

VOL. 2

NO. 28

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1983

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if
somebody on the benches there opposite could tell us if
the Premier is going to be in his seat to answer questions
this afternoon?

MR.OTTENHEIMER: To the best of my knowledge
he will be here this afternoon.

MR.NEARY: Well, while we are waiting
for him to arrive perhaps I will put a question to the
President of Treasury Board and ask the Minister of Finance
(Dr. Collins) if there is anything new to report, any new
initiatives taken to resume negotiations with the teachers?
Have the government taken any new initiatives to bargain in
good faith, to get back to the bargaining table, to get the
teachers back into the classrooms and get the children
back into school? Have there been any new initiatives? I
do not mean that the minister should get up and tell us
what proposals or counter-proposals are being negotiated
if negotiations are taking place, because yesterday we
called for a news blackout on these matters, But have the
government taken any new initiatives at all, apart from
the propaganda that they are pumping out, have they taken
any constructive initiatives to return to the bargaining
table and negotiate with the teachers in good faith?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR.COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the government
has taken some very unusual actions in the last ten days to

DR. COLLINS: two weeks. As hon. members know there are two ways to terminate negotiations during a collective bargaining situation: One is to walk away from the table and just indicate that you no longer wish to carry on the negotiations; an even more definitive and definite way is to go on strike. If you go on strike you definitely terminate negotiations, you say that you are no longer expectant that you can get anywhere through the negotiating process and now you are going to go into a power situation, and that is the most decisive and incisive way of terminating negotiations. Now, as hon. members know, the NTA did put their members out on strike so they terminated negotiations on - I forget the date, I think it was the 12th, anyway whatever the date was.

DR. COLLINS: In a situation like that where the employee side terminates negotiations so definitely, decisively and unequivocally, traditionally the employer side then indicates that it will not initiate the negotiation process itself unless the side that so decisively, dramatically and completely stopped the negotiation process reverses their action. In other words, they will desist from strike action and go back to the negotiating table. That is the traditional way, that is the understood way, that is the way that, I think, the public mind views things. That is normal, that is only to be expected because otherwise, if that did not happen, the employer would be negotiating with this terrible threat of the employee side being out on strike and that is just generally regarded and considered to be intolerable. It just does not happen that way.

Now, what government did in the interest of terminating this very, very unfortunate situation of a strike against the children of this Province, what government did was, even though the other side had so dramatically and without any shadow of a doubt terminated the negotiation process - in our view, quite unnecessarily - what government did was it nevertheless said, 'Despite what is generally understood, despite what everyone expects, despite what no one would criticize you for, despite all that, nevertheless we will negotiate with you and will not insist that you stop your strike action.' We said, 'We would like you to stop your strike action, we would like a moratorium on the strike action, but we will not insist on it,' although that would be the logical and expected thing,

MR. DR. COLLINS: 'We will negotiate and we put forward therefore a new packet.' Again almost an unheard of situation that one side goes on strike and then the other side voluntarily says, 'Despite this dramatic and uncalled for action on your part, we will nevertheless put forward a new and generous packet,' but that is what government did. So, those are the two very, very significant moves that government made because of this very serious situation facing this Province, and particularly the children of this Province. Now, one would have expected that, because of those most unorthodox approaches made in the best of interests and made in a most sincere fashion, that there would have been some sort of reciprocation from the other side, there would have been some sort of move. Even if government had only moved a little way you would have expected the other side to move a little way. But government moved absolutely dramatically and almost without precedent. Government moved and what happened? The other side did not move at all. When I say the other side, I mean the NTA executive and the NTA negotiating team. Now government has therefore been faced with this intolerable situation and therefore what government has now done is said to the professional membership of the NTA, 'Your executive have elected not to respond to these sincere and dramatic moves that government has made, We are going to ask you as professional members of the association to just look at our proposal, look at our new package, see if this is a reasonable stance for government to take. Look at each item. Do not consider it in any preconceived way, just read the words and see if your concerns -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order please!

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

MR. NEARY: I am sure I do not have to remind the Chair that the hon. gentleman is misusing and abusing the rule of this House. that answers must be brief. The hon. gentleman is straying far from the question that I put. I asked the hon. gentleman if there were any new initiatives Now the hon. gentleman is giving me the history of negotiations from his vantage point. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is abusing his privilege and I would ask that the answers be brief in accordance with the Standing Rules of this House.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. minister was asked a question on a matter of great sensitivity, great importance, and great complexity. He was asked a question with respect to that matter and he is responding. Presumably if the hon. gentleman wishes to ask general questions he will expect general answers. Obviously the answers to general questions demand a much longer time than the questions themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: That point of order is basically correct, both questions and answers should be brief. However, there are times when the very nature of the question asked requires that the answer be a little longer than is normally expected. I again remind hon. members that perhaps their questions and the answers should be as brief as possible.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS: To conclude, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been told that his answer is too long.

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

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) rose on a point of order and the Chair made a ruling on it. The Chair did not rule the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) out of order. I will let him continue if he is very brief in finishing up his answer.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, what government has now done, it is asking the professional membership of the NTA itself to look at what we have put forward in a new, generous package. We are saying, 'Just read what we have offered in the light of what your demands are and decide

DR. COLLINS: We have full confidence in the teachers of this Province that we have addressed any legitimate concerns they have in the proposals we have put forward. We know that the teachers of this Province themselves have a very, very sincere - this has never been in doubt - concern for the educational system in this Province and particularly for the education of the children of this Province. So we are asking, therefore, that they give rise to that concern having read the proposals that we have put forward to address any points that they had on the negotiating table. And that is a very, very positive move that government has made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that answer was not a direct answer to my question. I know I cannot appeal it at this moment. I can only say it was insulting and provocative and can only further intimidate the teachers and harden positions. The hon. gentleman made a very irresponsible response to my statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman if the government, if the administration, have adopted a new strategy now and the new strategy is that collective bargaining will continue based on public opinion? Is that why they are publishing ads like this full page ad in The Daily News? Is that why the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) is putting out political statements on Newfoundland Information Services? Is that why the Premier's staff has been ordered to call all PC Party supporters around the Province

MR. NEARY: to solicit their support in blocking the open line shows? Is the government now orchestrating a propaganda campaign, Mr. Speaker? Is that now their idea of collective bargaining? Mr. Speaker, are they turning it into a political issue? Are they orchestrating a propaganda campaign?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is doing, Mr. Speaker, exactly the same thing he complained about the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for a moment ago. Standing Order 31 indicates that questions have to be brief and they cannot be speeches. Section 31 (c): 'In putting any oral questions, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same'.

Mr. Speaker, that Standing Order is well known. I think he has asked his question now anyway, Mr. Speaker, and is just embellishing it with his own political rhetoric.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The Chair a few moments ago indicated that the Question Period is designed so that both the questions and the answers should be brief, and indicated that sometimes the nature of the question asked requires that an answer be a little longer than usual. The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) took some time to answer a question, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) rose to ask another question, and was taking a little longer than, again, perhaps was necessary to ask this question and was wandering into the field of debate. Maybe he would like to propose a specific question.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what he expects the administration to accomplish by this massive propaganda campaign that they have undertaken using the Premier's staff and the PC Party supporters who campaigned actively in the last election for the government, for the Tory Party, what do they expect to accomplish by this? Will it be on the basis of the outcome of that propaganda campaign that negotiations will resume? Is that what they are waiting for? Are they turning it into a political issue or is it better to return to the bargaining table and sit down calmly and quietly and negotiate these matters with the NTA in good faith?

MR. BAIRD: Like you people did in '68.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, what we expect to accomplish is that the membership of the NTA, the teachers themselves, the professional teachers in the schools, those who are actually involved in the teaching system itself as opposed to those teachers who have, at this point in time anyway, gone into a totally union type of stance, that is the executive of the NTA and the negotiating team of the NTA.

DR. COLLINS: Quite apart from that group we are now asking the people who are actually out there in the trenches, giving education, dealing with children on a day by day basis, dealing with the parents of children on a day by day basis, we are hoping to achieve that those responsible people out there will look at our proposal and will bring forward their considered opinion.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: The Premier, I notice, has arrived in his seat, Would the hon. the Premier tell the House what the administration expects to accomplish by using taxpayer money for this kind of propaganda campaign? Will it do anything to help negotiations? Will it do anything to help get the schools open? Or is the hon. gentleman merely worried about his image and the image of his party and worried that he is being slaughtered on the open line shows and would prefer to orchestrate a propaganda campaign rather than negotiate with the teachers in good faith? Would the hon. gentleman care to answer that question?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would think that the government has a responsibility to put its position forward to the people of the Province just the same as anybody else does and that is what we are trying to do. What we have done is we have made a simple request to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association that in our view - and I do not think it is a view that is just held by the government - it might be a good idea to speed a settlement to this if the latest new offer, which was substantially different from anything else the government had put on the table during negotiations, was voted upon by the membership of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. And we have an obligation to inform the public in the same way as all governments do about what our position is. And that is one way in which we do it, and we will continue to do it on this issue and other issues as they come up from time to time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is saying in effect is that the negotiating team, the NTA executive, do not have a mandate to make a decision on this matter. Now, following the hon. gentleman's logic and the hon. gentleman's reasoning, and not using double standards, does the hon. gentleman not feel that he is just as obligated to put the matter of the offshore before the people of this Province because of his failure to deliver on the mandate that he was given in April of last year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is one of the problems we have in this dispute, that somehow or other the Newfoundland Teachers' Association executive has suddenly become, if you use the hon. the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) argument, the Cabinet or some kind of an organization which is elected in public suffrage by the people of the Province to serve in a Legislature, to operate under a group of law. Now, I do not think that is true. If you want to use the comparison that the Leader of the Opposition is using, that is not true. The election of members of the House of Assembly is much different from the election of the executive of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. And, as I understand things, normally, and it does not happen every time, but given the nature of this dispute and how it has dragged on with 140,000 pupils not receiving instruction as we would all like them to and the employer having put a new, substantially different proposal on the table, I do not think that it is in any way inappropriate for government to suggest and request in a letter to the leadership of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association that they put that new, substantially different offer to the membership of their union.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is somehow trying to say that there is no difference in an offer from an employer to a union as opposed to a public policy position of a government, elected by the people through a system of British Parliamentary democracy that we all know about, on a public policy issue like the offshore, then I think the Leader of the Opposition is due for some very, very quick instruction after the strike is over.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman used one issue in that campaign, one issue only, and that is why you have forty-four members sitting on the benches there opposite. On that one issue the hon. gentleman received a mandate, he has not delivered on that mandate, and now he is trying to worm his way out of it. He is asking the teachers to do something that he has not got the courage to do himself.

Now, let me get on another matter regarding the dispute. Could the hon. gentleman tell us where is the point of no return? When do we reach the point in this dispute that it will be no longer feasible, realistic to reopen the schools until September? I heard the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) this morning being very vague and general as she usually is about these matters when being interviewed on radio, she seems to be programmed, she turns on the tape and that is it, could the hon. gentleman tell us when we reach the point of no return? When will the school boards and the administration decide that there will be no point in reopening the schools until September? If that happens, if we do reach the point of no return, how will the children be graded? Will they move on to the next grade? How will they be dealt with? Could the hon. gentleman enlighten us on that situation?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the preamble to the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) question, and obviously he really needs speedy instruction. The mandate that was given last April 6th, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition and all hon. members of this House know, is a mandate for four or five years, I think it can go five years as the leader of his party did back in 1971 and almost extended the mandate right out. So that the mandate that was given to this party was a mandate not from April 6, 1982 to April 26 or 27, 1983, I do not think. I do not think that was part of the mandate. I think the mandate of a political party when it goes to the people is a mandate for the term, and that term happens to be five years. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a good question what is going to happen on the offshore before another four years is out, a real good question. We will see who will win on the offshore, Mr. Speaker, before it is all over. I know it is frightening for the Leader of the Opposition to think that possibly because this government is taking the position it is now taking on the offshore it might get a better deal than Nova Scotia has, it might get a better deal than other provinces have who have capitulated, we just might. And then the poor Leader of the Leader of the Opposition is going to be forever in the political wilderness of Newfoundland.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, let me deal with the question of talking about the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). I think every hon. member on this side of the House is very proud of the Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the Leader of the Opposition can learn a few pointers from the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now on the question of the point of no return, I guess it is a matter of opinion. I mean, everybody can have their own opinion on that. As a former teacher I can give an opinion on that and others can give an opinion on it. I guess if one wanted to be sort of a purist in the educational sense of the word in looking at the students and the amount of time they lost, that not one hour, not one minute should be lost from classroom instruction. I know that in certain parts of the Province last year - I think it was in the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) district, I am not sure, and the Minister of Transportation's (Mr. Dawe) district last year - some students lost school instruction twenty-one days to twenty-eight days in weather and storms. I guess they made it up. So you have on the one hand the purists who would say from the pure educational point of view that one minute, one second out of the classroom instruction will impair, and if you get into it and you look at the various students, if you look at your average student versus your very bright student or what have you in the general classroom situation, I guess the average student would have more difficulty trying to manage the additional work than a brighter student would. So there are a lot of gray areas in dealing with it, where is the point of no return. That is a question that begs an answer. There are many, many answers to it depending on the school board district. How many school board districts or schools in this Province now have lost a significant amount of time because of weather and how many have not? Avalon North is a good example, where they have already lost a lot of time because of a strike of maintenance workers. So, you know, the question

PREMIER PECKFORD: cannot be answered yes or no, black or white. That is one of the problems generally with an employer dealing with a professional organization, on the one hand and, on the other hand, also dealing with a group who are also unionized on the other. It is a sort of hybrid situation where they are both professionals and unionists, because it is very, very difficult as the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) knows, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) would know, as the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) would know when you are dealing with professional items to be able to put them specifically and mechanically within a contract. So it begs the whole issue of the dispute between the employer and the employee because one of the big problems we have is the whole area of professionalism and what constitutes professionalism, what can be in a contract and what really needs to be done as a sort of a side kind of agreement rather than a contract to try to deal with all those professional items which are very important to the teachers of the Province. I might just add for the Leader of the Opposition's edification, I do not know if he heard last night or not, there has just been a major study done on education in the United States of America by a Presidential Task Force which has just released its report, which I commend to the hon. gentlemen, which tries to deal with educational policy of the 1990s and the year 2000 in the United States of America. Knowing full well that very often Canadian thought

PREMIER PECKFORD:

on education, as well as other things unfortunately, is influenced significantly by what happens in the United States, we might do well to read what they are saying in that report.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, regretfully I have to change the subject, I wish I could debate the answer just given by the hon. gentleman who obviously is still trying to interfere with the internal affairs of the NTA. And the hon. gentleman cannot win. On the course he is on, nobody wins, it is a no win situation. They are jockeying for public opinion, and you have two great forces jockeying for public opinion and that will not help collective bargaining.

