR. NEARY: What a man. What a man.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that this House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions relating to the raising of loans by the Province. And also on behalf of the Minister of Finance I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, An Act To Provide For The Portability Of Pension Services Between Certain Pension Plans Guaranteed By The Province.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Concurrence Debate, Resource Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Concurrence Debate, Resource Committee. I believe the debate last night was adjourned by the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Opposition.

The hon. Leader of the

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously the hon. gentleman did not want to get up.
MR. MARSHALL: I did not hear the hon. the Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

I have been recognized. I

believe Your Honour recognized -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Take your chair when the Speaker
calls order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair called Orders of
the Day and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall)
indicated the Resource Policy Committee and the Chair
said that it is understood that the debate was adjourned
last day by the hon. President of Council, which in essence
means that the Chair recognized the person who adjourned
the debate last time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the Chair had
already recognized me because the minister did not elect
to speak. The hon. gentleman did not get up. He did not
rise in his place and you have to let the member whom
you recognized go ahead and speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The Chair
recognized him by saying the Chair understands that the debate
was adjourned by the hon. President of the Council, or whoever
it might be, and is recognizing the person who adjourned the
debate. And the Chair recognizes the hon. President of the
Council.

MR. NEARY:

But then you recognized
me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is entirely out of order. If the hon. gentleman wants to play games all the time in the House that is all right, but he should not offend the institution of the House that is represented by His Honour there. His Honour has made a ruling. If His Honour makes a ruling he makes a ruling and that is it. The hon. gentleman knows the rules of the game. It is all right for him to kabitz with the Premier or myself, or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), or the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), whoever it may be, but you do not attack the Speaker of the House the way that the hon. gentleman is doing it. The hon. Speaker made a ruling, when the hon. gentleman makes a ruling, the Speaker, every member of this House, including the Leader of the Opposition and myself and anyone else, complies. Otherwise you get anarchy.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anybody in this House who is not complying with Your Honour's ruling, but we have rights in this House, rights and privileges under the Standing Rules of this House. The Speaker did recognize me. Your Honour said, "Leader of the Opposition." That is recognition. My hon. friend across the way sat in his seat like a dummy, did not get up to speak. And I believe Hansard will show that the Speaker had recognized the Leader of the Opposition, because, Mr. Speaker, the President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) did not want to speak at that time. But now he is sulky and contrary and now he wants to speak.

April 21, 1983

Tape No. 1286

NM - 3

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a course that we can use if we feel that the ruling was incorrect. We are not going to use that at this particular moment. Maybe somewhere down the line

MR. NEARY:

we may, if the pattern continues to develop, we may have to, on any number of occasions, challenge the ruling of the Speaker. Hansard will show that the Leader of the Opposition was recognized, that Your Honour had indeed recognized the Leader of the Opposition and, therefore, I had the right to speak. And I did not break any rules in the process, Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend is implying.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: It really should be a point of privilege. What I was pointing out is Your Honour made a ruling. Now, Your Honour is entitled to the protection of every single member in this House. Your Honour occupies that Chair as a symbol of authority in this House, itself, and each member is bound to respect Your Honour, to respond to his ruling. Now what the hon. gentleman is now doing, even on his point of order, is questioning Your Honour and that is what I am pointing out. Now, if the hon. gentleman continues there is only one recourse, Mr. Speaker, for people who follow the most serious action, as the hon. gentleman is doing, of questioning Your Honour barefacedly after Your Honour has made a ruling - and that should be the end of it, otherwise you cannot have any order in the House - is for the hon. gentleman to be named.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman is trying to intimidate the Opposition. Nobody challenged the ruling of Your Honour. We know

MR. NEARY: what the rules of this House are. We know how to challenge Your Honour's ruling if we so desire. We are not challenging the ruling in any way, shape or form. We are not attempting to cause any embarrassment to the Chair. We are merely pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that it is our right - we have rights and privileges too. They may be trying to muzzle the Opposition and turn the administration into a dictatorship. We realize that, Mr. Speaker. But, nevertheless, there is some impartiality in this House that the rules have to be observed. Now, we know that they have been chipping away at the House of Assembly, we know the contempt they have for the House, the disregard they have for the House of Assembly, we know they are shifting all the -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition is attempting to make a speech on his point of order. And I have to rule that he did rise on a point of order, in the first place, which really was not a valid point of order.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will get back to the debate.

What we are now debating, I think, is about the last hour left in the Concurrence Debate on the Resource Estimates. The report was very ably presented by the Chairman, the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), and the departments considered were the resource departments of government, including the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Mines and Energy, the Department of Forest, the Department of Development. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MARSHALL: I know that participating in that particular debate at the time—or when the Energy portion of Mines and Energy estimates were being presented to this House, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was there, and at that particular time, we literally begged him to ask questions which would have a bearing and which would be of interest and to ask questions with respect to the items of expenditure that were there. He did not see fit to do so, and neither have he nor the Opposition seen fit to do so with respect to the other departments.

As a matter of fact, I am given to understand that when the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) came and gave his estimates there was not even a single member of the Opposition present at the time, not one; now, this, all in the context, Mr. Speaker, of getting letters from the Opposition talking about the rules of the House, asking that there be no more than one meeting at a time because it was too hard for the Opposition to get to two meetings at a time, and here they had advance notice four days beforehand that this meeting was going to occur. And what happened, Mr. Speaker? Not one single, solitary soul turned up to deal with the budget, or the estimates of the Department of Development and ask the minister questions about this most important department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a few things with respect to the Mines and Energy area that I would like to comment upon because they were not touched during the time when the estimates were being considered by the hon. gentleman, maybe because he did not want that to be. But I just want to draw to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite the situation that still pertains with respect to the stop drilling order and what has transpired since on the

MR. MARSHALL:

offshore of this Province.

In mid-February, as everyone knows -- it is a matter of history now -- this government gave a stop drilling order to the oil companies, which to the great exultation and glee of the hon. gentlemen there opposite, was defied by the companies concerned, unfortunately, directly because of the countermanding order that had been given by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources of Canada (Mr. Chretien).

Now, I suppose when these things occur, we in this Province are not supposed to say anything, we are supposed to lie down like little lap dogs and be trampled upon and take our just deserts as we ought to, but that is not the way that this government has operated in the past or will operate in the future. Because it needs to be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, what happened. After the stop drilling order, they were playing, as I say, Russian roulette with the lives of people out there, because the order had been issued on the basis of reports that had been given to us from the International Ice Patrol and other agencies to the effect that the ice conditions off Newfoundland in the Hibernia area were going to be worse than

MR. MARSHALL:

in recorded history. So that is why we issued the order. They choose because of these instances to play Russian roulette with the lives of the workers out there, acting on a countermanding order from the federal government who were flexing their muscles with their then new perceived jurisdiction as a result of the court case. As I say, they played Russian roulette with the lives of the workers out there, and what happened?

Ultimately then what happened was that they had to move anyway, because we were proven right, and they had to move these rigs into shore, away from the site, and they disconnected. Mobil's original intention was to bring them into Marystown. But when you want to see a picture of indictiveness, history has shown that what happened was that, Mr. Chretien and the federal government gave specific orders that they were to go to Halifax, and a plan was filed for them to go to Halifax with the Coast Guard. So there is no doubt about that.

Then Mobil, acting on the orders of the federal government, kept these rigs at sea. They kept them away from the site, they were not drilling, but they kept them on the high seas in the North Atlantic. Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, they went back to engage again and they had to move off a second time. Now, it is only by the grace of God that there was not a loss of life out there this Winter, another loss of life like the Ocean Ranger. Maybe people do not get exercised about this, maybe we should lie down and accept all of these things, but you have to mention them. It is only by the grace of God that there was a weather window that allowed those rigs to disengage, because I happen to know they had an extreme difficulty disengaging in these weather conditions, where you had seas raging up to 60 feet high, you had winds

MR. MARSHALL: in excess of 80 knots an hour,
and you had icebergs looming on the crests of those waves. And
it was only because they happened to have a weather window that
there was not a disaster out there that day. But what