But I have to get back to the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) because I have a very important question I want to put to the hon. gentleman, so I have to change the subject. It has to do with 129 caribou having been shot laying on the ground in Northern Labrador, 29 skidoos and sleds are in the country, and it will cost about \$20,000 to use helicopters to get this caribou out of the country and get the skidoos out and so forth, and get all of the camps that belong to the people up there out because it is about thirty-five minutes from Nain by helicopter. They are waiting for word up there from the hon. gentleman. Could the hon. gentleman tell me and tell the House what is going to be done about that situation? Sealand Helicopters are waiting for an answer. I understand the German Air Force up there have the facilities that could be used to bring out the caribou and skidoos and sleds and tents and so forth. I would like for the hon. gentleman to tell us what the answer is on that situation.

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

MR. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, the information that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) just gave is basically correct, I was told yesterday by one of the people who was on the hunt that there were twenty-five hunters stuck in the country after a river on which they were supposed to have travelled fell through, and the EMO people under Mr. Greer removed the hunters from the country. But they had left behind their snowmobiles, the caribou that had been shot, etc., their gear and so on.

I understand that the hon. gentleman representing Torngat Mountains district (Mr. Warren) is on his way North to deal with the matter from his end. The proposal we suggested to them is that it is going to take \$19,902 to remove the animals and the gear to a safe place where they can travel by snowmobile back to Nain.

There is a difficulty

MR. GOUDIE:

with weather in Labrador, Northern Labrador particularly. The snow is soft, it is difficult to travel. As a result many of the residents of the Northern zone have not been able to get in to get at the caribou herd which has just moved down. We have suggested to them that they agree to take \$50,000 from the Native People's Agreement, we are waiting on telegrams from the communities involved now to verify that, and not only remove the gear and the animals that are in there already, but carry on and get enough meat and protein for the other communities along the North Coast covered by the agreement, thereby resolving all the problems.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary on that,
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I thank the hon. gentleman for the answer. Would the hon. gentleman, if he will excuse the way I put this, ride herd on that request to make sure that it is done quickly because the 129 caribou that are slaughtered on the ground, as the hon. member knows, the meat will spoil unless a decision is made quickly? So would the hon. gentleman try to get a quick decision so that that can be moved out quickly?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, that was the suggestion that we made to the communities. We are waiting on telegrams from them now. My parliamentary secretary was on the phone as recently as ten minutes ago to make sure that the telegrams have either arrived or have not arrived. As soon as they come in, whether it is in a matter of minutes or a matter of hours, then action will be taken, the money be provided and the whole thing can be resolved.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to come back now to the teachers' situation. I want to ask the hon. Premier a final question today with regard to this matter, Could the hon. gentleman tell us what he expects to accomplish by involving his staff and the political wing of his party in a dispute with the teachers? What does he expect to accomplish? What will that do for collective bargaining? I mean, from now on when the hon. gentleman cannot get his own way is he going to call in his political troops, use his staff and use taxpayer money to carry on a political campaign? Is that what the hon. gentleman is going to do?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are not trying to get our way. We have moved significantly from the position that has been put on the table months ago in our negotiations with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. I have not been trying to get my own way. The government has not been trying to get its own way. It has been extremely flexible on just about every issue that has come before the collective bargaining process, so we are not trying to get our own way. We are trying to resolve this situation as best we can. We do have to deal with other groups. We have to deal with the nurses next month, and we have to deal with tens of thousands of workers who get their pay from the government. So we have to be fair and reasonable. The evidence does not support the allegation made by the Leader of the Opposition that we are trying to get our way. We have been very, very flexible on the issues that have been outstanding in trying to resolve this dispute, and we remain that way. We demonstrated that last week. We had on the table 10 days and 2/3 on the substitute teacher issue and we moved

PREMIER PECKFORD: from ten days to three days, implementing the two-thirds for those three days until next April, 1984, by a whole year. And we suggested a committee be struck or a task force be struck to examine the professional workload items, which is different from where we were before. On the other issues that have been outstanding, we have moved and will continue to demonstrate flexibility on these matters. So, you know, there is no attempt at all by the government to just have its own way and the evidence does not support what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is saying. We are here negotiating all the time. We have settled with 10,000 workers already. We have settled with the vocational instructors, we have settled with this group and that group and another group and, you know, we are into negotiations daily with many, many groups and there has never been an allegation by any of these groups that we just wanted to get our own way. We have to make sure that we are fair and equal to all people who come before us. That is why the wage restraint programme was so important.

It is a matter of public record that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association did not accept a publicly announced wage restraint policy until about a week and a half or two weeks ago although it was announced last Fall and 10,000 other workers had agreed to it. So, I mean, when you start talking about people who get entrenched in given positions, the facts have got to be told and we have, as I say, moved on just about every single issue that came before the parties last Fall, last Winter and now the Spring. So it is not a question of the government getting its own way, it is a question of trying to resolve it satisfactorily, you know, to the benefit of everybody. But I have to point out in speaking on

PREMIER PECKFORD: behalf of government that at the same time as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) tries to allege that we just want our own way, one has to point out that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, through the negotiating team, did not for months and months and months and months agree to a twenty-four month wage restraint policy which was public policy and was announced and was consistent with what was happening in all parts of Canada and with the federal government.

So when we talk about entrenchment and so on, all the facts have to be told and allegations made by the Leader of the Opposition will not suffice and cannot be substantiated.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I have answers here to Question 103 and Question 78 on the Order Paper presented by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

MR. SPEAKER: It being Wednesday, we shall -

MR. MARSHALL: If I may, Mr. Speaker, on a point of tentative order.

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

MR. MARSHALL: As a point of order, a point of observation for the House, I had made an agreement with the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) on Friday last that Private Members Day, which is normally held today, would not be held but we would do ordinary government business. I made a gentleman's agreement with

MR. MARSHALL: him to give the gentleman an
opportunity to participate and lead off in the Budget
Debate. That agreement, as far as

MR. MARSHALL: I know, still stands and I would assume that it is in order to go into government business today. I mean, you know, you make a gentleman's agreement with respect to it and obviously you would expect both sides to keep their undertaking with respect to it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, while it is true that my hon. friend discussed this matter with the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder), it was a personal matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I talked to the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) last night and he deeply appreciates the hon. gentleman trying to accommodate him, but he is out of town on important business, so we can carry on. But the fact of the matter is that he is not here so therefore, Mr. Speaker - as Your Honour knows we started the budget debate yesterday - it will be Private Members' Day today, business will go on in the House as usual. While we appreciate the fact that my hon. friend across the way wanted to accommodate the member for Port au Port who is our spokesman on Finance, Mr. Speaker, there was no deal.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I will not belabour this in the House but, Mr. Speaker, this is not a private House of Assembly occupied by myself and just the member for Port au Port. We made this deal, rather regrettably. The hon. member for Port au Port remembers it, the Leader of the Opposition does not. It just goes to show how

MR. MARSHALL: difficult it is securing any agreement from the Opposition with respect to these matters. In otherw words, Mr. Speaker, if things do not suit them, they are not going to comply with the agreements which they made. So we have to go on because we require unanimous consent, but I want to draw it to the attention of the House as being a flagrant violation of an agreement that was entered into with the Opposition. It seems to be almost impossible to make any agreement with respect to the operation of this House if they are going to act in that fashion in the future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, if I may respond.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!
The Chair has heard arguments on this matter -

MR. NEARY: Two to one.

MR. SPEAKER: - and agrees that there is no unanimous agreement to dispense with Private Members' Day and we continue with Private Members' Day.

The debate last day was adjourned by the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), and he has three minutes left.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, obviously three minutes is not a lot of time to sum up what I had to say last week in this debate. Suffice it to say that there are concerns with respect to the offshore as it relates to my department and local employment or local preference in the offshore. I indicated last week that BP who operate off the Northeast coast. Unfortunately, since that time we found out that BP will not be conducting a programme off the Northeast Coast and, despite what they say as their reason for

April 27, 1983

Tape No. 1450

SD - 3

MR. DINN: not conducting that exploration off the Northeast Coast, Mr. Speaker, that means jobs lost for Newfoundlanders on the Northeast Coast. But I will say that I am happy to report that we know that rigs coming this year, the SEDCO 706, the West Venture and Zapata Uglund,

MR. DINN:

which are out there; possibly the John Shaw, Pellerin, Pacnorse and Neddrill, SEDCO 710 and the Petrel will be offshore this year. We are having trouble with Petro-Canada with respect to asking them to employ Newfoundlanders on their new rig that is supposed to be coming in here, the SEDCO 710, and I hope to have that concluded. If that is successfully concluded, Mr. Speaker, we should still have something in the order of 3,000 people working in the offshore this year and on shore directly related to offshore. There will be about 2,000 jobs still for Newfoundlanders offshore and on shore directly related, and these are as a result of negotiations that have been held over the past few years. Obviously, for example, the Pellerin, Pacnorse and Neddrill that worked off the Labrador Coast last year will be back this year. They each have approximately thirty Newfoundlanders on these drill ships at all times. These thirty Newfoundlanders on each rig went with the rigs when they left Labrador waters last year, will come back with that thirty and add to that when they get back. So we are looking to a fairly successful season. I think it is interesting to note also that the drilling season or the drilling operations off Nova Scotia this year, where Nova Scotia has an agreement and we do not have an agreement, is a little bit less than what we have here off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. As a matter of fact, if one were to investigate we are talking about nine to ten rigs off our shores this year whereas Nova Scotia will have four to five, and I believe the fifth rig will be off Prince Edward Island. The hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I am sure is delighted to hear that we will have approximately 2,000 Newfoundlanders working in the offshore this year and the taxes will be able to roll in and he will be able to balance his budget.

MR. DINN: Now the problem that we are having with the SEDCO 710 is with respect to the fact that the SEDCO 710 basically is a Petro-Canada rig, or Petro-Canada is the lead company operating that rig. Basically what has happened with Petro-Canada -

MR. CALLAN: Criticize Petro-Canada.

MR. DINN: No. For the hon. member who likes to interrupt and break the rules of the House, we have several agreements that were concluded in previous years for rigs that were operated by Petro-Canada, Pellerin, Pacnorse and Neddrill, but I think it is interesting to note, that the new rig, whilst we had negotiations ongoing with Petro-Canada, the federal Crown Corporation, since the Newfoundland Supreme Court decision we have been having a great deal of difficulty with respect to talking to Petro-Canada to employ Newfoundlanders on the SEDCO 710.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, today, Private Members' Day, I think we should review for just a second the Private Members' Motion by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that we are debating, and to refresh the memories of members on both sides I want to briefly run down through the resolution. It says,

MR. CALLAN: WHEREAS on February 12, 1982, the Premier of this Province announces that the Provincial Cabinet has referred the offshore ownership issue to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal and, WHEREAS that same Court did on the 17th day of February, 1983 - just a year and a week later - rule that the resources in question do not fall within the meaning of the Term 37 of the Terms of Union and thus do not belong to Newfoundland and, WHEREAS this present administration - this government, the Queen's government - has, by its own admission, no other reason to exist except that battle for ownership of the offshore now lost by that administration in the Courts and, WHEREAS this Province still needs an offshore development agreement to boost a desperately failing economy, BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House of Assembly go on record, today, as supporting a negotiated settlement to this question at once which would provide maximum long and short term benefit to this Province and to Canada and, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the delicate issue of whether or not winter drilling should be allowed under any circumstances during our storm season should at once be referred to a joint Federal-Provincial committee which would establish guidelines on this and other related matters that address the subject of human life in a marine work environment.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the Private Member's Resolution which we are debating today,

Mr. Speaker, if there was any doubt ever in anybody's mind why this administration,

MR. CALLAN: why this Province, does not
have a negotiated settlement with Ottawa, I am sure that
in the minds of people that doubt is being dispelled
on a daily basis. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker,

MR. CALLAN: if the government on at least two occasions were in agreement we could have had another Private Members' issue debated, the issue that is at the forefront in this Province today, Mr. Speaker, the issue of 8,000 teachers and 140,000 students who are not in their classrooms.

MR. CARTER: Be relevant!

MR. CALLAN: The member says, 'Be relevant!' I am being relevant. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that the teachers and the students are out of their classrooms is the same reason that we do not at this point in time have a negotiated settlement with the federal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what plans does the Premier have for the teachers and the students? That is a pertinent question. Another pertinent question, Mr. Speaker, what plans does the Premier have as it pertains to a negotiated settlement with Ottawa?

Well, let me first deal with the negotiated settlement with Ottawa. I believe, and I believe sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is quite happy, for his own political gain and his own ego and his own personal gain, and at least two years, perhaps longer than that, but at least two years go by while this Province is slowly and surely drifting along with fewer and fewer jobs and fewer and fewer employment opportunities. The game that the Premier is playing now is a political game, a game that he loves playing, a game that he plays very, very skillfully during election time, but plays just as surely and perhaps just as skillfully between elections as well.

The Premier forgets that when the election is over the time now has come to carry on his mandate to govern and not to play petty politics as he is presently doing with the teachers with

MR. CALLAN: these full page ads and of course as he is doing regarding the offshore.

Mr. Speaker, what the Premier is doing now and what he plans to do is wait until the Tory leadership is finalized nationally, and then he is prepared to wait until the next federal election is called in perhaps two years time, and he thinks and he hopes that the candidate that he is supporting, John Crosbie, will be the eventual leader of the PC Party nationally and will be also the PC Prime Minister. That is what the Premier is waiting for, that is what he is hoping for. He thinks that in two or three years time he will be able to say to the people of this Province, "We waited but we finally have the kind of agreement that I have been waiting for for so long." And then the Premier will wait a few more months and then he will go to the people again and he will hold up in front of them the new agreement and he will ask those 8,000 teachers, and he will ask people in unions all over this Province to forget about the fact that in the Spring of 1983 he held the teachers up to ransom, he held the students up to ransom, and he closed the hospital in North West River, and he closed the hospital in Markland, the Premier will ask the people of this Province to forget all of these things. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that an end can be found and I believe that a solution can be found long before two years from now when the people of this Province, I daresay, will be starving to death if it were not for the old age pension cheques,

MR. CALLAN: the family allowance cheques, and the unemployment cheques, and the millions and millions of dollars that are being spent on the Trans-Canada Highway and the millions and millions of dollars that are being spent in make-work projects by the federal government. But the Premier is prepared to create a few make-work projects for welfare recipients, let them work for ten weeks so that they also can then be thrown on the unemployment insurance rolls so that their cheques will also be coming from Ottawa rather than from the Department of Social Services. It is very easy to see the kind of cheap political game that the Premier is playing.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in another debate I questioned the role of the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), I questioned his plans for the future. Everybody will remember that it was the member for Mount Scio, when he was a member of the Peckford team and when he was a member of the Cabinet, who negotiated the ERCO deal; it was the member for Mount Scio who resigned from the Cabinet because he could not carry on the negotiations with Ottawa the way that he wanted to carry them on. It was the member for Mount Scio, Mr. Speaker, who less than a month ago, at the university, suggested to a bunch of students that he knew the answer, he knew how to negotiate a deal with Ottawa. I have mentioned before that the Premier made no response to that. The Premier who responds publicly to practically every thing that goes on in the world practically - he knew why Bill Davis was re-elected in Ontario - it was the fault of Trudeau and the Liberals in Ottawa; he knew why Hatfield in New Brunswick was re-elected - it was the fault of Trudeau and the Liberals in Ottawa - but the Premier made no response, as he normally

MR. CALLAN: does to everybody else's actions and so on inside and outside of this Province, the Premier made no public announcement in reaction to what the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) had to say. And last week, and again earlier this week, Mr. Speaker, we had the member for Mount Scio in the public media, in the print media and the electronic media, the member for Mount Scio suggests - he does not suggest, he comes out forthrightly and he says that what is happening in negotiations with the NTA, what has happened with negotiations with the federal government is wrong, the administration is wrong and the party that he is a member of is wrong.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, what is the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) planning to do? What is he planning to do? Is the member for Mount Scio going to continue to play this little game, when the member for Mount Scio knows that if one trick does not work he can try another? He tried it at the university. He told a bunch of students at the university less than one month ago that he knew the answer, he knew how to negotiate a deal with Ottawa, and he hoped that the Premier would respond in some way or other, at least, publicly he thought the Premier would respond, but no.

Well, perhaps the Premier will do the unlikeliest thing in the world, perhaps the Premier will get in touch with the member for Mount Scio and say to him, 'Okay, I want to make you a generous offer. I want to invite you back into my Cabinet. I want you to put your money where your mouth is.' But, no, the Premier made no response.

So what is the next thing that the member for Mount Scio can do, Mr. Speaker? What is the next thing that he can do to help this Province? One thing, Mr. Speaker, that he cannot do - if he does he will be worse than the Premier, just as bad or a worse enemy to this Province and to the people of this Province - if he sets himself up as the Prince-in-Waiting for the day in a couple of years time when the Premier, who has said that he is a two-term man, will perhaps

MR. CALLAN: resign and call a leadership convention. If the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) were setting himself up as the Prince-in-Waiting for that occasion, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that he is just as bad an enemy and he is treating the people of this Province just as unfairly as the Premier is.

Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is smiling. The member for St. John's North, Mr. Speaker, should not be smiling, he should be feeling very guilty, if I can change the subject for just a minute.

MR. TOBIN: Just what we expected, since the member for Mount Scio came in.

MR. DINN: Those members will even attack themselves.

MR. CALLAN: Yes. The member can attack the member for St. John's North.

Mr. Speaker, another game that the Premier has played, and he is good at it, is he has appointed the member for St. John's North as Chairman of the Committee on Election Expenses. Why? And how long ago was he appointed? Did we have any control? Were there any controls regarding election expenses during the election last Spring? Will there be any at the next election? Not very likely, Mr. Speaker, not very likely! The Premier likes to suggest in the media, you know, that 'I am going to maintain the culture of this Province and I am going to bring in some changes in the Election Expenses Act,' and all of these sorts of things. He likes to sound in the media like he is a great innovator and at the same time, you know, he wants to do everything fair and square. But the Premier does not want an election expenses -

MR. CALLAN: act for the next election any more, perhaps, than the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) wants one. If the member for St. John's North, who is chairman of that committee, really wanted to do something about the way elections are conducted in this Province, like the one last Spring, then, Mr. Speaker, he would be holding a lot more meetings than he is holding presently.

MR. TOBIN: What has this got to do with the offshore? You did not want the Budget Debate and now you will not talk to the resolution.

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), who would never be permitted to cross over to this side of the House, would never be invited or permitted to cross because, Mr. Speaker, he was elected last Spring on the Premier's coattails and he is in here in this Legislature for his first and last time, and the one thing that we do not intend to do is to give him an opportunity to be elected a second time on a Liberal ticket.

MR. TOBIN: You have no worries about that.

MR. CALLAN: We would rather let him go into the next election, Mr. Speaker, on a Tory ticket and see him defeated and defeated soundly. The member for Burin - Placentia West knows that any fool can get elected once, but just try it twice or three times.

MR. DINN: How many times for you?

MR. NEARY: How many times for you?

MR. CALLAN: Three times Your Honour.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West knows in his heart of hearts that this Province should have an offshore agreement

April 27, 1983

Tape 1457

EC - 3

MR. CALLAN: with Ottawa.

MR. TOBIN: Right.

MR. CALLAN: He knows that we should,
and he knows who is to blame. He knows who is to blame,
Mr. Speaker, because,

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, of all of the players who have been involved in trying to settle the offshore oil dispute over the past several years, of all of the players only one remains the same, only one. The Premier is the only player who was there from beginning to end. Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) who was in his seat and has left again, he was one of the gentlemen who tried to negotiate with Ottawa but quit because the Premier forced him to quit. He resigned from this Premier's Cabinet, He did not resign from the federal Cabinet, he resigned from this Premier's Cabinet. And then we had the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) who quit as well because he was told to do so by the Premier. But he, of course, did not resign from the Cabinet as the member for Mount Scio did. He was in cahoots with the Premier and he agreed. But on the federal scene, Mr. Speaker, how many people have we seen on the federal scene?

MR. TOBIN: Who is the member for Mount Scio?

MR. CALLAN: You tell me. We saw Mark Lalonde and we saw John Chretien, two different players, who tried to negotiate with this same Premier and, of course, failed. And everybody in this Province knows how hard John Chretien worked just to get the negotiations started. He had to go down on his knees and come to this Province and try to get the negotiations started again let alone try to get them settled.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I will get back to this some other time. Thank you.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has probably set a precedent in this House for relevance. Apparently anything on Private Members' Day, no matter what the resolution is, apparently anything is relevant. So in the light of this new rule I think I will be excused if I wander a little bit.

The first point I would like to deal with is the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). The member for Bellevue is wondering what the member for Mount Scio is going to do. Well, what a number of us were thinking of doing, Mr. Speaker, was - and it would take about nine of us - if nine of us crossed the floor we would then be in the majority over there and we would elect a new Leader of the Opposition. Possibly we would do it on a rotational basis and when my turn came to be Leader of the Opposition I would try to find something for the hon. member for Bellevue to do, that is to say, if I could find

MR. CARTER:

something menial enough for him to do, I suppose the office could use some cleaning occasionally, it perhaps could be scrubbed out. But I warn the hon. gentlemen opposite that if they test our patience too far, that is exactly what will happen. Nine of us will get together, cross the floor, elect a new Leader of the Opposition, and turf the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) out of his thick carpeted office. And one of the advantages of doing this would be that during Question Period the questions will be a lot more relevant and a lot more sensible. For instance, I can imagine the first question would be 'Mr. Premier, why are you doing such a good job?' We might ask the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) if he is not working too hard? All these various soul-searching questions could be addressed, coming from the Opposition benches, and I am certain that it would raise the tone of the debate in this House.

Mr. Speaker, to get serious, the resolution that we are debating is not the one that the hon. gentleman read, it is the one that was amended. We are now debating the amendment made by the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and he amended it because it was not the length of the resolution it was the dirt of it. Therefore, it was amended and shortened considerably and it merely requests that we try and get a deal with Ottawa on the offshore. The law regarding offshore ownership and the ownership of inaccessible parts of this earth is long and complex and there will certainly come a day when all of the earth, even the deepest trenches, will be claimed by some country or

MR. CARTER: some authority or other.

Geological research has indicated that the continents are floating, if that is the word, on heavier material and that they move and that the plates as they separate other plates quite distant from them have to go together, so there is a continual renewal of the land surface of the earth. And where these plates come together it is possibly a good place to dispose of radio-active material. Radio-active material, as members know, can have a half life of anything from a few seconds to a few centuries. The half life of a bit of radio-active material is the time it takes for half of its radio-activity to decay and using the same logic, I would think that the half life of some of the hon. members opposite is considerably short

MR. CARTER: but the half life of some of their documents and some of their charges, and some of the stuff on file in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) office, is such that it should be disposed of in one of these trenches. But the areas of the earth that have traditionally been claimed by countries, or companies like the East India Company, or by authorities, have generally been those parts of the earth that were accessible and accessible to everyone. It is interesting to note that the laws of the sea and the law of ownership of land, were worked out in the time before air travel was possible and most of the laws that we are struggling with are the result of deliberations that took place in those far off days.

Now, of course, since the bottom of the sea can be not only visited by submarines, or by bathyscaphes in the deeps, but it can also be exploited by drilling rigs and by laying deep pipelines and also by laying cables both for electric power and for communications, But practically no part of the earth is inaccessible and therefore it must all belong to someone. I do not know enough about international law to know how the cable companies get on claiming the right to lay a cable on the ocean deep where no country claims ownership, but I can see disputes easily arising in the future. And also, of course, in the deeper parts of the ocean there seem to be residues of minerals that are worth exploiting and with our modern technology we are now able to bring up even samples from the deepest parts of the ocean.

Now, there is a great deal of debate about whether we should own the 200 mile limit, all the land within 200 miles of the offshore, or whether it should really be the Continental Shelf. Ordinarily that debate would be quite academic but it is very important for us because what they call

MR. CARTER: the nose and the tail of the Grand Banks are outside the 200 mile limit but are part of the Continental Shelf. Of course, this is rich fishing ground as well as perhaps exploitable ground for oil drilling and exploration, so this has taken upon itself a new importance. And I would hope that within the lifetime of most of us here that we will be able to get a sensible, decent, and workable settlement.

 It is interesting to note that the members opposite, their hero, or I think the hero of most of them, the former, former Premier Smallwood who botched the negotiations for Confederation, he was one of the signators for Confederation, he botched the deal entirely. There was no thought or mention of the offshore and yet in the recent decision by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland it was pointed out that had any gesture, any concrete gesture, effort or note or notation been made or taken of the possibility of our owning the offshore at that time, then our claim to the offshore would have been justified and would have been recognized by our court and presumably this would have an effect on the Supreme Court of Canada. But

MR. CARTER: because the former, former Premier could not see beyond the end of his nose, not only did he botch any possibility of an offshore deal but he also gave away the Churchill Falls, I mean, this was a most incredible display of incompetence and the present Liberal Opposition, if Newfoundland were ever unfortunate enough to see them in power -

MR. HODDER: What did you botch?

MR. CALLAN: You were kicked out of Frank Moores' Cabinet, what did you botch?

MR. CARTER: I do not think I need to comment on that, Mr. Speaker, although if the hon. gentleman would like me to discuss his -

MR. TULK: There is light at the end of the tunnel.

MR. CARTER: Anyway I will get back.

The Churchill Falls was botched and, of course, we saw what sort of a person the former Premier Smallwood was when he ran that ill-fated Independent Liberal Party - what was it? - Liberal Reform Party and I think the hon. member for Bellevue was one of his worshipping adherents, one of his chief toadies, and finally, I think, he partially saw the error of his ways and coalesced with the Liberal Party.

It is always a case of great wonderment to me, Mr. Speaker, how former Liberal members or Liberal Reform members can sit down comfortably with each other, how the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) can sit down comfortably with the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and vice versa and yet they have more reason than most to hate each other. And I have wondered about this. It sometimes kept me awake at night. Finally I realized that Liberals do not have friends, they do not have enemies either - they do not have friends or enemies they just have interests, like countries they just have interests.