MR. MARSHALL:

has happened? I got the report yesterday, I have not got the report today, but here again yesterday they were not even engaged. Now, this is April 20th that we are into, they are still not in the area and what is the consequence? The consequences are that these rigs should not be out in these circumstances. Granted the weather conditions are not as severe normally-the wind the conditions that is -in the North Atlantic in April as they are in February, but it is still possible for it to exist and there is no point in taking chances with human lives. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, let it be drawn to attention what has also happened. During this period of time, and approximately two months have expired, really, since there has been drilling out there, since we gave that stop order, it has been a month and a half since they disengaged, and out of spite they were floating around in the North Atlantic when these rigs could very well have been in Marystown where they ought to have been, being refitted. Now, they are going to have to be refitted; The SEDCO 709 has to have a new thruster, the West Venture has to be re-examined and examined pretty carefully in relation to its capacity in the North Atlantic, and all of these rigs no matter what they are, no matter what they have shown, every year they have to come in for a very careful refit. Now, this refit could have occurred, Mr. Speaker, this month and given much needed employment to Newfoundlanders in Marystown. Instead, out of petulance, childishness, vindictiveness, call it whatever you may, they have been towed around - and weakness on the part of the oil company, I might say, the big multi national oil company bowing down to these orders. The net result of all of this is that these rigs are going to have to be refitted at some time, and they are going to have to be refitted

MR. MARSHALL: when? Sometime between now and October. So each and every one of those will be coming in from time to time, as one was in last week, slipped into the harbour in Trepassey, for some work on its anchors. You see it would not come high profile into Newfoundland but it had to come in. Now, what is going to happen within the next six months, when these rigs should be out there productively drilling on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland and what have you, is that they are going to have to be taken into Marystown. Now, I mean, what a loss of time, effort, productivity, all because of childishness, churlishness, the desire to punish Newfoundland because it was correct with respect to these things. So we have, Mr. Speaker, not only the specter that the hon. gentlemen applaud, because anything that Ottawa does they will applaud there is no doubt about it, of human lives being put at risk, but we have the loss of employment.

MRS. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, you talk about applauding and being gleeful, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat seems to applaud and be gleeful about the fact that Mobil defied the hon. gentleman's orders. I think that is what is hurting him more than anything else. The Premier made a statement publicly that he had some kind of secret weapon that he was going to use against Mobil if they defied the order to bring the rigs in. We have not seen any sign of that weapon yet, Mr. Speaker. So that is the real point here. The real point is that this government no longer has any authority, nobody respects this administration any more. They are a government on the run. The Premier is on the run. We see that every day in this House, we see it outside the House, the hon. gentleman is on the run. And, Mr. Speaker, it is tragic, it is unfortunate, indeed, that we have an administration here that Mobil, the Iron Ore Company of Canada, all the fishing companies, all they are doing is just listening to the yapping and they are treating the administration just like school kids. And I believe that is the real issue here. The real issue is the fact that Mobil defied the order, that this government has no authority to deal with Mobil or the drilling companies. That should be self-evident by now. And, Mr. Speaker, during the Committee Estimate meetings that the hon. gentleman referred to, I suggested at that time that the Petroleum Directorate be disbanded. It is no longer necessary, it

MR. NEARY: is now only a burden to the taxpayers of this Province. The administration could save between \$3 million and \$4 million by getting rid of the Petroleum Directorate. Its top officials, the top people in the Petroleum Directorate are looking for new jobs anyway. They realize there is no future in that Directorate. The Newfoundland Appeals Court made that decision, Mr. Speaker, there is no future there for them. They have feelers out looking for employment. Some have already left, some of their key men have

MR. NEARY:

already left the Petroleum Directorate. The hon. gentleman cannot deny it. Others are looking around for suitable employment, where they will have some kind of a future, because now they realize there is no future in the Petroleum Directorate. Now, what will take the place of the Petroleum Directorate, Mr. Speaker? Well, I do not know if hon. gentlemen have ever heard of COGLA. COGLA is now moving into Newfoundland. They have just rented 5,000 square feet of office space down in Atlantic Place and they are moving in here in a big way. You have Petro-Canada, which is a Crown corporation as members know, very active in Newfoundland and off the coast drilling and exploring for oil and gas. But COGLA, which is the Canadian Oil and Gas Lands Association, will be the organization that will deal with the permits, the drilling, the pace of the development, when the development takes place, and so forth and so on. The Petroleum Directorate, Mr. Speaker, no longer have any say. They were stripped of their authority by the Newfoundland Appeals Court. So COGLA now seems to be in complete command. COGLA, the Canadian Oil and Gas Lands Association, has now taken over and are proceeding with the development of the offshore as a result of the ruling of the Newfoundland Appeals Court. They are determining the permits, the rate of exploration, the rate of development, if and when production gets underway. COGLA is in complete control and complete command and the hon. gentleman just sits there twiddling his thumbs. There is not a thing he can do. Now, Mr. Speaker, am I happy about that? Am I gleeful about that? Am I applauding that? No, Mr. Speaker, I am not. I regret it. I am sorry about it. I feel very bad about it because, Mr. Speaker, we have missed the opportunity, the one

MR. NEARY: last opportunity we have to get generous benefits for the people of this Province from that great resource. When the Premier put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, as I said so often that I hate to have to continue to repeat it, he took the resource, he said to the three judges of the Newfoundland Appeals Court, all Newfoundlanders, not Americans, not Canadians - well, Canadians, yes - not Norwegians, not Englishmen, not Scotsmen, he said to these three Newfoundland judges 'Here is the resource, you decide who owns it'. And these three gentlemen in their wisdom, all learned and knowledgeable gentlemen, decided that Canada owned the resource. And I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the Supreme Court of Canada will do likewise.

And while all of this is going on, while COGLA is moving in, while plans are being made for the Summer drilling programme, when we will probably have about, I would think, eleven or twelve rigs drilling - and the hon. gentleman has no knowledge of that, because when the hon. gentleman was negotiating with Mr. Chretien, he gave Mr. Chretien an undertaking, in writing, that the number of drill rigs on the Grand Banks this year would not exceed eight, because the hon. gentleman said any more than eight would overheat the economy.

Can hon. members believe that the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate presented a document to Mr. Chretien saying, 'We do not - this administration, the Premier and his colleague, did not want any more than eight drill rigs on the Grand Banks this Summer because it would overheat the economy.' What childish, silly nonsense. There will be probably twelve or fourteen there, but the tragic and unfortunate part of it is that the hon. gentleman has no knowledge of that. He does not know where the drilling is going to take place. He has no knowledge of the drilling programme

MR. NEARY: this year. It is, Mr. Speaker, sad, indeed. It is something that nobody should be gleeful or joyous about. They have made a complete shemozzle of the offshore. They have failed. They have made a colossal blunder, the biggest blunder in our whole history.

They talk about the Upper Churchill, a sixty-five year contract, when they have given away the offshore forever, forever, and ever and ever, amen. There is no turning back. That is not a fifty year contract, or a sixty-five year contract. When they put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and they gambled with the future of the offshore, once the decision was made that was it, they gambled and they lost. And that is tragic and unfortunate, indeed, for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, Mr. Speaker. And if I were the hon. gentleman I would not be chastizing Ottawa and the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) as he did this afternoon, making very provocative statements, trying to

MR. NEARY: intimidate the Government of Canada, and the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) when the hon. gentleman should be trying to make his peace and negotiate an agreement on the offshore. That is what everybody in Newfoundland wants. They are so out of touch, they are on the run so much, they are a government on the run. The Premier is on the run. They are on the run so much that they have lost touch with reality in this Province. Nobody wants to hear tell of controversy anymore, in Newfoundland and Labrador. They are fed up with it. The hon. gentleman is flogging a dead horse when he is whining and complaining about Mobil defying the order to bring in the rigs. He can whine all he wants. People are fed up with it. And they do not want to hear any more of it. They want a little bit of - Mr. Speaker, we have more social unrest in this Province at this moment, I suppose, than in all the other provinces of Canada put together, social unrest like you would not believe. And the hon. gentleman should stop whining and complaining and moaning and groaning.

MR. SIMMS: Bring in the SWAT team.

MR. NEARY: The SWAT team, yes. The SWAT team will be used, I am afraid.

MR. SIMMS: And the riot police.

MR. NEARY: They got into the baptisimal fire today, the SWAT team. But I guarantee you that if this administration stays in very much longer, and I hope they do not, I hope somebody, the Lieutenant-Governor or somebody, will deal with the hon. gentleman. Or maybe he will do what he suggested this afternoon, he might just pack up and leave. We applaud that. The sooner he leaves the better. But the hon. gentleman can whine and complain and moan and groan all he wants, it is not going to do anything for Newfoundland. It is not going to do anything for our case we have.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what they have to do, they have to learn how to negotiate. That is the problem. The Premier can play little, small, narrow-minded political games, he is good at that, but he is not a good administrator, he cannot negotiate. That is his big problem. He whipped the carpet out from under the mediator in the teachers' dispute, the same as he did with the minister when he was negotiating with Mr. Chretien. It is unfortunate indeed, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, one of the worst things about being Government House Leader, if there is anything worse, is the fact that you find that you have to respond to the Opposition, you find that you have to respond to the hon. gentleman. And it is even doubly worse when you happen to have certain residual responsibility for energy, so you have to respond. So I just invite my other colleagues the next time the hon. gentleman gets up, one or two of the others like the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who can do it in a much more erudite manner than I can.