April 27, 1983

Tape No. 1461

MJ - 2

MR. CARTER:
own interests in -

And of course they all have their

MR. CALLAN:

Who was it that gave you the Family Allowances?

MR. CARTER:

Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

And the old age pension.

MR. CARTER:

It was not the hon. member, that is
for sure.

So we may have to adopt a waiting game,

Mr. Speaker, and I think in the Question Period this
afternoon our Premier eluded to the fact that we may -

MR. CARTER: or I think it was the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who alluded to the fact that we may very well have to wait for two years for the present Liberal Government in Ottawa to disappear and for a more friendly government to come into power, one that we can negotiate with.

MR. CALLAN: We do not think he can do it.

MR. CARTER: We hope that it will be Prime Minister Crosbie that we will be negotiating with, but even if it is not, any change would be for the better. And I am convinced that -

MR. TULK: Is it because of his first name that you want him to become Prime Minister?

MR. CARTER: No, it is because of his many abilities, not his first name, and not his first ability, all of his abilities. We saw in this House of Assembly what an asset he was and we will certainly see what an asset he will be as Prime Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: So I would say the Opposition better keep a civil tongue in their heads, otherwise the nine of us, or some nine of us - possibly we will rotate, Mr. Speaker. There is no reason why nine of us should go over and be the Opposition all at once, we will change sides, it is perfectly within the orders of this House. This House does not recognize political parties, it recognizes the government and it recognizes the Loyal Opposition.

MR. NEARY: What a buffoon!

MR. CARTER: So I think perhaps - the hon. gentleman may well be afraid his job may be coming to an end very quickly, because in a matter of hours we could have a new Leader of the Opposition, we could have any number of new Leaders of the Opposition, and perhaps if hon. gentlemen on this side

MR. CARTER: would put down their preferences for which shadow Cabinet they would like, or what title or office they would like to hold, perhaps we will see if we can accommodate them.

So I would warn hon. gentlemen to keep civil tongues in their heads and to behave themselves, otherwise they may, and they certainly can, be replaced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, after hearing such a humorous broadside it is hard to stand in this House. The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), I believe, may have used a couple of sensible sentences and that is unusual for him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Be kind, boy.

MR. TULK: Be kind? The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) does not know what it is to have somebody be kind to him.

MR. DAWE: He has no sense of humour at all.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want, in speaking to this resolution, to first of all point out to this side of the House and to that side of the House that we have before us one of the most magnanimous resolutions that will ever be brought before this House. It is a resolution put forward by the member for LaPoile, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), and it is one of the most statesmanlike, I would submit to this House, resolutions that has ever come to the floor of the House.

MR. CARTER: We are debating the amendment now.

MR. TULK: I will get to the amendment in a minute. In speaking to the resolution as it was amended by the member, I understand, for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, that it is too bad indeed that the government of this Province which last year - just a little over a year ago - got a tremendous mandate from the people of this Province to govern and to govern them democratically, it is too bad that the Premier and the government of this Province cannot act in the same statesmanlike manner as the Leader of the Opposition has in putting forward this resolution. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing there is absolutely - and I cannot understand why the member for Baie Verte - White Bay wanted it amended in view of the fact that I think this resolution, as was pointed out by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) last week, is very similar to a resolution that was put forward one time by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay when he sat on this side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. TULK: So I find him to be the most unlikely person,

MR. TULK: perhaps, to want to try to amend such a resolution as has been put forward by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I say, Mr. Speaker, that the original resolution expresses every concern that all Newfoundlanders today are expressing, it expresses every concern that every Newfoundlander has in this Province about what is happening to the Province.

And there is nothing in this resolution that is fictional. For example, the first 'WHEREAS': 'WHEREAS on February 12, 1982, the Premier of this Province announces that the provincial Cabinet has referred the offshore ownership issue to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal'; and then it goes to the second 'WHEREAS'.

Well, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TULK: there is nothing fictional about that. That WHEREAS is perfect - "the Premier of this Province-

MR. SIMMS: They are left in the amendment, that is perfect.

MR. TULK: Oh, that much is left in the amendment and at least, in that case, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) showed good sense - "The Premier of this Province did on February 12, 1982 refer the offshore ownership question to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal." That is a perfectly legitimate thing and the member for Baie Verte - White Bay was very wise in leaving that in.

The second WHEREAS: "WHEREAS that same court did on the 17th day of February, 1983 rule that the resources in question do not fall within the meaning of Term 37 of the Terms of Union and thus do not belong to Newfoundland," - that is a fact. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) does not like the fact that the Supreme Court of Newfoundland ruled against them. The Premier does not like it. They have questioned the decision of the court. The fact of the matter is that they did refer it to the court and the court did rule against them. As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has said so many times in this House and as we have said so many times on this side, the truth of the matter is that they took their chance, paid their money, took their chances and lost.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. TULK: And they seem not to be able to accept that fact. It is too bad that in that fit that the Premier had last February 12, 1982, that fit - he suddenly, as he always does, acts on the spur of the

MR. TULK: moment without good judgement -
it is too bad that he put it in the court but he did put
it in the court.

MR. CALLAN: Like the Day of Mourning.

MR. TULK: Similar to the Day of Mourning,
very similar, the same kind of thing.

MR. POWER: April 6th, 1982 a day of mourning for the Liberals.

MR. TULK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell
the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) something about politics -
he does not know anything about forestry but I would like
to tell him something about politics, last April 6th
started the rebirth of the Liberal Party, make no mistake
about that, not a day of mourning.

Mr. Speaker, to come back to the
resolution.

MR. MARSHALL: They did not show too much in
Port Blandford (inaudible).

MR. TULK: Port Blandford? Is that right?
Were you out to Port Blandford? They got you outside the
Overpass?

MR. MARSHALL: I know about it.

MR. TULK: Oh, rumours, you are operating
on rumours?

AN HON. MEMBER: He heard about it.

MR. MARSHALL: A first-hand report.

MR. TULK: You heard about it. You did
not get out there at all?

MR. MARSHALL: They blocked more telephone booths.

MR. TULK: I see. Very good.
We will see who is in the telephone booth. Call an election
and we will see now who is in the telephone booth.

MR. CALLAN: You are smarting now.

MR. TULK: He is hurting.

MR. TULK:
the resolution -

Mr. Speaker, to come back to

MR. CALLAN:

Monitoring the Liberal (inaudible).

MR. TULK:

- to ignore the hurt President

of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council
who has seen his little empire crumbling around his ears
in recent days and recent months, to ignore him,

MR. TULK: to come back to the resolution, the truth is that, as I said, this government did put the matter in court and they lost. And they lost the offshore, perhaps, hopefully not, but perhaps they lost it for all time for Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) wanted to end the 'WHEREASES' of this resolution at that point and to cut out the next one, 'WHEREAS this present administration has, by its own admission, no other reason to exist except that battle for ownership of the offshore now lost by the administration in the Courts'.

MR. RIDEOUT: That was cut out of the resolution.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, that was cut out of the original resolution, it is not in the amended one. Mr. Speaker, that is too bad, because what the member for Baie Verte-White Bay apparently is saying is that that is not the main plank any more of the P.C. Administration in this Province. And I would like to suggest to him that the Premier and, indeed, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay staked his whole political future on government's stand on the offshore. They were given, last year, a mandate to negotiate a settlement. Not to sit over there and fight with everything they come across, but to negotiate a settlement of the offshore issue. And, Mr. Speaker, we know where that is, it is in the Supreme Court of Canada, and they may, indeed, as I have said before, have given that very thing away.

Mr. Speaker, the other WHEREAS that the member for Baie Verte-White Bay has cut out by his amendment, he has cut this out of the resolution, 'WHEREAS this Province still needs an offshore development agreement to boost a desperately failing economy', that is the next WHEREAS. Now, Mr. Speaker, there can be nobody,

MR. TULK: absolutely nobody in this Province, including the members on the other side, there can be absolutely nobody who doubts the state that this provincial economy is in. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have some figures here that show the rate of unemployment in this Province. Mr. Speaker, if you look at those figures there can be no doubt what the rate of unemployment is. For example, among our young people, the number of unemployed youths between the ages of fifteen years and twenty-four years is 21,000, or 42.9 per cent of the total number of unemployed. And, Mr. Speaker, the total number of unemployed in this Province has gone from 35,000 in 1982, the year when we were supposed to have the new beginning, April 6, the year in which we were supposed to give a mandate to our Premier to solve all of our problems, a mandate to negotiate our future, to see that our future was secured, which he got

MR. TULK: the unemployment rate in this Province has gone from 35,000 up to 49,000, an increase of 14,000 people unemployed. The unemployment rate has gone from 16.4 per cent in 1982 to 22.5 in last month's calculation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there can be any doubt about the sincerity and the work of the resolution that has been put forward by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) there is no doubt in those two WHEREASES that the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) has cut out. So, Mr. Speaker, one can only conclude that the member for Baie Verte-White Bay and the government side of this House, were being hurt by the truths that are contained in the resolution as put forward by the member for LaPoile.

Because you see, Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest concerns, as I have already said, one of the biggest concerns that is expressed in this resolution, and one of the biggest concerns that the people of Newfoundland have, is over the settlement of that offshore issue. The Premier, for example, first when the teachers' strike started in this Province - the teachers' lockout I choose to call it, he chooses to call it the strike, The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) tells us that legally it is a strike, I say it is a lockout. For example, there is no reason that teachers in the community that I live in would not be in the classroom except for the fact that schoolboards have locked the doors and said, "No, I am sorry, you cannot come in."

MR. TULK: But the mandate that was given to this government last year, if I can come back to that, Mr. Speaker, the mandate that was given to this government last year was to carry on a negotiated settlement, to see that the issue was settled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that this Fall everybody in Newfoundland, certainly everybody on this side of the House - and we supported the government on a number of issues on the offshore, but it was hoped by everybody, everybody believed this Fall that what I choose to call the Chretien/Marshall talks were going to succeed. We believed that we were on our way to a settlement of that very important issue. We believed that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the minister responsible for the offshore - he was the Minister of Energy then, was he not, when he started the talks? - that the Minister of Energy at the time was going to conclude an agreement with Mr. Chretien and with the federal government. And I believe that

MR. TULK: the Minister of Energy at the time, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), believed it himself, I believe he believed it himself. I mean, he sweetness and light 'See you the once Jean,' everything was working out beautifully. Of course, we know what happened: I firmly believe a certain policy advisor in this Province said to our Premier, 'If you do that what do you have left to fight about? What is your issue? What else do you have left?' And I do not believe that the Marshall/Chretien talks are doing what I want done, Mr. Premier, for this Province, what that policy advisor wants done for the Province. So I think it is very well known that the Premier and his policy advisor sat in a room in a certain hotel in Montreal - I have heard it. I do not know if there is anything to this or not - watching the two Ministers of Energy, the Minister of Energy from Newfoundland (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Energy from Canada (Mr. Chretien), negotiating. When they saw the -

MR. NEARY: Through a pair of binoculars.

MR. TULK: -through a pair of binoculars, I have heard - when they saw the two gentleman were going to come to an agreement, I think it is a well known fact that the Premier of this Province pulled the rug out from under his Minister of Energy and somehow or other moved it around so that he was not Minister of Energy any longer, he was Minister without Portfolio responsible for the offshore - is that correct? - Minister without Portfolio responsible for the offshore, gave him a demotion.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to go back and look through that situation it is very obvious that the Government of Canada had met the four pre-conditions that were set down by this government in order to have a negotiated settlement, and they have always had to have their pre-conditions before they start to negotiate, you always have to agree to their point of view before they start to negotiate, and it is .

MR. TULK: very obvious that the federal government had met their four pre-conditions. After the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) had the rug pulled out from under him by the Premier and the policy advisor on the eighth floor, he then went back to the Minister of Energy for Canada, Mr. Chretien, and sent him a telegram with seventeen other items that were now outstanding. The same kind of senario that you have today with the teachers in this Province; after one issue has been put on the table and it seems that you may have a settlement, the Premier adds others.

MR. TULK: First of all, before he signs anything with anybody in this Province or outside of the Province, he has got to have them on their knees; they have to kiss the hem of his garment before any negotiations can take place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before my time is up I want to point out that I do not think you can negotiate by telex, I do not believe that the Premier can stay in his stance, the stance of what I call shadowboxing. The Premier is always shadowboxing. I do not believe that you can run a Province in that way. I further do not believe that the Premier has the experience to run this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who does?

MR. TULK: Where did he get it? I ask a very important question. He should, realizing that -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. TULK: Keep quite now. I am helping you along the way to your leadership ambitions. I hear you have them. He should have the good, common sense though -

MR. NEARY: He will not get ahead of Barry.

MR. TULK: I have to get to him later. He should have the good common sense though to hire and to stay by the advice of people who can perhaps negotiate and who can get into those good deals. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has two things in mind, first himself and then his political party. And on the offshore issue, the one that my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has referred to and has brought in a very magnanimous resolution, the Premier hopes to win the next federal election. Mr. Speaker, the other thing that is mentioned in this resolution is the concern over Winter drilling. That is the last part part of the resolution. Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland where

MR. TULK: we have the climate, the type of climate, the type of North Atlantic climate that we have and the distance that we are from shore and so on, there has to be concern by all people, even the people who work out there. I know they have to be concerned although they go out there and work and they do not want to be stopped from working. But there has to be concern over Winter drilling off this coast, given the kind of situation we exist in, the kind of environment that we exist in. Keeping that in mind the Liberal party of Newfoundland and Labrador last Fall at the National Convention on November 12th, put forward a resolution that all Winter drilling be stopped until a thorough investigation of the whole situation was carried out. That was passed at our convention. The Minister of Energy at the time pooh-poohed such nonsense. Why should you stop Winter drilling? Well,

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, he suddenly realized this year that he was in another situation that was very similar to what happened on that tragic night when the Ocean Ranger overturned and then he tried to jump on the bandwagon and tried to put down the fact that it was this side, led by the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), which had put forward such a resolution. What he was trying to do, Mr. Speaker, was to show us that, indeed, he was still boss and that he could take on the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak again about what the member for Mount Scio -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get involved in the large partisan debate that I am motivated to get into, particularly on this particular issue today. All I can say to the hon. gentleman who just spoke and who tried to recount facts which are not true with respect to those negotiations, if the hon. gentleman knew and really appreciated the exact facts and what occurred during those negotiations, I wonder whether, as a Newfoundlander, he would really and truly continue the position that he has been taking and continue the support that he has taken with respect to the Federal Government in this matter. Because, Mr. Speaker, it needs to be stated again - I am glad the hon. gentleman is coming back-whether the hon. gentleman accepts it or not, the simple fact of the matter is that in December and

MR. MARSHALL:

trust of the Federal Cabinet, and the federal government, to make the commitments that the gentleman made to me in those agreements. But there was a change, there was a direct change when it went to the officials and what happened was that they reverted, i.e. the federal government reverted to its previous position of the Nova Scotian agreement or nothing else. And the Nova Scotian agreement, Mr. Speaker, is unsuitable, unacceptable for anybody in this Province. It has been proven to be so. It has been condemned actually in Nova Scotia. So we are prepared, let there be no doubt, we are prepared to negotiate, but in order to protect the interests of the people of Newfoundland in view of the circumstances, obviously we have to do it on a certain basis and that basis, Mr. Speaker, purely and simply is that all we do is ask the federal government to put in writing the understandings which it had through Mr. Chretien and myself when we arrived at that agreement in principle.

Now, you know, if a person - a government is no different than a person, and if a person refuses to put his or her words in writing, you have to ask the reason why and you certainly have to question the sincerity of the intent. I repeat again, we are prepared to sit down and negotiate tomorrow but all we want is a simple response to those letters and those seventeen points. And I think, Mr. Speaker, not only is it not too much to ask, but for those people who take a little bit more than just a superficial view of the situation, they would say that any government in our position would not be acting in the best interests of the people of this Province if it negotiated on any other basis. Because what would happen if you negotiated

MR. MARSHALL: on any other basis was there would be this euphoria built up in the Province and elsewhere pushing us to make an agreement and you would end up getting an agreement at any cost, which is really what the federal government attempted to get us to do before the negotiations broke off. And we do not care, Mr. Speaker, what the perception of people may be one way or the other, this government will not sign an agreement unless it is good for the people of Newfoundland and for Canada as well.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Now, the hon. gentleman brings it up again about the teachers. Look, I hear it said over and over again in relation to offshore, and in relation to teachers, and in relation to the recent thing with the Micmacs and what have you, that the government does not know how to negotiate. But I think what you have to do is you have

MR. MARSHALL: to ask what negotiation means and that brings you right to the kernel of the situation.

MR. TULK: I hope you have learned.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, could I have the protection of the Chair? I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: When people negotiate with the government, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be the impression that they negotiate and they ask for everything that they want, obviously, first off.

MR. TULK: That is true.

MR. MARSHALL: And there are things that are given by government, there are things given by the other side and that is the normal give and take of any negotiation. But then when you get down to the bottom line, Mr. Speaker, and you get down where the government can give no more and the other side tries to hold on to its full and entire position, accusing you of not being able to negotiate. That does not mean when you negotiate, Mr. Speaker, you must capitulate. If you adopted that philosophy it would mean you would have to give everything away, that the government is good for it no matter what demands are made. Whatever the situation, whatever you are negotiating, the government has to take a broad view.

MR. CALLAN: You have saved millions so far.

MR. MARSHALL: There is a \$28 million deficit this year and rather than -

MR. CALLAN: You want to (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I ask for the protection of the Chair. I am not interested in debating with the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: There is a \$28 million deficit this year. The government had to nickel and dime foster children's clothing in order to bring it down to \$28 million. We know that we cannot provide from the public chest all the needs of the community either in Education, Health, Social Services or elsewhere. So we keep it down to \$28 million -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - and when we try to act responsibly in that manner, then people like the hon. gentlemen there opposite try to insinuate that what we are doing in that particular situation is attempting to save money so we can cover the deficit. Mr. Speaker, that is completely and absolutely untrue. There was a \$28 million deficit in the budget - the same budget that included the amount for the salaries in question. But I am not going to be put off on that situation except to say, Mr. Speaker, that this government is ready to negotiate in all matters, but negotiation does not mean capitulation. What we have to do, we have to look at the broader aspects.

MR. MARSHALL: As I say, a mandate to negotiate does not mean a mandate to capitulate. The Leader of the opposition (Mr. Neary) with his arcane statements was again on radio today talking about the Premier, the old tired statement, oh, the Premier had a mandate to negotiate on April 6th and because he did not come up with an agreement therefore he should resign and call an election, he has not fulfilled his mandate. Mr. Speaker, this government has -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - fulfilled its mandate, let there be no doubt about this, in the offshore. It has fulfilled its mandate, it arrived at an agreement, it was a good agreement in principle, we are prepared to deliver that agreement. If the federal government wishes to show its good faith all it has got to do is respond to that letter and negotiations will resume. And as I say, anyone with a little more than a superficial knowledge of the complex issues involved would realize that to negotiate except on the basis of that agreement would not be for the benefit of the people of this Province. When we entered into those negotiations we gave, Mr. Speaker, we believed for the first time that Ottawa was moving in the direction of meaningful equal joint management, was moving in the area of meaningful revenue sharing, and was moving in the area of the necessary permanence of the agreement. Mr. Chretien convinced us of that over a period of five meetings. There were constant dialogues with the Cabinet and the Planning and Priorities Committee, and as a result of our belief and trust in that particular position that he was taking, we gave and we gave all that this Province can now give. No matter what the court case may decide, this Province cannot

MR. MARSHALL: give any more than we gave which briefly was this: Number one, they were concerned about their national concern, which is our national concern as well, I hope, which is energy self-sufficiency and security of supply. The national interests are not the entire prerogative of the national government as I would hope the provincial interests are not the entire prerogative of the provincial government. So, we gave that. We agreed that there would be no turning off of the taps, as it were, up to our proportionate share of energy self-sufficiency and security of supply, 'But,' we said, 'while this is being done we have to determine how this development occurs, the manner or mode in which it occurs.' And that surely is reasonable, Mr. Speaker. Then they came back at another meeting and said, 'Well, we agree with that but what happens if your manner or mode interferes with the paramount interest of energy self-sufficiency?' So then we said, 'Okay, in that particular case our preferred mode would be put before an independent board and if our mode or manner of development is proven to be unreasonable, then, in that event, the other mode which would attain energy self-sufficiency and security of supply will pertain.' Now, how much more reasonable can you be than that? We would determine the how, we would concede our per share of energy self-sufficiency. We would determine the how and if our how was demonstrated to be unreasonable, then their how would have the way. The next element of the settlement was that we would get 75 per cent of all government income, they would get 25 per cent. So there would be sharing right off, but we would

MR. MARSHALL: get 75 per cent until certain economic indicators had been achieved, the major one of which was that the per capita earned income of the young people and all people in this Province would be equal to the average per capita earned income.

Now I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with that agreement? That was, as I say, a model of federal/provincial co-operation. It was our bottom line which we gave to the federal government on the faith that Mr. Chretien, I am sure he was sincere at the time, but on the faith that Mr. Chretien could deliver that particular agreement. And he cannot today deliver that agreement, Mr. Speaker, and that is why that letter has not been received.

If that letter is received we will negotiate it, if that letter is not received we cannot negotiate, because to negotiate would bring us down below that bottom line and would be an abject breach of faith with the people of this Province which we will not do, Mr. Speaker, under any circumstances, no matter what any court decides, no matter what anybody says, And the hon. gentleman keeps alluding to the courts. All the courts will do, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, if the Supreme Court of Canada upholds it, will decide the narrow legal issue that the resources offshore are owned by the federal government. It puts us in no different position than the people of the Western provinces, we say over and over and again, were before 1930. They did not own the resources below their land. They did not need a court case to determine it, that was determined, it was a given fact. If you had referred it to court they would have said yes, the federal government owns it, without even having a court case. So that was given. But common sense dictated that the people living above the land should own the resources underneath the land and so they were given their resources.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, why should this Province, no matter what any court decides, settle for anything less? Is it the Grand Banks of Newfoundland or it is the Grand Banks of Newfoundland? You can have all of the court decisions between here and Outer Mongolia and back again, but they will not make the Grand Banks of Newfoundland the Grand Banks of Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate part about the situation is that we do not ask in that settlement - we have not asked for the same thing as Alberta, you will note. They are paranoid over the last two years in the negotiations with Messers LaLonde and Chretien over the fact that a province might turn off the taps as they did in Alberta. And that is one of the main incidents of ownership, that you can turn off the taps. Well, we went even further than that, and we said, Look, we are good Canadians, we will agree that up to our proportionate share we will put it beyond our control to turn off the taps.

Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with that? And how in the name of heavens the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) or anybody can oppose that particular settlement? If we oppose that settlement and get lost in all of the rhetoric that is gone, what we are going to see is the demise of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: And the question remains as to whether or not Newfoundland is going to lie down, roll over and play dead. We saw a situation which occurred last week which was disgraceful, with respect to British Petroleum. There is no doubt about it, the facts are there. If you wanted to you cannot have a select committee. If you had a select committee before this House now and you called in the President of British Petroleum, and the international president, and the local manager here, and the various parties, and they testified in this House before a committee under oath, it would substantiate every word I said last week, that there are 250 jobs on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland this Summer that are not going to - 250 people who are going to be drawing welfare payments this Summer rather than working and being gainfully employed on the resources which we brought into Confederation, and why? Purely and simply because, and here again to quote unfortunately the Minister of State for Small Business, (Mr. Rompkey), "They did not give the permits at that period of time because of the negotiations." The Mayor of Botwood said, and he was right, it had nothing to do with the negotiations. He said that sometime ago.

So they waited and while they waited, Mr. Speaker, the ice floes came down.

MR. NEARY: That is not what he said. He said just the opposite.

MR. MARSHALL: "The ice floes came down tight to the land, you could do no site surveys, so drilling is off this year." Now, Ottawa does not seem to know and appreciate that we have ice down here as witness what happened again, another instance of why you need joint management so much down here. Imagine the denial of the Winter drilling which occurred. And what happened? Everybody said, "Oh, yes, you will damn your own politicians," the hon. gentlemen there opposite made all

MR. MARSHALL: their statements, Oh, it is totally political, the same type of little speeches the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) made now supporting the federal position, but what happened? Nature took its course and within eighteen days you had the spectre of rigs having to flee from ice. That is what happened, Mr. Speaker. And they stayed out for six weeks afterwards. And what happened when we wanted them brought into the port in Marystown, the logical place where they could have been refitted? Oh, no, puerile, childish reaction from Ottawa demanded that they be towed around in the North Atlantic where they were. In the meantime, they could have been into Marystown, they could have been refitted as was necessary in the appropriate time, and everything could have been done orderly, but instead of that what is going to happen is the Sedco 706, and the West Venture, Zapata Uglund very likely, as well this Summer is going to have to come into Marystown. Will they go to Marystown or will they be pulled into Halifax? That is another question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) exults from time to time that we lost jurisdiction, and this is what is happening. And I say unless Newfoundlanders are prepared to wake up, unless, Mr. Speaker, they are prepared to wake up and realize what is happening, I do not believe that there is any Newfoundlander worth his salt -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - except the hon. gentleman there opposite who is worth virtually nothing, not even a plugged nickel, but there is not a Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, worth his or her salt who is going to lie down and play dead. But I am afraid that events are going to transpire to such an event, Mr. Speaker, if you allow this type of thing and take the type of attitude that people take, 'Oh, it is just political, a pox on all their houses,' and in the meantime, on the Western boundary of our Province where we see \$600 million taken off and we are treated as a foreign country; we might just as well be on the borders of Afghanistan as being a part of Canada and they cream \$600 million. Now on the Eastern portion of our Province we are no longer - Mr. Speaker, are we a foreign country? Oh, no, Sir, we are all one great big happy family now. And incidentally, the putative father, i.e. Ottawa, is going to take all the resources out from the family and is going to dole it out by way of dole to the child. And that is what is happening. You hear talk going on about the position that we are in and today and every day we sit in this House and we sit in government, immersed with problems related solely and simply to the financial

MR. MARSHALL: position of this Province.
Pretty well - not pretty well, just every minute of this day is utilized by this government in dealing not with the creative things that this government would like to deal with but with things that are certainly not creative, the things are counterproductive, and all brought about why? - Because of the lack of money.
If hon. gentlemen there opposite, Mr. Speaker, think - and to hear people say that we choose to save money. Does anybody think that any political party who has a respect for the teaching association, for example, and the teachers of this Province, wish to inveigle them in any way?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!
The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Your Honour could enlighten the House on how Your Honour feels about speaking to an amendment? The other day, if you recall, the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) moved an amendment to a resolution, and I suppose this is the only institution in the world, the only organization in the world where you are not permitted to speak to an amendment. Even though we have this rule about a member only being allowed to speak once on a private member's resolution, Mr. Speaker, I believe the spirit of that rule change, if it were to be observed, would have to mean that there would be no amendments. If you can only speak once to the main resolution and not

MR. NEARY: speak to the amendments, then it should have barred amendments being brought in. Could Your Honour rule on that point?