But I want to deal with a few things, just a few things, Mr. Speaker. He talks about, first of all, what our secret weapon is to get the rigs in. My comment to him is we have our secret weapon which will come to the fore in due course. But, in the meantime, when we talk about secret weapons, I do not know yet what his secret weapon was that had to do with the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province, when this session of the Assembly started.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Sir, the hon. gentleman is making a very important speech, I would like to have a quorum in the House. Could we count the House?

MR. MARSHALL: I would like to have a quorum, too, yes. If I have got to suffer the hon. gentleman, my colleagues should as well.

MR. PATTERSON: You need company for that, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order, please!

We have a quorum present.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with a few points the hon. gentleman has raised; they have raised again and again and again so I reply to them again. He talks about COGLA with this great glee about losing the court case, as he puts it. Let me tell him about COGLA: First of all, COGLA is the counterpart of the Petroleum Directorate in the federal government. When the Ocean Ranger disaster occurred that grim, grim morning, when we got a telephone call as to the happening of that tragic event, we went down to the Petroleum Directorate and co-ordinated all activity and we looked around for a presence of the federal government through COGLA, and do you know what, Mr. Speaker? There was one person in the Province that night and that happened to be a secretary. There were only three people in COGLA assigned to this Province at that particular time, that night. One year later, exactly the same thing, Mr. Speaker, there were just three. The hon. gentleman talks about - some years after the find in Hibernia, some years after the beginning of exploration in Hibernia,

MR. MARSHALL: many years after the claim of the federal government you find there are only three people down there and, with all due respects to them, those three are extremely junior people. Now, he talks about renting 5,000 square feet of space and exults in the fact that COGLA will determine the permits, the pace of development, the hiring and what have you. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in the event that COGLA, through the federal government, exercises ultimate jurisdiction in this matter, I will gain-say to Your Honour that there will be no decisions made with respect to the offshore in this Province, I do not care whether they have an army of people down here. What we were told in the course of negotiation was the plain, simple fact—when they rejected the joint management aspect of the management of the resource, when we wanted the employees to be employees of the board and they were insisting that they be employees of the federal government and we asked them why, we were told - I was told myself, personally - 'Oh, they will be down here their kids will be going to school with your kids, their wives will be shopping in the supermarket with your wives, you will be

MR. MARSHALL: taking them out to the golf club, after a while they will get to think like Newfoundlanders and we will lose control. Now that is a great statement of Canadian philosophy and that is what will happen. I do not care if they rent the entire Atlantic Place, all of the TD Building, they will only have people down here who are very junior clerical people.

MR. SIMMS: Who said that?

MR. MARSHALL: Who said that? Mr. Paul Tellier in the negotiations with the officials, The latter part of it was said personally by Mr. John Chretien, the hon. gentleman's hero, to me directly.

MR. NEARY: Oh, how nasty. Did you have your nasty pills today?

MR. MARSHALL: So that was said, Mr. Speaker, and whether they have an army of civil servants, I guarantee you the decisions will not be made here they will be made in Ottawa, and you will have other instances such as you had this February and March, with people playing Russian roulette out of a case of churlishness, and trying to flex their muscles, and their own invincibility, because it is pretty difficult to see the ice, Mr. Speaker, some 1,700 miles or 2,000 miles away as it is pretty difficult to administer the resource. So the hon. gentleman should not get on with that, should not get on and exult that we are stripped of our authority. We have, in the Petroleum Directorate, Mr. Speaker, probably the best organization in any jurisdiction in the world to manage the offshore, and we are pretty proud of what they have done and what they are doing. And I can guarantee the hon. gentleman that they will continue to exist and they will continue to perform a very valid function in this Province, notwithstanding the statements that the hon. gentleman makes in his great glee that he talks about.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, he exults, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that the Appeals Court of this Province has decided, three Newfoundlanders have said that Canada owns the resource. Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not happen to agree with that particular decision. But regardless of the way in which it is decided, I do not care whether it is done by judges, by lawyers, by ecclesiastics, by engineers, by angels, by people who can stand on the top of a pin, there is no exercise in semantics, Mr. Speaker, which is going to make the Grand Banks of Newfoundland the Grand Banks of Ottawa.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: The Grand Banks of this Province belong to the people of Newfoundland. Prior to 1930, and the hon. gentleman can exult all he wants -

MR. NEARY: He does not accept the decision of the court.

MR. MARSHALL: - prior to 1930 the resources of Western Canada were owned -

MR. NEARY: You are whistling as you pass the graveyard.

MR. NEARY: - the resources under the land of Western Canada, as a legal principle, were owned by the federal government. There was no need of a court case, it was all decided, that was it. But common sense dictated that the people who lived above the land should own the resources underneath the land and consequently out of common sense, a sense of fair play and decency, the federal government gave to the Western provinces the resources below the land. So now today, Mr. Speaker, the people of Alberta enjoy the benefits of their oil. Well now, Mr. Speaker, if that applies

MR.MARSHALL:

to the people of Alberta, how much more or equally should it not apply that the resources below the Grand Banks of Newfoundland should belong to the people of the Grand Banks of Newfoundland? I can tell the hon. gentleman that no matter what the courts decide, no matter where they are, the people of this Province and this government, will never be put off this position, notwithstanding the lap doggish, churlish little attitude of the hon. gentlemen there opposite. And, as a matter of fact, it is the statements of the hon. gentlemen there opposite and their supporters in this Province, and the few, unfortunately, in the business community of this Province who only see their own selfish little aims, which give credence to that and give the impression outside this Province that we are prepared to accept that particular regime. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no Newfoundlander or Labradorian worth his salt in this Province today who is ever going to accept it. There is no reason why we should accept it. No matter what the court case may decide, precedent, fair play, reasonableness, historical Canadian precedent demands that the people of this Province should own the resources below the Grand Banks and we are never going to be put off on that.

The hon. gentleman also tries to make a great deal about the fact that we said there were only going to be eight rigs. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. We were talking about, in the negotiations, a reasonable number of rigs exploring at any particular time. He talks about trying to make peace and negotiate, which is a motherhood statement and what have you. We have always sought peace. We have always sought to negotiate. All we desire, Mr. Speaker, is for people who made an agreement in principle, as they did in December and January,

MR. MARSHALL: to put their promises in writing. Is it too much to expect anyone to put their words in writing? How can you deal with anybody, be it a government or others that may not be? And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, why it is so important. Acting on the basis of information given, and undertakings and promises given by the federal government through Mr. Chretien in those exploratory talks last December and January, we felt with the rest of Newfoundland that an agreement was at last at hand, so we gave what amounts to our bottom line, Mr. Speaker, and we cannot go any further. I cannot summarize it in the time available but generally, in capsule, I could say we conceded this big problem that the federal government had of energy self-sufficiency and security of supply, that we would not turn off the taps. They were afraid that if they gave us control we would do the same as Alberta. Up to our share of that we said we would undertake binding agreements that we will not interfere with, that we will contribute our emergency self-sufficiency and security of supply, our share of it, on the understanding that we merely determine how the development should take place. If our determination of how the development is going to take place, for instance, be it concrete platforms or floating platforms, is unreasonable, so it unreasonably delays energy self-sufficiency and security of supply your way can go. In other words, we said we wanted to determine the how up to the point of time-as long as we were reasonable, we wanted to determine the how. What is wrong with that? We also said, Mr. Speaker, that we wanted 75 per cent of the total income dedicated to this Province until such time as the young people enjoyed a per capita earned income equal to the average per capita income in

MR.MARSHALL: Canada. What is wrong with young people in this Province being able to get an equal income with their counterparts in the other parts of Canada?

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR.MARSHALL: So that is it in a capsule,
Mr.Speaker.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR.NEARY: We just heard another ten minutes of whining and moaning and groaning, Mr. Speaker, that will do nothing to help the unemployed, to help business and industry in this Province. I think probably the most significant thing the hon. gentleman said during his ten minute tirade was the fact that he did not intend to accept the decision of the Newfoundland Appeals Court and the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada . The hon. gentleman said he is not accepting the decision of the court, and I presume he is speaking for the administration.

MR. NEARY:

Well, now that is too bad. I am sorry to hear that. I am sorry to hear it, Mr. Speaker, because they can sit back once the legal work - once all the courts have made their decision and have released their opinion, then they can sit back and sulk all they want. The fact of the matter is that that development is going full speed ahead and is going ahead without any dialogue, without any input from this administration. And, Mr. Speaker, nobody wants to crow about that. That is tragic and unfortunate. They are sitting there. They may as well be down in their offices, as I said the other day about the Premier, making little paper airplanes and tossing them into an empty wastepaper basket.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman could not resist getting his little mind down in the gutter again when he talked about the personnel who would make up COGLA in this Province. The hon. gentleman seems to be rather annoyed and irritated that COGLA is moving in here in a big way. They are opening offices down in Atlantic Place. They have rented 5,000 square feet of office space initially. They are the federal equivalent of the Petroleum Directorate. They are now in command. So what do we need the Petroleum Directorate for? Why do we need it? To bolster the hon. gentlemen's pride and ego? Are they too ashamed now to dismantle it and save the taxpayers of this Province \$3.5 million or \$4 million? Because they are going to leave anyway. I can tell the hon. gentleman right now that all the key people in the Petroleum Directorate are looking for an 'out', they are looking for a future. They want to go where the action is. And if they have not resigned, I guarantee you, they have feelers out for jobs.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, let me say for the benefit of the hon. gentleman, when he got down so low as to drag the personnel into it, he said you would be able to take them golfing. He said, 'You will be able to take them golfing,' Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not golf.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not golf. Maybe he can take them bicycle riding.

MR. SIMMS: Do you have a bike?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman that one of the top men of the Petroleum Directorate in this Province was a Mr. Duggan. I do not think the hon. gentleman can deny that Mr. Duggan was a very competent and able man. Where is Mr. Duggan now?

MR. WARREN: Chopped out, is he?

MR. NEARY: No, he is not. Mr. Duggan is now the top man of COGLA.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And is Mr. Duggan from Ottawa? Is he from the United States? Does he have a company down in the West Indies and only works for the government part-time and looks

MR. NEARY: after his company down in the West Indies part-time? Is Mr. Duggan in that category, like Mr. Millan, who has some kind of special arrangement with the government, that he can go whenever he wants and look after his business in South America and in the Bahamas and come back whenever he wants? Mr. Speaker, is Mr. Duggan in that category? Mr. Duggan, whom I happen to know personally, is a Bell Islander, is a fellow Bell Islander, Mr. Speaker, a fellow Bell Islander, a young Newfoundlander who came from an ordinary family, who did remarkably well for himself, did remarkably well. He was an outstanding scholar. Pat Duggan was an outstanding scholar who went through university, by the way, in the hard times when there was no free tuition or no student allowances or anything else. He pulled himself up by his boot straps. I guarantee you a Newfoundlander that you would have to admire and respect. The hon. gentleman has the nerve to cast aspersions and insults on that kind of a person. Anybody who knew the background of this fine Newfoundlander, I guarantee you, would not get up and make the snide remarks that the gentleman just made about the employees of COGLA. I guarantee you, as one Newfoundlander, I am proud of men like Mr. Duggan, proud of them. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Duggan is one of the top men in COGLA in this Province. He is not from Ottawa, not from Ontario, not from New Jersey, he is a man who has a feel for Newfoundland, if that is what the hon. gentleman is concerned about. He is a Newfoundlander, he is a Bell Islander, he is a good Canadian and I am sure he will do just as good a job for COGLA as he did for the Petroleum

MR. NEARY: Directorate. And the hon. gentleman can get up and try to defend now, hanging on by their fingernails, this Petroleum Directorate, and by their toenails and their eyelashes. They can hang on all they want. All they are doing is bolstering their pride and their ego and wasting taxpayer money.

MR. CALLAN: And their false teeth.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and they can cling on with their uppers and their lowers all they want.

Mr. Speaker, it would be far better to disband the Petroleum Directorate, use the countervailing savings to open hospital beds, to get the teachers and the students back in the classrooms, to look after the students at the university. No, their pride will not allow them to do that, Mr. Speaker. But I am not going to belabour the point except to say that it is too bad for this Province that this administration, who have not been able to deliver on their mandate that they were given last year to negotiate, can sit there now, they had the gall and the face to sit there and twiddle their thumbs, no attempt at negotiations. The reason they are over there, Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, the very reason that 44 members are sitting on that side of the House is because they were given a mandate to negotiate

MR. NEARY: and they are making no attempt at negotiations. In the meantime, the development is going ahead, there is no dialogue, no input; communications have completely broken down between this Province, Petro-Canada, the oil companies, the drilling companies, and the Government of Canada, and the Federal Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Chretien). And that is unfortunate and tragic for this Province.

COGLA is in complete command and they are going to get bigger. Petro-Canada is going to get bigger in this Province, and that crowd over there will not know but a stream roller went over them in another six months or a year. There will be so much activity going on, so many jobs being created offshore, business being generated as a result of the offshore, oil drills working off Labrador and off the Grand Banks, and they are sitting their tossing their paper airplanes back and forth, because that is all they can do, Mr. Speaker. That is all they can do.

I am not going to belabour that any longer. They will get another jolt when the Supreme Court of Canada hands down its decision. They will look for another rock to crawl under they will be so ashamed of themselves. We used to hear in this House a few years ago about the great case that Newfoundland had, Could not lose we were told; they hired lawyers, constitutional experts from all over the world and paid out millions of taxpayers dollars. 'We cannot lose' we were told. 'We own it, and nobody else is going to dare' -

MR. TOBIN: And you are some happy,

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am rather sad about it. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, should go and try to get that fish plant opened before they take him down -

MR. TOBIN: Do not worry they will be back before (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - before he tastes the salt water off the head of the wharf down in Burin, Mr. Speaker, where the draggers are tied up and the trawlermen are not working.

MR. TOBIN: You ask the Chairman of the Action Committee.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, ask me brother, ask me Tory brother, Mr. Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to belabour the point, I think I have made the point. I think I have made it. And hon. gentleman can betray and turn their backs on Newfoundlanders and their constituents who voted in favour of a negotiated settlement, they can betray and turn their backs on them to please the Premier. Well, that is what they are doing. They are trying to please the Premier and they are turning their backs on their constituents and on the people of this Province. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, they are an administration, a government on the run, and the Premier is on the run.

MR. TOBIN: Why will not the Liberal Party in Ottawa take the same stand as the P.C. Party and N.D.P?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to change the subject a little bit now if I can. I want to talk about another matter.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will change it if I get another opportunity.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of things - and I am not going to enter into a game with the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman always has to dig and, you know, he wants to dig up the names of people, make references to the executive director of the Petroleum Directorate, Mr. Duggan, and what have you. I am not going to make any comment at all. Mr. Duggan is not here in Newfoundland. As are a lot of Newfoundlanders, he is in the federal civil service. No dispersions on him or anybody else whatsoever, but the fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman has to realize it does not matter who is down here; what I am saying is the decisions will not be made in this Province, the meaningful decisions and the realistic decisions will be made in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: That is only your dirty mind.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I have an example of that. We saw what happened when they played Russian roulette and forced Mobil to defy the order to stop drilling when the ice was out there. We saw yesterday - the hon. gentleman was in the House when the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) was talking about what is going to happen. Sure, they are going to determine the

MR. MARSHALL: hiring policies, Mr. Speaker. He talked about Petro-Canada. Last year as a result of our regulations - perhaps he will exult about this as well - we managed to get the optimum people employed in the offshore. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) gave some pretty startling facts yesterday, some pretty startling statistics about what is happening with respect to a drill rig going up off the coast of Labrador. How many Newfoundlanders have been employed there, Mr. Speaker? Are there more Newfoundlanders than Nova Scotians on it, more Newfoundlanders than people from Quebec? I suggest we ask that particular question and maybe the hon. gentleman when he gets up with all his rhetoric, will dance with joy on that as well.