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, you know, this is a part - now, the hon. gentleman has a little smile on his face; you see, this is part of the way he conducts debate. In this very debate last week, Your Honour, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) rose on the same point - I do not know whether the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker was in the chair - and a ruling was given at that time which was consistent with a ruling that had been given by a previous Speaker, that is in the rules and regulations and precedents of this House, to the effect that on Private Members Day a person may only speak once, with the exception of the mover of the motion who speaks at the opening and the closing. By presenting an amendment, as contrasted with other debate, there is not the right that springs out the second time. And I quote to Your Honour Section 53, and the spirit and intent of Section 53 (2) particularly, indicates this: "Notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 49, no member may speak for more than twenty minutes in the debate on a private member's motion." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And there have been two rulings of the Chair.

MR. MARSHALL: And there have been two rulings of the Chair. It has already been decided. And for the hon. gentleman to raise it now is an attempt to just take the time of the House and to cover up the obvious embarrassment that the Opposition finds—and notwithstanding the fact that they have eight members, they normally only have a compliment of between 25 per cent and 50 per cent in their chairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please! To that point of order. There has been a precedent set in the House that a member only speaks once. If the member has not used his twenty minutes he may speak again.

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I, of course, do not intend to debate or comment upon Your Honour's ruling, I mean, that is fine, the ruling is right. I will simply say to my absent friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), who is now back again, that in his concluding remarks he is obviously confusing quality with quantity. It is true that we may not all be here all the time and it is equally true that those on the other side - I see over there now, one, two, three, four, five, seven, ten, twelve seats occupied whereas there are four occupied on this side.

MR. CARTER: We have a few in the wings.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not saying whether any of them over there are even functioning or not, or whether they are comatose, but my friend from St. John's East ought not to confuse quality with quantity.

MR. NEARY: 50 per cent on this side and 10 per cent on that side.

MR. ROBERTS:

50 per cent on this side.

And, of course, our strength, Mr. Speaker, is as the strength of ten because our hearts are pure. Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House is one moved by my friend the Leader of the Opposition and an amendment has been moved by my former parliamentary friend - I have nothing against him personally but in a parliamentary sense he is no longer a friend, and that is the gentleman from Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout). I do not know whether we have stated explicitly where we stand but we on this side are prepared to support this amendment. It does not in any way change the import of my friend the Leader of the Opposition's resolution. It states the principle of that resolution, I think it is fair to say, in a little different words. It does delete some of the whereas clauses. And while I have no difficulty in supporting the whereas clauses in the original motion, I think they are correct, I think they are properly stated and I think they are relevant, I equally have no problem in seeing them deleted. I guess I am in the school of thought that says in drafting private member's motions it is usually best if we left out these preambles that sometimes tend to be argumentative. The Chair has a discretion as to whether or not these clauses are removed in whole or in part. That is entirely within the purview of the Chair.

MR. CARTER:

Sit down. Sit down.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, you know

MR. ROBERTS: you know, if you are walking across a pasture at night and you step in something obnoxious you really have to pay attention to it and on the same reasoning I have to pay attention to the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) who once again is demonstrating the fact that I believe ought to be a state secret, and that is that his collar size exceeds his intelligence quotient.

Now my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) asked if Your Honour would and Your Honour, of course, did enforce the rules of the Chair. I was not interrupting anybody opposite, I simply want to be allowed to speak for the twenty minutes or whatever it is I am allowed by the rules and make my modest contribution. The hon. gentleman for St. John's North has nothing to contribute - his role in life. And I say welcome - speaking of somebody who has something to contribute - welcome to my friend from Placentia East (Mr. Patterson) who at long last has seen the light and in the words of his old adversary, Mr. Smallwood, has heeded the old adage that 'While the light holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return'. And I am not saying my friend from Placentia East is the vilest sinner, but I do say welcome back and I hope he and the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) are happy there side by side, cheek by cheek, jowl by jowl, spiritual bed fellows if naught else.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I do not want to get quite as low as my friend from - the last I heard of my friend from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) he was on the bus.

MR. SIMMS: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: I would say if he met some of my constituents he is in good hands and I hope he has

MR. ROBERTS: been as generous and as responsive to them as he is to his own.

MR. MORGAN: You will find good people there.

MR. ROBERTS: They are good people. And I say to my friend the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), they are good people in the North, they are politically among the most astute in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment to the resolution is one that we are prepared to support. What it says in a word or two or three is that the House - it is badly drafted, it is bad language, it is sloppy language - but the House supports the principle of a negotiated settlement of the offshore issue. And that is not one that I find difficult to support. I have been standing here in this House for four or five years now saying just that and so have my colleagues. In fact, we were saying that when hon. gentlemen opposite, including my friend from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), thought the only issue was ownership. And I had the immense privilege of being called a traitor by the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) because I stood in this House and said, 'Let us not get hung up on ownership, let us instead do a negotiated deal'. Well, they have seen that much of the light. It is too bad that in so doing they have launched the Province on a course that has cost us four or five years at minimum and in addition has put us on a road that could easily lead to doom. You know, it was this administration that forced the ownership issue before the courts.

MR. ROBERTS: There was no need at all, Mr. Speaker, to take a reference to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland Appeal Division on this issue. The administration either panicked or did so for base partisan political purposes as part of the prelude to what turned out to be a successful election campaign, successful to the hon. gentlemen opposite but unfortunately not for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. They did so, Mr. Speaker, and let this be recorded, in the face of the legal advice that had been given to this administration and every administration in Newfoundland, namely, that the Newfoundland case at law on the offshore issue is on the short end of the fight as against Ottawa. And the Supreme Court of Newfoundland Appeal Court has now given their ruling. I am not going to comment on it in detail except to say that the judges down there, the Chief Justice, Mr. Chief Justice Mifflin, Mr. Justice Morgan, Mr. Justice Gushue, after an extensively argued lengthy hearing gave their judgement, the matter is now on appeal. I believe it has been appealed, in fact, before the Supreme Court at Ottawa and, of course, a similar issue is being raised by the federal reference -

DR. COLLINS: It is not settled yet.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree with my friend the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and I am delighted to see him back. I agree that the issue is not settled by any means. All I am saying is that this administration went to court, nobody else took it to court, they took it to court and they blew it. They went into the poker game with kings and they called the cards and it turned out the other side had the aces. And all of us are going to pay the price for it, because the administration have seriously weakened our negotiating position. That is a brutal realistic fact. I am, for one, grateful that Ottawa has not chosen to

MR. ROBERTS: take advantage of this. You know, we heard my friend, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) up today talking about his negotiations with Petro-Canada and others to get more Newfoundlanders and Labradorians employed on those rigs. I am all for it and I give him every commendation and every encouragement, but we must realize, Your Honour, that as a matter of law our regulations now outside the three mile limit are as effective as the laws of Basutoland are in ruling the offshore, in law. Because the only legal ruling there is is by the Court of Appeal here and the Court of Appeal has held on the opinion, the reference, which is an opinion, they have held that Newfoundland's writ does not run and that is where this administration's course of action has led us. That is where we are now. We are in a cul-de-sac of our own making. We have jumped into a hole and we have pulled it in behind us. But it is not too late. We should negotiate. I have been saying that for four or five years, we have all been saying it over here, 'It is still not too late.' And that is the point of my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, .

MR. ROBERTS: that is the point of his resolution, and that is the point of the amendment moved by the gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout), Well, since they are of one mind, and since they agree with the position, my friend for LaPoile has said , We support it. The gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay has finally come around this far. I welcome that. I regret that he is doing it from that side and not from this side, but that is history now.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council, who is the minister responsible for negotiations in this matter, has made it quite clear that there was an agreement between Ottawa and Newfoundland, and there was. There was an agreement. It was not reduced to writing, but there was an agreement. And any lawyer, including my friend for St. John's East, knows that you can have an agreement, a contract that is not in writing, You can have some that must be in writing, but you can have a contract that is not in writing, many contracts are not. I do not know to this day why the negotiations broke down. I have heard what the gentleman for St. John's East has to say, I have heard as well what Mr. Chretien has to say, I have read the propaganda which this administration has put out, I have read the propaganda which Mr. Chretien has put out or his officials in Ottawa, I honestly do not know where the fault lies, and I do not care where the fault lies, Your Honour. What I do care about is what I believe to be the best interest of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and that is to get this matter resolved.

The only way to resolve it in my view is now, as it has been right from the start, by negotiation, by talk, by give and take,

MR. CARTER:

Tell us about it.

MR. ROBERTS: Going to court, Mr. Speaker, is not an answer. We have gone, we forced it into court and we lost. Newfoundland, if you wish, lost. Not that the court ruled against Newfoundland, it did not do that. The court ruled on the law as the judges found it. And that is their job and they did it I am sure to the very best of their ability. And I will say again that this administration went to court on this matter against the opinions that they have received over the years, not only this administration, but the previous one, the Moores Administration had the same advice as did this one, and the Moores Administration backed off. They were a lot smarter than this present administration, in my view.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only way out is negotiation. We are now on a course for calamity, we are going straight for suicide. And this administration pigheaded, bullheaded, arrogant, inward looking, they have got a bunker mentality - plainclothesmen in the galleries today. I do not know what we are coming to, plainclothesmen which may, by the way, be an infringement of the privileges of this House, unless Your Honour asked them to be there. It is an infringement of the privileges of this House, I would say. No police officer has the right to come within the precincts of this House without Your Honour's permission.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. ROBERTS: There is no breach of the law here. But here we are with plainclothesmen - this administration and their bunker mentality now, they are afraid of the people, afraid, they are quivering and cowering, they brought us to the point, Mr. Speaker, were the

MR. ROBERTS:

time is running very short. So I would say simply this to my friend for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) whom I believe wants a settlement, I believe that. I believe he had a settlement. He says it broke down because of Ottawa, Ottawa says it broke down because of him. I do not know where the truth lies, I suspect as is always in these cases, it lies a little on each side and a little on the other side. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that negotiations in my view are the only way to resolve this issue else we risk losing it all.

MR. CARTER:

Tell us how to

negotiate.

MR. ROBERTS:

Yes, I will tell the

government how to negotiate. They do not know how. Everytime they get into negotiations with anybody - it took Joe Smallwood twenty years to get the teachers on the streets against him. It took Brian Peckford four years. They do not know how to talk. They do not know how to negotiate and in fact one comment of the gentleman for St. John's East that he made today; one comment troubles me deeply because he said, 'we want to negotiate' and then he went on and a little later in his remarks he said 'we have given all that the Province can give'. Now if that is so, then there can be no negotiations unless negotiation means in the eyes of the gentleman opposite, give us everything we want and we will talk to you. I sometimes suspect, Mr. Speaker, to be quite candid, I sometimes suspect that is what the Premier and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall)

MR. ROBERTS: and his colleagues believe is negotiations. That seems to be what they are saying to the teachers, for example - 'give us everything we ask for and then we will negotiate with you.' That is not negotiating in my books. I am not saying you should give up anything you do not want to give up, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is negotiation is sitting at a table and giving and taking and when it is all put together as a package then saying, alright, we will take it or we will not take it. But the decision as to whether we take it or not is at the end of the road. You do not break matters off, in my view, in a childish dispute, a childish dispute over telexes and negotiations in public, it is as childish as the teachers dispute which in my mind is madness. The teachers dispute is sheer madness or badness, but sheer madness - 140,000 kids out of school and this government cannot do anything about it and will not do anything about it and the teachers obviously want to settle. They obviously want to settle, Mr. Speaker. if ever man or woman wanted to settle -

MR. MORGAN: What would you do?

MR. ROBERTS: What would I do? I would sit down and talk with them. I would have them in and talk with them. Instead of throwing harangues I would do the one thing, Mr. Speaker, I would do the one thing that has not been done, I would sit down and talk. There is nothing separating those two parties. I would say to my friend, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) there is nothing separating those two parties that is of any substance. There is nothing that any reasonable and fair-minded man or woman could not come to an agreement on.

MR. ROBERTS: In fact, the government's failure to do it only leads credence to the belief which is widely held in this Province, true or not it is widely held - it is true it is held whether it is true in itself or not - widely held that the only reason this strike is being prolonged, or lockout whatever it is called is being prolonged, is so the government can save enough to try to balance current account.

But, Mr. Speaker, to come back to the amendment itself.

MR. CARTER: That is a dirty slur.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

MR. CARTER: That is a dirty slur.

MR. ROBERTS: It is a dirty slur, Mr. Speaker, by the administration on this Province, yes, it is. Because there is a lot of evidence to support it, there is no evidence to counter it. And more and more people - the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) has had his answer night after night at meetings of parents, they have told him what they think of him. They told him what they think of him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me come back to the amendment. The amendment asks us to negotiate. It approves the idea of negotiation. The federal/provincial joint management board of course; Winter drilling regulations of course; these ought to be items in the negotiation. But the only way we are going to negotiate is to sit down at a table, and I say now to my friend from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) who, as I have said, I believe sincerely wants a settlement. It would be a capstone to his political career. It may not be the conclusion of his political career, it will be the capstone to that career. If he can get a settlement that both sides willingly accept, then he will have done something,

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, that will put him among the rather small number of men and women who in public life in this Province, over the 150 years this House has been in existence, have made a notable contribution. It is a small circle, he can join it.