Mr. Speaker, on his statement, we had a mandate to negotiate. We did not have a mandate to capitulate and we in this Province never will capitulate, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: We took that mandate and we fulfilled that mandate. We entered into negotiations and we achieved an agreement in principle with Mr. Chretien, who was representative of the federal government at the time, and we are waiting on the federal government to deliver it. We got that agreement because we entered into it with the great spirit of co-operation that was evident to anyone who wants to think back to those days in December and January. We - myself, the Premier and the Cabinet - were convinced that at last they really meant what they said, we were going to get joint management, we were going to get meaningful revenue sharing, we were going to get an agreement that was good for Newfoundland and good for all of Canada. So we gave them our bottom line

MR. MARSHALL: which I described the last time I was speaking, with respect to the sharing of revenue based on the right of the young people of this Province to achieve an equality of earned income equal to the average for Canada, not more than, but equal to the average, based on our right to have a reasonable measure of say in the control, so that you would not get a majority of Nova Scotians on the drill rigs up off Labrador, so that you would be able, if it were reasonable, to see the concrete platforms were there. Based on that and based on our recognition of our national concerns as well, which is energy self-sufficiency, we had an agreement. We were enticed to give the bottom line of this Province, Mr. Speaker. And that is why we now insist, and I think it is reasonable, that the federal government confirm in writing its understandings which they gave us at that particular time and not try to get us in there and negotiate beyond the bottom line which no self-respecting government,

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, worth its salt, which keeps faith with the people who elected it, which had a mandate to negotiate but did not have a mandate to pick up an agreement, to pick up the crumbs, to take an agreement at any cost, which the hon. gentlemen there opposite would be satisfied to see us do and that we will never do. We will never capitulate. The hon. gentlemen can get up and talk about courts all they want to, and I know as much about the courts as the hon. gentlemen do.

MR. NEARY:

(Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, I have had experience with the court in a different way than the hon. gentleman has had in his time. Yes. But I have had experience and I know, Mr. Speaker, about the courts as well. And the courts will only give a narrow legal ruling. If the Supreme Court of Canada decides in favour of this Province, this Province will recognize it to be a narrow legal ruling and will respond as Canadians should, for the benefit of all Canada as well as Newfoundland and Labrador. But it is a two-way street, Mr. Speaker, and as I say, despite the glee exhibited by the hon. gentlemen there opposite, all the decisions in the world, be it the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, the Supreme Court of Canada, the Privy Council, the International Courts of Justice, any of the ecclesiastics, or anybody who wants to dance on the head of a pin, who is a soothsayer in this world, Mr. Speaker, nobody is going to be able to change the common sense precept that the Grand Banks of Newfoundland are the Grand Banks of Newfoundland; they have been for centuries, they were brought by us into Confederation with Canada, and but for that there would be no entitlement of any sharing whatsoever by our fellow Canadians with respect to it.

MR. MARSHALL:

So that is what we adhere to, and it is only, Mr. Speaker, the little lap dogs like the people on the other side of the House, and their statements, that are trying to damage and will eventually, if they have their sway, and if you allow the greed of the few pseudo businessmen in this world who are nothing but glorified manufactures' agents, or you allow the people in the Liberal Party whose only interest is to shore up the federal Liberals so they will get their appointments to their boards, and their agencies and their senates from time to time, if the little quizzlings of this Province could hold their sway sure we will lose it. But I do not think we will lose it because, Mr. Speaker, at least 90 per cent of the people of this Province have a determination that we are to get justice and equity from this resource, and that is all that we ask.

So I would advise the hon. gentleman to watch what he is saying. Of course, I do not need to advise him, because nobody takes the hon. gentleman seriously anymore, either in this Province or outside this Province, except sometimes when he wants to stir up things, like he tries to do from time to time, for his own benefits. But nobody takes him seriously. The only trouble is as he is Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), somebody outside the Province, probably an immigrant into Canada from Ecum Secum in Nova Scotia, who has never heard of the repute and the regard of the hon. gentleman, might hear that the Leader of the Opposition in Newfoundland said something, and they might put a certain degree of seriousness on it. That is the danger. It is not the danger because of the mind of the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MARSHALL: because that abysmally absent at all periods of time. What is serious is the fact that he does exercise a public position in this Province and he should be careful of the statements he made.

So, Mr. Speaker, we will get off Mines and Energy now and we will show the versatility of the government; we will get on to the Fisheries. Where is the Opposition today with respect to the Fisheries? I did not hear any questions asked to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in Question Period today. He talks about the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) opening the fish plant - what is he going to do? What is the hon. gentleman going to do? Is he going to join with Mr. Cashin, the leader of the Union in this Province, and condemn his five Liberal colleagues? Has he got the same courage as Mr. Cashin, who is a trade unionists? He is a former Liberal, he supported the Liberals in recent years but he could see reason as a Newfoundlander for the salvation of the fishery of this Province and he condemned them. It must have been pretty painful. He condemned outright the five Liberal members. Now, where is the hon. gentleman on this? Does the hon. gentleman agree with Mr. Cashin? Does the hon. gentleman feel that he is going to support these same five people who support the federal government on the decimation of the fisheries, on the removal of the offshore jurisdiction in this Province, on the continuation of the debacle in Labrador and what have you? You do not hear a single, solitary thing said by any of the Opposition members with respect to that. We still await, Mr. Speaker, from Mr. Kirby his response to the reasonable position given by this government which requires an urgent response as to a logical way in which the fishery should be ordered in this Province, and we also wait, Mr. Speaker, for the Opposition there opposite to give us some indication of their position with respect to it. The hon. gentleman has the gall

MR. MARSHALL: to turn to the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and ask him about the opening of the fish plants in his district when the hon. gentleman is supporting the very people who are keeping these fish plants closed and seem to be dedicated to a policy, Mr. Speaker, that are going to keep them closed forever. He talks about closing down things, I mean, his friends up in Ottawa have a policy that relates entirely to what they perceive to be the economic viability of communities, and they do not look at the social benefit. But that is all a sop anyway, because what they are really about is to try to remove the effective power of the fishery from Newfoundland into the Province of Nova Scotia and complete it with their plans. That is what they are about and the hon. gentlemen there opposite could not care less, Mr. Speaker, if Burin is closed forever, Grand Bank closed forever, Gaultois closed forever, Fermeuse or any fish plant in this Province as long as it is my party, right or wrong. And it does not make any difference, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. gentlemen, they are savages as far as their representation of people in this Province is concerned, they are totally callous. If they

MR. MARSHALL: were interested in the people in this Province they would support us, first, in the offshore and equally as strongly in our position with respect to the fisheries.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I just want to say that at ten minutes to five the time for this Concurrence Debate will have elapsed.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. speaker, I am not going to reply to the hon. gentleman except to say that under the Canadian Constitution, which had its first anniversary the other day, the right for Newfoundlanders to be hired on offshore and in other projects in this Province was entrenched in the Constitution brought in by a Liberal Party. The hon. gentleman referred to Nova Scotians on the rig off Labrador. How many Newfoundlanders, I wonder are on the rigs off Nova Scotia?

MR. DINN: Thirty-two.

MR. NEARY: How many?

MR. DINN: Thirty-two.

MR. NEARY: Thirty-two. I met that many one day on one plane going back and forth. Mr. Speaker, I would submit that there are a large number of Newfoundlanders working off Nova Scotia on these rigs, so I am not going to play the mugs game with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman resorts to the personal attack like he did - he went on the personal attack with me and the Board of Trade,

MR. NEARY: the business people, squirting his poison and showing how small and rotten and narrow-minded he is, how low he is, Mr. Speaker. He is not going to intimidate the Opposition.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I refer hon. members to an editorial in the recent edition of News and Views of the Board of Trade when they said, 'It is sometimes hard to believe that we still enjoy freedom of speech in this Province'. And then it goes on to say, 'Such an admonishment can be delivered in varying ways one of which is from a letter from the Premier criticizing the recipient of actions which are a great disservice to the position of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador', and you can go on and on, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I want to deal with a hearing that is presently going on before the Public Utilities Board, Mr. Speaker, in which certain testimony came out yesterday concerning Newfoundland Hydro, something that we had thought for a long time about that organization, about that Crown corporation being mismanaged by a crowd of incompetent people, Mr. Speaker. And that was proven, proven in a report that was prepared for the Public Utilities Board by an independent chartered accounting firm - Noseworthy, Keating, Howard and Kung, Mr. Speaker. And what did they say about some of the goings on down at Newfoundland Hydro? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Public Utilities Board hired them. Let us see some of the things they said that are going on that have meant an increase in the electrical rates for consumers in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have argued for years that the government should not have allowed increases in these rates.

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible) read it alright, the way you are thumbing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will come to it now shortly - that these increases should not have been allowed. Why should they not have been allowed? They should not have been allowed for the simple reason that there is mismanagement and incompetence at Newfoundland Hydro, Mr. Speaker. Here is one quote: "We have reviewed an internal audit report for 1981 - 1982. Funds have been expended when not required to do so under contracts. There have been serious deficiencies in pre-planning and cost estimates." Other matters, Mr. Speaker: "The deficiencies in pre-planning and cost estimating resulted in the following conditions: There was a cost overrun on conductors as a result of budget being prepared based on outdated quotations. There was a cost overrun on poles as a result of design faults, survey inaccuracies, inferior quality of poles and inadequate construction practices." The permanent access road to Cat Arm that the minister was boasting about yesterday: "The permanent access road to Cat Arm was budgeted, based upon aerial photographs and topographical maps.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The actual cost to 1982
\$27 million -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - compared to a tender price of
\$11 million.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for debate on this
report has expired.

The motion is that the report
of the Resource Committee be concurred in. Those in favour,
'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against, 'Nay', carried.

MR. MARSHALL: Concurrence motion, Government Services Committee.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Concurrence motion, Government Services Committee.

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

I had the privilege this year for the first time of being Chairman of the Government Services Estimates Committee and the Heads covered under our committee this year, as they have been for the past few years, are Labour and Manpower, Public Works, Municipal Affairs, Finance and Transportation.

I guess I would be very negligent not to recognize the members of our Committee. I first wish to recognize the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) who allowed me the opportunity to be Chairman this year. Because of personal circumstances, he could not make it to the first meeting so I was fortunate enough to be able to be Chairman. I served under the member for Bonavista North last year and found him very competent and co-operative and I only hope I can keep up the good name of the Committee on his behalf this year.

The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) initially was Vice-Chairman of our Committee and, unfortunately, he was assigned to another Committee. We replaced the Vice-Chairman with the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

The member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon), the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) were all members of our

MR. AYLWARD:

Committee, and I must say at this time that I feel that both sides of the House who served on this Committee co-operated very well. I did not see any great difficulties in having our meetings with the co-operation on both sides. When you have your Committee meetings or hearings here in the House, there seems to be a feeling of us against them or one side against the other. But during the committee hearings I find an improvement when all members of the committee try to obtain information from the ministers who are before the committee and it seems to work quite well. It works very well to my mind.

MR. SIMMS: The best system ever introduced by this government.

MR. AYLWARD: There has been some criticism of how the committees work, and there have been charges of taking the business of the House and putting it into board rooms or into dungeons, as they were called. Just to explain to some hon. members who did not have the opportunity to attend our meetings, I would like to let them know how our committee works.

MR. SIMMS: Right on. In the old days, of course, what happened was that they would concentrate all their efforts on one department and the other departments would never get scrutinized. Right? It is much better now.

MR. AYLWARD: Some members say that in the old days certain things happened, but I have only been here since very recently so I am not too sure how things happened.

MR. SIMMS: You are going to be here for a long time yet, brother.

MR. AYLWARD: But in our Government Services Committee, which in the first year of its existence

MR. AYLWARD: operated under the chairmanship of the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) -

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear! A good man.

MR. AYLWARD: - and on which I also served, I found that this system was very good. It provided each member of the committee or each member of the House the opportunity of getting information from the ministers, not only once as it happens in the House, where you have debate, one side and then the other side, and usually it is debate by one or two members in the House, most of the time the Leader of the Opposition sparring with one or more members here or one of the ministers. But in our committee each committee member or each member of the House of Assembly has first the opportunity under the heading of the Minister's Salary -

MR. SIMMS: The member for Bellevue, by the way, thinks this an excellent system. He told me himself, personally.

MR. AYLWARD: Under our committee hearing each committee member has the opportunity to discuss departments under the heading of Minister's Salary, generally. Any questions, any thoughts that they might have or any expressions can be discussed under the heading of Minister's Salary. There has never been any limit on debate of this, or any limit of discussion, or any attempt by the chairman or the members of the committee to limit anyone in whatever discussion they have on that department.

MR. SIMMS: They could ask whatever they wanted.

MR. AYLWARD: So, that is one opportunity for hon. members to get whatever information or express whatever concerns they might have to a minister or to a department. In our Committee which operates somewhat differently than some of the other Committees, we have a second opportunity for all members to discuss each individual head. And if there are some items that an hon. member might miss in the general discussion, it probably will come to his attention when we are discussing the heads individually, as they are called. If a member happened to miss a head when it was voted, there was never any problem for the Chairman or the Committee to revert back to the Head to make sure that all the questions had been asked to the minister. And each member of this House of Assembly has a third opportunity to discuss each department, which is here in concurrence debates.

So, I cannot see why the criticism that members are being stifled, or they cannot get the opportunity to debate or to ask questions or to get answers when there are at least three opportunities in the Committee that I served on for a member to discuss a head. The Committee, when it was set up this year - there was a letter from the House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hodder) expressing concern that the Opposition had difficulty in attending three meetings that might be held at the same time, which did happen in the past. So it was discussed with the Chairman of each Committee and it was arranged that there would never be any more than two meetings held on one day - or at the same time, I mean occasionally - not occasionally, I guess, but quite often there was only one meeting being held so it gave all members the opportunity to attend as much as possible.

As Chairman of our Committee I also made an effort to hold as many meetings as I could here

MR. AYLWARD: in the House of Assembly so that the members of the Committee or the members of the House could have the opportunity to be close to their own files and if they had to go to their own office to get some information or make a phone call -

MR. SIMMS: Who was vice-Chairman?

AN HON. MEMBER: The member for Bellevue.

MR. SIMMS: Did he show up at all the meetings?

MR. AYLWARD: Yes, we had very good cooperation from all of the hon. members. We did hold two meetings earlier on in the Colonial Building which did work quite well. We had good coverage from members of both sides. The committee meetings operate on a rather relaxed basis and I feel the more relaxed hon. members are and the ministers and the officials of the departments, the more information you can probably get out of them.

One other criticism of the committee hearings this year and it is an important one, I believe, was the press coverage of certain committee hearings. Now, it is not possible for the Chairman to dictate that the press has to cover his meeting, but I did try to inform the press gallery when our meetings were being held and all except one of our committee meetings did have some members of the press attending, sometimes it being only one member, but there was only one meeting when we did not have any members of the press.

MR. SIMMS: That was when the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) was speaking, right?

MR. AYLWARD: No. We had one meeting on the Department of Transportation where there were no members of the press in attendance.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I wonder if the hon. member would let me interrupt him for a moment.

MR. AYLWARD: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: There is one item, one question for the late show this afternoon - I notice that neither of the persons involved are presently in their seats, maybe they will be by 5:30 P.M. - it is the question asked by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to the

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Premier with regards to the funding for the Conne River Indian Band Council. There is just one question for the late show this afternoon.

The hon. the member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I was mentioning before your announcement that there was one meeting we had when there were no persons from the press available, so at the request of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I believe, at that meeting or the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) - I am not sure now - this department, although it was discussed quite considerably that night, was held over to the next evening and we had press coverage at the second meeting and members were allowed to discuss to a reasonable extent

MR. AYLWARD: things that were covered the night before. So there was no attempt to stifle any debate.

One other thing is that members do not have the opportunity to attend the meetings, and I was very pleased this year to, probably because there were only two meetings at a time, or maybe a lot of meetings were held by themselves, to find that quite a number of the members of the House of Assembly attended our meetings who were not necessarily members of the Committee. Just to go over them. On March 22 when we discussed the Department of Labour and Manpower, we had the privilege of having with us the hon. member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) who attended our meetings, and also members of the Committee, the regular members of the Committee. During the discussions on the Department of Finance the member for Trinity North was also there. I also was very pleased to have the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) at that meeting, and also the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) attended our meeting.

On March 29th. we discussed the Department of Public Works, and besides the Committee members who were present we also had the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). The Department of Transportation; people showed the most interest in it. I guess it affects all of us. So we are very pleased. I was very pleased to have the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) attend, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), our first meeting. It shows a great interest in our Committee meetings. And there were also the regular members, most of the regular members of our Committee there.

MR. AYLWARD: April 12th., besides the Committee members discussing transportation once again, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) appeared at our meeting and added greatly to it, and once again the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout).

Any of the decisions that had to be made by the Chairman of the Committee-I do not think the Vice-Chairman of the Committee would dispute that all of our decisions and times for meetings were made in co-operation with the Opposition. I found it very good, I must say, working with the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) through our whole Committee hearings. I found that they had a great interest and were there to extract information rather than just to oppose or criticize.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. AYLWARD: Some other comments were made that the Committee meetings might be improved, and I am not naive enough to say that there are no improvements that could be made to Committee hearings. Anything can be improved.

MR. AYLWARD: The first year I attended the Committee meetings, since three meetings were held at a time, we had several meetings in the Board Room at the Department of Health. There was just one table and everyone got there around it - ministers, Opposition members and the Chairman - all mixed together. I found that, because of this closeness, I guess, people were more relaxed, information was flowing quite well and I thought it worked very well. As I said before, people were not interested in pitting themselves one against the other, you against us, but the members of the Committee, and members who sat in on the Committee meetings, were extracting information, which is the object of the exercise.