What he has got to do is to stop this silly business of sending Telexes, a bunch of children. If he were downtown, as he is from time to time, practicing his trade as a lawyer, he would not be doing that. You start sending messages only when negotiations have broken off and you are gathering ammunition for the other rounds. If you are negotiating you are talking. So I say we will support the resolution, we will support the amendment, we will support the resolution as amended, but I would say that the way to make this work is for my learned friend, the Minister of Nothing, whatever he is, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), whatever his correct title is - I am not sure if he is Minister of Energy, or half energy - that he should send word to Jean Chretien. And I will say to my friend from St. John's East, and I know whereof I speak, Jean Chretien in the course of those negotiations was speaking with the approval and authority of the Government of Canada. There has been no withdrawal by the Government of Canada, no withdrawal, no renegeing, no nothing. And I make that statement because it is correct and I make it without fear of successful contradiction. But the way to prove it, Mr. Speaker, is for the hon. gentleman from St. John's East to send word today, let it come in the form of this resolution if he wishes, that this administration, that he as the negotiator, are prepared to talk. That does not cost us anything. We are not giving up anything to talk. We do not have to sign anything unless we want to but let us talk. Because the alternative, which is where we now are, is we are

April 27, 1983

Tape No. 1481

NM - 3

MR. ROBERTS: on a path to disaster. We have already been unsuccessful in one initiative down in the Supreme Court here. I have no idea what the Supreme Court of Canada is

MR. ROBERTS:

going to rule, but I will say the balance of legal opinion is that Newfoundland's case is the weaker of the two, which is, of course, what the Newfoundland Court of Appeal found in their opinion, in their judgment. So, Mr. Speaker, the way this administration is going now we are headed for disaster, we are going to lose everything, so let us negotiate. What was it John Kennedy said? 'Let us never negotiate from fear, but let us never fear to negotiate'. That was true in 1961 when John Kennedy made those remarks in his inaugural address, and it is true today.

I support the amendment, Sir,
I support the resolution. I hope it will lead to negotiations being resumed.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister of Communications.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I have no great difficulty really in agreeing with certain parts of the Opposition Leader's (Mr. Neary) resolution on the offshore, especially the second last part which says: 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House of Assembly go on record, today, as supporting a negotiated settlement to this question at once which would provide maximum long and short term benefits to this Province and to Canada'.

Mr. Speaker, I think most people on this side of the House would agree with that. However, it is the method, Mr. Speaker, by which the hon. Leader of the Opposition arrives at that particular part of his resolution that the people on this side of the House have a little bit of difficulty with and would question. Now I would question the method, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. Leader of the Opposition makes

MR. DOYLE: an insinuation, either intentionally or unintentionally, that this government has somehow not made some kind of a sincere, conscientious, concerted, honest effort to negotiate a settlement to the most important issue, incidentally, to the most important issue that this government or any other government will possibly ever have to deal with in the next one hundred years or more. Mr. Speaker, it is because the offshore quite possibly represents the last great opportunity for Newfoundland ever to become even a little bit more than a welfare community, it is because of that one stark, glaring observation that we have to ensure, as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said a minute ago, that any agreement that is signed by the Province represents the very best agreement that this Province is capable of receiving.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen opposite also make reference to the fact that this government has a mandate to negotiate and somehow we are not negotiating. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do have a mandate to negotiate, but what we do not have is the permission of the Newfoundland people to throw away what is their birthright, to throw away what is rightfully ours, and to somehow condemn the people of this Province to permanent welfare payments. Now we do not have a right to do that, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a right to

MR. DOYLE:

permanently condemn future generations in this Province to being a little bit more than a welfare state. We do not have the right to say to the people that we are going to condemn them to become the type of province that does not have a decent standard of living and does not have a decent quality of life like the people in other provinces of Canada. That is what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), Mr. Speaker, and his hon. gentlemen opposite would do, they would permanently condemn Newfoundland to welfare payments. And that is why we see this type of resolution, Your Honour, being proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, a resolution in which the Leader of the Opposition seems to derive some kind of a sick satisfaction over the fact that a few more obstacles have been placed in the way of the Province and that the Supreme Court in Newfoundland has ruled, as he says in his resolution, that the question of the offshore does not fall within the meaning of Term 37 of the Terms of Union and it does not belong to the people of Newfoundland anyway.

So the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, seems to get some kind of sick satisfaction that a few more obstacles have been placed in the way to keep Newfoundland under the poverty line and to prevent the Province from achieving its just rights within this federation. We, on the other hand, say to the people that they do have some kind of a ray of hope left and that we are working for them. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is too much to ask as a member within a partnership whose constitution and whose Charter of Rights and freedoms clearly state that all its people are equal and they should have equal opportunity within Canada.

MR. DOYLE: I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, that if you went out and said that to some of the people in this Province that they would actually refuse to believe it. They would refuse to believe that they are equal to any other part of Canada and they would challenge any government, whether it be provincial or federal or municipal or what have you, to prove that they are equal to other parts of Canada. Because, Mr. Speaker, they have been told every single day by the federal government that they are not equal to people in other parts of Canada. Ottawa says that Alberta and some of the other provinces can own their own resources, and as a result achieve a certain standard and a certain quality of living, Ottawa says that Central Canadians can own their resources and receive a very satisfactory standard of living, but at the same time, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa tells the people of Newfoundland that the federal government must have ownership and they must have control over the resources that we have here in Newfoundland. And this is what the people of Newfoundland are questioning today. They are asking, Why should that be? Is it because, Mr. Speaker, that we are not located at the nub of the central power base in Central Canada or is it because we only have seven federal seats in Ottawa and as a result we do not even show up on the old political graph anyway? Or is it because Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Chretien realize that quite possibly they have the unconditional support of the five Liberal MPs in Ottawa and the eight Liberal members

MR. DOYLE:

of the House of Assembly here. So, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder what kind of representation one lone Cabinet representative can do for Newfoundland in trying to get a deal on the offshore. I sometimes imagine the lone Cabinet representative, Mr. Rompkey, sitting around the Cabinet table and discussing ways and means of plotting strategy which will bring the Province of Newfoundland to its knees on the offshore. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, is that the case, do we have our own Cabinet representative in Ottawa sitting around the Cabinet table with Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Chretien and plotting ways and means to bring this Province to its knees on the only resource that we have left capable of putting the people of Newfoundland in the position that they can have a decent quality and a decent standard of living?

It is pathetic, Mr. Speaker, I guess when you get right down to it. And I suppose if it was not so serious and if it was not so important to the well being of the people in Newfoundland, I guess it would almost be funny. But, Mr. Speaker, this little pamphlet here, I am surprised not too many people in the debate so far have made any reference to this little pamphlet because this little pamphlet here tells the whole story and I would send out my compliments to the individual or individuals who are responsible for putting this little piece of paper together. I do not know who is responsible for it but I guess somebody within government. That is why, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Opposition just hate to see any monies expended on literature of this sort, because it tells the whole story and it tells the truth, and that is the important thing about it, and it puts the facts on the table so that

MR. DOYLE: the people of the Province and everyone else can see what the federal Liberals and what the provincial Liberals would deny to the people of Newfoundland.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know really why the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is so scared and so frightened to support Newfoundland in trying to get a decent and an honest and a fair and an equitable settlement for the Province. I would like to know why the Leader of the Opposition finds it necessary to come into this House with this type of declaration of his party's position on a matter that happens to be so vital and so essential to the well being of the people of this Province. Why is the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, so weak-kneed and taking such a satisfaction as to actually state to the people of Newfoundland through this motion here that it is his desire and his hope and his goal and his aspiration to reduce Newfoundland to a little bit more than a welfare community? So, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for the people of this Province to have to bear witness to the fact that there

MR. DOYLE: actually exists within the confines of this House a group of eight people who toe the federal party line consistently and constantly and who would see our resources given away to the other people in Canada to be used for everybody else's benefit but not for ours. So, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be recorded forever how the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his whole party have dealt with this vital issue on the offshore. It should be recorded forever how they have consistently and constantly taken a middle-of-the-road attitude and, when it gets right down to the short strokes, finally cave in and support the federal government on their position.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition made the insinuation that the government took the initial step - and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) said the same thing just a few minutes ago - that this government took the initial step in putting ownership of the offshore to the Newfoundland Court of Appeal. But as the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) happened to mention last week when he was speaking to this particular motion, the Opposition members failed to mention that it was the federal government who first asked the Supreme Court of Canada to expand the SIU case to include ownership of the offshore. So, Mr. Speaker, what choice did this government really have in the final analysis but to ask our own court for a reference also and to make a ruling on it before it actually got to that point.

So, again, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition toes the federal party line. Every single day he continues to toe the federal party line whenever the opportunity presents itself. If the hon. gentleman had any thought for the people of this Province, why did he not come into this House last week with a resolution that might

MR. DOYLE: read something like this:

WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland have demonstrated its flexibility and its goodwill by reaching a verbal agreement on the offshore with the federal Energy Minister; and

WHEREAS the federal Energy officials and Mr. Trudeau have refused to put into writing the concepts that the two ministers had verbally agreed upon;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House unanimously request the federal government to put its previous verbal promises agreed to by both the federal and provincial Energy Ministers into writing so negotiations may immediately resume for the benefit of both the people of Newfoundland and the benefit of the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, had the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) done that, what an easy thing it would be today for every single member in this House to support that kind of a motion, because that kind of a motion, Mr. Speaker, makes sense, to ask the federal government simply to put into writing what has already been agreed to by our provincial Energy Minister (Mr. Marshall) and the federal Energy Minister (Mr. Chretien) some time ago. But no, Mr. Speaker, he has to beat

MR. DOYLE:

around the bush and make his little insinuations to indicate that somehow this Province has gone wrong in trying to negotiate a deal on the offshore.

What a great day it would have been, Mr. Speaker, in this House, to send a clear and unmistakable message to Ottawa that Newfoundland's House of Assembly stands united behind this one cause and that there is not one dissenting voice in the House. But no, Mr. Speaker, again he has chosen to take the middle-of-the-road attitude and has refused to support Newfoundland in its stand on the offshore. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is why I, as one member, cannot support this particular resolution that the hon. gentleman has put to the House of Assembly, but I do unconditionally support the amendment that the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) brought before the House last week.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I will just have a few words on the resolution.

I support the resolution and also the amendment because the bottom line of all this is that both sides, Mr. Speaker, have to get down to work and come up with an agreement. Here is the second largest country in the world, one of the richest countries in the world, Canada, borrowing \$31 billion a year; here is one of its provinces, with untold potential, with a debt of \$4 billion and our carrying on is utter madness, and I use the word 'madness' advisedly.

Mr. Speaker, we have to come to our senses, and hopefully, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall)

MR. HISCOCK: will contact the federal minister and say they are open to negotiation and would like to have it renewed again. Because if not, Mr. Speaker, they may be taking the attitude, as I have said in this House all along, that this government does not want to negotiate a settlement, they want to be able to fight it in the next election, and now that Mr. Crosbie is running for the leadership of the P.C. Party that has become even more evident. Mr. Crosbie is saying that if he becomes the next Prime Minister he will give the offshore resources to all the provinces, including B.C., just as the federal government gave the land-based petroleum resources to Alberta and Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, no thought whatsoever is given to the suffering of the unemployed people of this Province. And there is a sinister attitude in the Province that the reason why the teachers are locked out is, in actual fact, to save money.

Mr. Speaker, I said in this House three or four years ago that government do not want a settlement, they want to use the offshore as a federal issue in the next election and now it is becoming even more conclusively evident that this is the approach that they are taking. And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, this administration is putting the party first and not the Province first, putting the P.C. members in Ottawa

MR. HISCOCK: and in Newfoundland ahead of the well-being of our Province. And I would go so far as to say, Mr. Speaker, the message is going out in this Province loud and clear this administration is more concerned with its political well-being than with running this Province so that we can come up with a society that is based on a fair economic return to our citizens.

The other question I have asked, and I still ask it, is why do they not want a settlement? Is it because the Premier is afraid to have a settlement? Mr. Lougheed and Mr. Trudeau had an agreement that the price of oil to Canadians would climb to 75 per cent of the world price. Where is that agreement now? It is no longer valid and we are paying about 83 per cent of the world price when we were supposed to pay about 75 per cent.

What about the agreement on the Upper Churchill reached in Mr. Smallwood's day? We all know how little we are getting from that agreement. So I wonder if the Premier is a little bit afraid that, if he signs an agreement, within four or five or six years that agreement will be redundant like the one Mr. Smallwood oversaw and also the one that Mr. Lougheed ended up with.

Mr. Speaker, as a country and as a Province we cannot continue borrowing billions of dollars, borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars in the case of our own Province, putting our people in debt more and more, becoming more inefficient as a country and scaring off foreign investment in the Province, because there is not one large international corporation would come near this Province with the attitude they have towards big business, and not only big business but labour, and it is the same, unfortunately, nationally. But, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to

MR. HISCOCK: provide jobs for our youth we have to build a basis for sound investment by the international community. We also have to spend only what we take in, and I am not saying necessarily a balanced budget either, but when we go over \$35 million on a current account deficit each year, while as a nation are going \$31 billion in the red then something has to give, somebody has to pay down the line. As a younger person in this Province I am saying that the younger people are not having their hopes and aspirations filled. It is the younger people who see when they go to university that the tuition is doubled, it is the younger people who graduate and have to go on the dole line.

It is a pity that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) is not here so he could answer this question; why is the Harvey Road outlet the main centre for social service recipients in this city? Why is it no longer the main headquarters? Why have we now broken it down into three units and moved one out near the Village Mall, another one in another part of the city, and Harvey Road? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is so that we do not have to see the dole line, just as we do not have to see the dole lines in Montreal and in Toronto and in Vancouver. I have seen the dole line a couple of times here, where the people go down and pick up their cheques and there are about thirty or forty people outside. That is the reality

MR. HISCOCK: of this Province, Mr. Speaker. If we had Harvey Road as the headquarters, instead of breaking it up into other areas, we would see 100 or 200 people on the day when they get their cheques, and that would be reality. CBC and the other visual reporters and the radio stations would be able to report that. So this government, Mr. Speaker, has been very, very good from the point of view of their political aspect and their timing. And I also have to end up saying that if they do not get an agreement in the near future, and they continue to allow the federal court in Ottawa to decide, then what is going to happen? There is no question that if the Liberal Party is in power in Ottawa when the court makes the decision that the development will have to go ahead, will go ahead, and as I said, irregardless of what the Province says. And, of course, Mr. Peckford then can wash his hands clean and say, "Look, we had to take whatever agreement was given to us. We had no other choice. It was rammed down our throats." But I also have enough confidence in this country that whatever party forms the government when this is decided, whether Liberal, Conservative or NDP, it will make sure that Newfoundland was treated fairly under any agreement.