Now, before I put you all to sleep -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: We are listening intently.

MR. AYLWARD: I should say before I close, that would be more appropriate, I just want to say that the departments that did come before our Committee got quite detailed, a lot of information came out, and the ministers and their staffs were co-operative in supplying all the answers to the questions that were asked. And our Committee approved more than \$247 million in the estimates, which is a very substantial responsibility, as far as I am concerned.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The time for the hon. member has expired.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) had to say was very true. You know, there was ample opportunity in the Estimates Committees to ask questions of the minister and his officials and so on, but, of course, it is useless to ask questions if you do not get any answers.

April 21, 1983

Tape 1310

PK - 2

MR. WARREN:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

That was the big problem.

That was the big problem this time around, and it was a big problem last year. As a matter of fact, it is only in recent years since we came under a dictatorship

MR. CALLAN: that it has become a problem. Because, Mr. Speaker, you know, the list of roads programmes was obtainable two years ago and the year before that, and the same thing in the Department of Municipal Affairs. In the Department of Municipal Affairs it was possible to get a list of capital funding for water and sewer projects which named the town councils and communities where these water and sewer projects were approved. All that used to be done. I am talking about only two or three years ago during a PC administration that these things were done, but not under the present Premier. It is not permitted under the present Premier. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to an exert from Hansard dated June 22, 1982. Almost a year ago, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the same gentleman who is the minister now, Mr. Speaker, said: 'A number of weeks ago in this hon. House I was asked a question about the tabling of a list of capital construction projects and I indicated at that time that that list was in the process of being finalized and as soon as it was finalized it would be presented to this hon. House as has been the practice last year, the year before and the year before that and it will continue to be the practice, Mr. Speaker.' I am quoting the Minister of Transportation, June 22, 1982. 'Mr. Speaker, as soon as that list has been finalized there are a number of of extenuating circumstances that would not have the list finalized at this point in time ' - he used that instead of 'at the end of the tunnel' or 'down the road' - 'one of the things being', he said, 'on a priority listing, when you tender some projects on the money that you have available, sometimes the tenders come in above what the estimates were and so there are adjustments that have to be made further down the priority list

MR. CALLAN: and some projects that it had planned to go ahead with will possibly not be able to proceed'. What jargon, Mr. Speaker. 'And that decision, once we have reached the final listing, it will be presented to this hon. House, hopefully within the next few days'. That was June 22nd of last year, and here about a week ago in the Estimates Committee, when I asked the same minister, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) the same question about a list for this year's capital works

MR. CALLAN: programmes for highways, the minister said, 'Well, no, we will not be tabling a list'. But he said, 'Hopefully within a couple of weeks I will be able to table last year's list'. That was the list that would be tabled in a couple of days back on June 22, 1982. That list was supposed to be tabled within a few days. Now the minister thinks that he will have last year's list ready to table within a couple of weeks. Well, I mean, Mr. Speaker, what point is there?

Mr. Speaker, I was out in my district a couple of days ago, on Tuesday as a matter of fact, and I had a meeting out in one of the towns, right on the Trans-Canada; not a hundred yards off the Trans Canada, about a mile and a half of dirt road. A week ago I presented a petition in this House on behalf of 191 voters in the town of Hillview - again not a hundred yards off the Trans-Canada Highway. A couple of towns, the one where I had the public meeting and, of course, the town on whose behalf I presented a petition for a paved road. Mr. Speaker, when will it be that the people in Hillview and the people in other towns, right on the Trans-Canada practically, when will they find out for sure that they will not be getting any pavement? They are pretty sure that they will not be getting any pavement. They know that now or they think that now. But why does the minister not have the nerve to come out and produce a list and say, 'Here is where it is. Here is the money that we have to spend and here is where it is going'?

I know right now that there is a million dollars going into St. Mary's-The Capes. I know that now. But I did not learn it from the minister,

MR. CALLAN:

I did not learn it in response to a question that I asked the minister, but if I wanted to take the time to go and talk privately to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) and the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) and the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) and the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), if I want to talk to these individuals privately I would find out, as we will all find out in October.

MR. BRETT: I would not tell you that much, look.

MR. CALLAN: Well, I do not have to go and talk privately to the member for Trinity North. All I have to do is pick up The Clarenville Packet or listen to CHVO and I will hear him announcing the \$5.5 million for the hospital two or three days before the Premier comes in and announces it here in the Legislature. And of course, he will do the same thing with his roads I am sure. The member for Trinity North is typical of the kind of people who make up the administration. 'I would not tell you that much.' The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) has the same attitude. The taxpayers are not entitled to know, they is what he is saying in essence. 'We are a dictatorship, we decide what we will do with the taxpayers' money, no consultation with anybody on the Opposition side,' Consultation with your own backbenchers, sure, and that is where the money will go.

The Minister of Transportation was accused - not by me, not by any member in the Opposition - the Minister of Transportation was accused a couple of weeks ago by the Mayor of Corner Brook -

MR. WARREN: Who?

MR. CALLAN: - the Mayor of Corner Brook -

MR. WARREN: Oh, boy!

MR. CALLAN: - he was accused of misappropriating -
or perhaps 'misappropriating' is not the proper word - of playing

MR. CALLAN: around with federal money, putting it on the Trans-Canada Highway in his own district. That was not the Liberal Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that was the Mayor of Corner Brook.

MR. RIDFOUT: Still he was more Liberal than P.C., but it is still not true.

MR. CALLAN: I do not care what he is. He is not a member of this House.

MR. BAIRD: He knew about as much about it as you do - nothing.

MR. CALLAN: What do you know about it?

MR. BAIRD: A good bit, Sir.

MR. CALLAN: Well, perhaps after I sit down you will stand up and tell us all about it, especially since the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not here.

So, Mr. Speaker, the committee system works. Fine, of course it does. The committee system works just as well as the Question Period in the House of Assembly works; you know, there is an opportunity there to ask questions. But when you ask questions, you expect to get some answers, especially when you are asking reasonable questions.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: And I was asking the Minister of Transportation, and I was asking the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) when we went through her department, you know, will you make it public, will you tell us where you are going to spend the taxpayers' dollars for water and sewer projects? I told the Minister of Municipal Affairs in Committee about my own district. Water and sewer was approved for Norman's Cove two years back and then an election was called, and after the election was over it was cancelled.

MR. CALLAN: I have already told the story about what happened in Sunnyside. The member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) knows what happened, because he was in the Cabinet at that time, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) knows. I have told that story before.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That has never stopped you from telling it again.

MR. CALLAN: No, that has never stopped me before.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Tell it again.

MR. CALLAN: I do not have to tell it again, it is fresh in your memories, I am sure. What is the point?

Now, when will we find out which towns are getting capital funding for water and sewer this year? When will we find out?

MR. WARREN: Next year.

MR. CALLAN: Well, actually, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about water and sewer, I have a funny feeling

MR. CALLAN: that there are a lot of towns that do not particularly want it because everybody now, the town councils -

AN HON. MEMBER: Make up your mind. Do they want it or not?

MR. CALLAN: No, it started last year. There were towns last year that were told, 'You have been approved for water and sewer', who refused to accept it. These towns refused to accept it.

MR. TOBIN: Why would they do that?

MR. CALLAN: Why? Because of the stringent regulations. Every day that goes over our heads the Department of Municipal Affairs is getting more and more stringent, more and more responsibility is given to the town councillors out there and, of course, more and more responsibility but less and less money. And en masse, Mr. Speaker, town councils are resigning. It happened in Arnold's Cove. Why did the town councillors in Arnold's Cove resign en masse last Fall? Why was it? I mean, Arnold's Cove, Mr. Speaker, is one of the best little thriving towns in this Province. The National Sea fish plant in Arnold's Cove is going almost 100 per cent, full tilt, all year around, not just during the Summer months but practically all year around. When the NEED Programme was announced or was given to Arnold's Cove a while back - the one that was applied for under Canada Community Development, the one that Mr. Crosbie did not fund because Arnold's Cove would not be in his federal riding the next time around; of course all this happened before he became a leadership contender and, of course, now he probably would do it differently - but, anyway, when the NEED Programme came out it was discovered that there was nobody in Arnold's Cove who qualified to go to work on a NEED Programme.

MR. CALLAN: There were only two people in the town on welfare.

MR. DINN: Whose regulations are they?

MR. CALLAN: I am not talking about the regulations. I am talking about Arnold's Cove, which of course has water and sewer but got it long before this crowd took over - this hon. crowd, I am sorry.

Speaking of Arnold's Cove, I cannot help but mention this one. When I first got elected in 1975, even though Arnold's Cove had water and sewer and Arnold's Cove was a booming little town - you know, the Come by Chance oil refinery was in operation at that time - there was a big new school in Arnold's Cove but no auditorium. How did they get it started? It got started, Mr. Speaker, because of a \$150,000 Canada Works grant - at that time it was called LIP grant. That is how the gym got started. And, of course,

MR. CALLAN: then the school board was forced into finishing it and so on, so it got completed. They got it finished. But now, Mr. Speaker, under the dictatorial leadership of the present Premier you do not accept any money for gymnasium or anything else.

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

MR. CALLAN: My time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will get back on it some other time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

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

I would like to make a few brief comments on the Government Services that is being debated before the House today. After listening to the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) I am somewhat bewildered as to why the towns do not want the water and sewer systems. It has always been my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that in order to qualify for water and sewer systems you had to make application. And why would a town make application for water and sewer system and not want it?

I had the honour to serve, Mr. Speaker, as a councillor and deputy mayor of that great town of Marystown. From sitting there I can assure you that I never heard of a council sitting down with its staff, whatever the case may be, with its engineers getting estimates to make application to the Department of Municipal Affairs for water and sewer, get it approved, and then say, 'I am sorry I do not want it.' When I served on Council, Mr. Speaker, we were certainly not very pleased if the Department of Municipal Affairs did not approve our request.

MR. CROSS: You had to have your request in
by November of the year before.

MR. TOBIN: That is right, the deadline.
You had to have your request in in November of the year before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon.
member went into some detail and made reference to road
work projects, there is not much road work getting done in
his district, and there is not much water and sewer being
approved for his district. I certainly am not going to apologize
to this House if the hon. member is not representing his people
to the extent that he should be in having them qualify for
these grants and being successful in obtaining them for his
constituents.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that
in my short little time here that I believe that I have done
my fair share of representing the people who sent me here to
represent them.

MR. TOBIN: Water and sewer projects took place in my district last year and I sincerely hope that water and sewer projects will take place in my district again this year. And if I am representing my people, Mr. Speaker, the way that I should be representing them, I will be making the right representation to have these projects approved. And I can say, regarding the roads, that there are several communities, several roads in this Province that need to be upgraded. They are in my district as well as they are in the hon. member's district, and I am sure all hon. members in this House have roads that they need improved. I know the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) on several occasions has made reference to the roads not being up to standard in his district. Well, I suggest to the hon. member that he do his best to try and represent the people who put him here.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at Municipal Affairs and the lack of services, I happen to live in a town, Mr. Speaker, for the past eleven years and I happened to have had the great honour as I just mentioned, to serve on the council in Marystown and I think that the biggest joke, Mr. Speaker, of the lack of services in communities was when the Liberal government in this Province decided to move people from where they lived and resettle them in other areas. They went down and flashed dollars in Placentia Bay and they asked everyone to leave their homes, move with the glory of God and become part of a great resettled centre. And people started to move, Mr. Speaker, were forced to move in most cases, were forced to move by the Liberal government of this Province, and they ended up in a community where there was a house for them, there is no

MR. TOBIN:

in this Province, forced them to leave home, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - he is not here now - he takes credit, Mr. Speaker, and he should take credit, for the mess and the mistreatment and the callous manner in which he moved people from their homes in this Province. And, Mr. Speaker how well do I know it and how well does my colleague from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) know it. Right now, Mr. Speaker, in this Province the wheels are in motion to move people back. People want to go back to their homes, want to go back to where they were born, want to go back to where they can make their living every Summer, back into Placentia Bay, back, Mr. Speaker, to their roots where they come from. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his colleagues did not want to live up to their responsibility of providing the services that were necessary for these people. That is what is happening now, Mr. Speaker, they are asking this government, this government that cares about people, this government that cares about Newfoundlanders, they are asking them, 'Please us go back and live in our homes'. And, Mr. Speaker, their request, I am afraid, will no doubt receive the proper treatment. This government never had any intentions, never will be part of - and I can say that I will never be part of - such callous treatment, such uncaring manners. Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition not come in and take his seat and listen to what I have to say about the callous manner in which he treated people living in ourport Newfoundland, but I can tell the Leader of the Opposition that this government will let people live in isolated parts of Newfoundland. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there are parts of this Province, and

MR. TOBIN: I can name the community of Monkstown, where they tried to force people to leave. What did this government do, Mr. Speaker? They said, 'Stay and live where you want to live and we will free you from isolation. We will give you what everyone else in the Province has had'. The Government of Newfoundland, a good Progressive Conservative Government,

MR. TOBIN: instead of kicking the people out, they put a road there and provided services, the type of services that they should have.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that those words might irk some people in the Opposition but the truth of the matter is that this government provides services to the people rather than force them to leave their homes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as it relates to roads in my district, I still have two communities that are isolated, that are not connected to the main Burin Peninsula Highway. But if the Liberal Government of this Province that serviced for twenty-two years had the same foresight and the same determination as this government has, I can assure you that the roads would be there. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, these isolated communities in Placentia Bay did not even have electricity until my good friend and colleague who represented the area, and now represents Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), until he was elected as a Progressive Conservative and gave the people what other parts of this Province enjoyed, Mr. Speaker. That is the type of neglect that we have seen in Placentia Bay. And if I wanted to get into municipalities and to services and the demand for services and, Mr. Speaker, in some cases the inability of communities to pay for these services - right now we can look at the town of Burin, for example, the town of Burin that is basically at a standstill financially. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because the Liberal Government in Ottawa, the same people who the Fishermen's Union President today called upon to resign because they had not done their work - that is one of the reasons there is a close down, that is one of the reasons there is a tax burden on the people in this Province today, because of the Liberal Government in Ottawa.

MR. TOBIN: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked me where did I stand, why do I not try to get the fish plant in Burin open. Mr. Speaker, I will submit that if the members opposite along with their colleagues in Ottawa would put the same effort into reopening the plants on the South Coast as I have and this government has, the plants would be opened. And I would further suggest, Mr. Speaker, that despite the hon. gentlemen opposite -

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

It being Thursday and five-thirty, the hon. gentleman must adjourn the debate.

MR. TOBIN: I will get back at it later, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There is one question, as I said, for the Late Show, the question asked by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to the Premier with regards to funding for the Conne River Indian Band. I recognize the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think it was last week that hon. members on that side were saying that there was only one question from this side. So this evening, Mr. Speaker, I will not say anything about the question I had asked the Premier. The Premier is not in his chair where he should be to respond to me. So therefore I will not be asking any questions.

MR. NEARY: He never asked a question.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was speaking to it so I think we have the right to respond.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: I mean, he stood up.

So all I will do, Mr. Speaker, is just observe the contempt in which the hon. gentleman told this House.

Look, there is a procedure here where people who are dissatisfied with answers given by ministers can bring them up in the Late Show, this period of time every Thursday afternoon from 5:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., and indicate the reasons why they are dissatisfied.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it so happens that we have very vital issues before the Province at this time, particularly with respect to education, which is current, the fisheries, which is extremely current, and there are many, many other pressing matters facing this Province. Nevertheless, despite the fact they talk about their small numbers there is not a single person there now. Surely one out of eight could be there. Despite the fact that they have a small membership, they have ample opportunity of getting up in this House and voicing their dissatisfactions and putting their points across and we respond to them. Now what has happened the past three Late Shows. The Late Show before last - none. They were satisfied with every answer. Last week out of three possible slots, because they are ten minutes each, one, Mr. Speaker, so that is one out of six. Today the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) got up and he asked a question, he gave notice of intent today, and then he walks away. So that is one out of nine slots that have been filled. That is all they have an interest in. Now I want to say with respect to it, make no wonder the hon. member

MR. MARSHALL: did not pursue that question because the hon. member, who is normally in order -I must say he is not like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) or the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) who is always hauling up his pants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - when he makes a statement, you know - make no wonder the hon. gentleman would not pursue it because today he had to be called out of order because of the way in which, quite frankly, he was pursuing that was completely incorrect. So it was probably right for him to withdraw it because of that reason. But I want to point out to Your Honour again that this House and its proceedings -they talk about the proceedings in this House - are not being used properly.

There is ample opportunity and what have you, here in this very critical proceeding, it is a proceeding that is in every House in Canada, in pretty well every one under the British Commonwealth system, it is supposed to be one of the main proceedings in the course of the proceedings of the House, giving the Opposition a chance to say why they are dissatisfied with answers that have received and there has been only one used out of nine.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can lead the horses to the water but you cannot make them drink. And that is really what has happened.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Friday at 10:00 a.m.