So I say I am not afraid of what happens in the court if it goes in favour of Canada. I believe in many ways it belongs to the nation, I also believe in a strong central government, but I also believe, because the resource is in our part of Canada, that we get maximum benefits, control, jobs, spin-offs, etc., as Canadians - not as Newfoundlanders but as Canadians. And I feel, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HISCOCK:

if we took that attitude and went into negotiations as a strong country, building up a strong country in the international community to be able to compete with Japan, West Germany, Switzerland, Spain and the other ones, then
Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMS: Tell us about your friends in Quebec.

MR. HISCOCK: The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) is more concerned about my friends in Quebec than he is about making jobs for our younger people who are coming out now from the university and the trade schools.

MR. SIMMS: 500 jobs.

MR. HISCOCK: 500 jobs?

MR. SIMMS: Yes.

MR. HISCOCK: And there are at least 5,000,6,000 or 7,000 young people looking for them. That is another cynical attitude, Mr. Speaker, that I am beginning to develop, that I think the reason why we have the school locked out is the possibility that we may have Summer school, and one of the reasons why we may have Summer school is so that the Grade X, XI and XII students may not necessarily be able to find jobs.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! I am sure the hon. member is aware that at certain times on the second day of Private Member's Day that the Chair has to recognize the mover of the motion. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank all those who participated in this debate. We had a lively, informed and interesting debate. I must say, though, that some of the hon. gentlemen who participated in this debate stooped to a very low level. For instance, the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) probably stooped to the lowest level that we have seen a member on the opposite

April 27, 1983

Tape No. 1488

NM 3

MR. NEARY: side do for a long time, and
accused the eight members on this side of being less
than Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can express all the twisted and perverted logic that he wants but it will not change the situation as far as the economy of this Province is concerned. Mr. Speaker, I was rather taken aback that it was the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) who moved the amendment to my resolution. Because as my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) indicated earlier this afternoon, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay, who used to sit on this side of the House, is now seated over on the opposite side supporting the Tory administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, why is the hon. gentleman sitting supporting the Tory government? Why is he there? Well the hon. gentleman is over there because he disagreed with the Opposition of the day on the ownership question. The hon. gentleman moved across the House because he said he agreed with the government, he agreed with the administration of the day, that Newfoundland owned the offshore. And now what is that same hon. gentleman doing? Here is what the hon. gentleman is doing: He is moving an amendment to my resolution. Let me read his amendment and see if it has anything to do with ownership, the principle on which the hon. gentleman scooted across the House when he did, grasping for straws, looking for an excuse to get across the House, Mr. Speaker, on the ownership question, because he said, his colleagues in the Opposition did not come out solidly for ownership. My colleague for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) explained it this afternoon when he said ownership was not the question, but it was the big issue in the member for Baie Verte-White Bay's mind at that time. Let us see now if he is talking about ownership or if he has shifted his ground:

'BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House of Assembly go on record today as supporting a negotiated settlement to

MR. NEARY: this question.' No reference at all to who owns it, the principle for which the hon. gentleman ran across the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was rather taken aback that the amendment should come from that hon. gentleman, but the amendment basically says the same thing as the resolution. All it did was take out a couple of resolves in the resolution. And the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is similiar to the resolution itself, and that is that this House go on record as urging a negotiated settlement to this long-standing dispute. Now we agree with that. That

MR. NEARY:

was the intention of my original resolution and we are going to vote in favour of the resolution as amended. We are going to vote in favour of it because, Mr. Speaker, the main point here is this that we cannot stagger on the way we are going, we cannot ignore the question and hope that it will disappear. The Newfoundland Appeals Court handed down a decision, Mr. Speaker, that has placed the Tory administration in this Province in a very, very difficult position indeed. And no doubt the decision of the Supreme Court, when it comes down sometime in May, is going to be a deathblow to this administration. They had the body blow from the Newfoundland Appeals Court, they will have the clincher, they will have the TKO from the Supreme Court of Canada.

Now I am suggesting to the administration, as my colleague the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) suggested this afternoon, that before the Supreme Court of Canada hands down its decision that the Newfoundland government should take the initiative and get back to the bargaining table and negotiate an agreement.

MR. CARTER: What did Chretien say about it?

MR. NEARY: What did Chretien say about it?

Well, I know Mr. Chretien's feelings on it. But let me say this to my hon. friend, that it is more difficult now for the administration to negotiate an agreement than it was in January when the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) in this Province and Mr. Chretien were negotiating. It is more difficult now than it was then because, if hon. members will recall, when negotiations started between Mr. Chretien and the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate in this Province

MR. NEARY: a deadline was placed on these negotiations up to the end of January.

MR. TOBIN: By whom?

MR. NEARY: By whom? By the Prime Minister, by the Government of Canada. A deadline was put on the negotiations, That deadline was extended but not for an indefinite period. That deadline was extended, as my hon. friend knows.

MR. MARSHALL: Did it have anything to do with the court case?

MR. NEARY: No, it had nothing to do with the court case. The deadline was extended because the two ministers were getting near an agreement.

DR. COLLINS: How long did the negotiations go on with Alberta?

MR. MARSHALL: One of these days it will come out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. and learned friend says, 'One of these days it will come out'. Well, one of these days there is something else that will come out too, that the previous administration and this administration have been sitting on information on their shelves for the last eleven years.

MR. NEARY: They have been sitting on a report that was done by the government back in 1971, a report that was commissioned by the Smallwood Administration. Mr. Speaker, back in 1971 the government retained the expert services of the Dean of the Law School of the University of Alberta, Mr. G.V. Forest, Q.C., who was highly recommended. He was one of Canada's top constitutional authorities at that time, and he was commissioned to make a thorough study of Newfoundland's oil and gas and other mineral rights if any on the Continental Shelf and report to the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, that report is down in the Department of Justice. It has been there since 1971. It was there when the government changed. Hon. members who were involved in the negotiations and the court case know that report is there. That report clearly indicated that Newfoundland did not own the resources, never did own the resources. Mr. Moores -

MR. TULK: Who did that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Forest, Q.C. That report should be tabled in this House, by the way. He said that Newfoundland did not own the offshore resources.

MR. MARSHALL: He was in the woods.

MR. NEARY: And he was in the woods! He is only an expert giving advise to the government. Mr. Speaker, that report should be brought up and laid on the table of this House. Hon. gentlemen there opposite, especially the Minister speaking for Energy (Mr. Marshall) in this Province, read that report. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) for this Province read that report, the Attorney General who is supposed to be giving advise to the administration. And they knew, Mr. Speaker, that we had a very weak case. Mr. Moores knew it. Mr. Hickman, when he was Minister of Justice, knew it, Mr. Speaker. And yet they ignored that report and threw the ownership question

MR. NEARY: before the Newfoundland Appeals Court when they knew in their hearts that they had a very slim chance of winning the case.

Dr. COLLINS: We had very good legal opinions that we own it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if they had legal opinions that we own it, let them put them on the Table of the House.

MR. TOBIN: Sure that is all public record.

MR. NEARY: It is not all public record. This report that I am talking about that was done by the Dean of the Law School of the University of Alberta, Mr. Forest, Q.C., that report was never made public, although the Minister of Energy has read it and his colleague the Minister of Justice has read it. And they knew, Mr. Speaker, they knew that Newfoundland had a slim chance of winning before the court. They were hoping that the three Newfoundlanders would be patriotic people, that they would not rule on a point of law, that they would not administer justice,

MR. NEARY:

that they would let their hearts decide the offshore question. That is what they were hoping and they gambled on that. They gambled on the fact that three Newfoundland judges would not dare rule in favour of Canada, that is what they were gambling on, Mr. Speaker, and they lost that gamble. And in the process, in carrying out that procedure, they threw away the offshore resources, They should have been negotiating. If they had been negotiating, Mr. Speaker, we would have had an offshore agreement a long time ago.

And for eleven years in this Province all we have been hearing from this administration, from the Tories, are anti-Canadian statements, anti-Confederate anti-Canadian statements, Mr. Speaker. They are trying to brainwash the people. Every young boy and girl in this Province who was seven years old eleven years ago when the Tories came to power have heard nothing good about Confederation. All they have heard is a condemnation of Canada and of Ottawa, a steady stream of criticism, anti-Canadian statements and remarks from this administration, Mr. Speaker. These young men and women who are growing up in this Province, who are Canadians, for eleven years they have had this steady stream of propaganda being thrown at them, Mr. Speaker. Those who were seven years old when the PCs came to power this year will be able to vote. That is name of the game, Mr. Speaker, that is what it is all about, that is the brainwashing process, that is the Hitler-like tactics that are being used, brainwash the young people so they will be against Canada. They are portraying Canada as the enemy.

MR. TOBIN:

Chretien is not even going to -

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I think people are fed up with the rudeness of the hon. the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) who is ill-mannered and rude. People are fed up with that.

MR. TOBIN: They are certainly fed up with your ignorance.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, what has happened in this Province? We have record unemployment, we have a huge deficit in current account, we have no hope that we can offer the unemployed in this Province or the people who have invested into the petroleum industry. And, Mr. Speaker, what does APEC say about this? Remember, a couple of years ago APEC said that we had the richest oil deposit in the world and Canada would become self-sufficient in oil because of Hibernia. They gave it top

MR. NEARY:

priority. They could not give it any higher rating than they did a few years ago. What is APEC now saying in their Atlantic report, Mr. Speaker, that came out last month? How do they now rate Hibernia? Well, Mr. Speaker, offshore development, Grand Banks, 1985 - 1990, they give it a medium probability, Mr. Speaker. Maybe it will go, maybe it will not.

MR. TOBIN:

Why?

MR. NEARY:

Why? Because of the attitude and because of the failure and the blunders of this administration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me see how the people of Newfoundland feel about the way the situation is being handled. I have here in front of me -

MR. CARTER:

Table it.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, I will table it. I have here in front of me today's Evening Telegram and I think this sums up the situation very well, Mr. Speaker: "Peckford's stand benefits Nova Scotia." "Any taxpayers who feel that Premier Peckford is saving them a few dollars by hanging tough with the teachers should ask themselves how much he is saving them by hanging tough with the oil companies and the federal government. By driving the oil companies out of his Province, our Premier is pouring billions of dollars into the Nova Scotia economy. Nova Scotians love him," referring to the Premier. "Nero was an emperor of Rome who fiddled while Rome burned. Our Nero, our Brian fiddles with a few dollars taken out of the teachers' pockets while Nova Scotia burns with oil related activity. While he presides over an economic disaster at home, across the Gulf Nova Scotians prosper from his efforts on their behalf. Newfoundlanders will regret Brian Peckford ever -

MR. TOBIN:

Learn how to read, boy. Go back to school.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, listen to this:

"Newfoundlanders will regret Brian Peckford even more than they now deplore Churchill Falls." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty hard stuff. It is pretty hard to take, Mr. Speaker. Now the administration have put themselves in a corner, in a very difficult spot, in a very difficult

MR. NEARY: position. It will be much tougher and much harder now to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Canada than it was in January or February of this year.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately the Government of Canada is not hanging tough. The Government of Canada is trying to create jobs and get on with the development of the resource and that is obvious by the announcements that are being made by Mr. Rompkey and Mr. Chretien and other representatives of the Government of Canada who are talking about twelve or fourteen oil rigs drilling off our coast this year, about creating jobs for Newfoundlanders and business for industry associated with the offshore, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, this amendment or the resolution will do no good at all unless the administration is prepared to take the initiative once we pass this resolution, which I hope will get unanimous support of the House, Mr. Speaker. If the members of this House vote unanimously to support the resolution as amended, then it is up to the Premier and his Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall), to take the initiative and take the advice of the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who now supports our point of view, and we welcome his support, Mr. Speaker. The member for Mount Scio now agrees with this side of the House. He is opposed to the policies of his party. He is speaking out publicly against his party. He refuses to toe the party line on this matter. He is now supporting the Opposition in their endeavour to try to get an offshore agreement, a negotiated agreement and we welcome his support, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that the hon. gentleman continues to speak out as he has done in the last few weeks. But it will

MR. NEARY: all be in vain, it will be wasted, my resolution and the hon. gentleman's amendment will be useless, will be a useless exercise unless the Premier and the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) in this Province take the initiative and open up negotiations immediately with the Government of Canada and try to fulfill the mandate that was given them on April 6th. of last year, and that is to get a negotiated agreement on the offshore resources.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

All those in favour of the amendment, 'Aye'. Those against the amendment, 'Nay'. Carried.

All those in favour of the resolution as amended, 'Aye'. Those against, 'Nay'. The motion is carried.

It being 6:00 o'clock on Private Members' Day, I do now leave the Chair until three of the clock tomorrow, Thursday.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

April 27, 1983

Tabled by Hon. Minister of
Municipal Affairs,
27 April, 1983.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MONDAY, MARCH 28, 1983

QUESTION NO. 78

MR. HISCOCK (Eagle River) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION:

All correspondence relating to the Department's dismissal in 1982 of the elected Council of Paradise and the appointment of a three (3) man committee to run the Town.

ANSWER:

Having regard to litigation relative to the action taken against the Town Council of Paradise, which is presently before the Courts, it would not be appropriate to table the requested information at this time.

*Tabled by Hon. Minister
of Municipal Affairs,
12 April, 1983*

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1983

QUESTION NO. 103

MR. HISCOCK (Eagle River) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION:

- (a) A list of expenditures, under the heading "Regional Appeals Board", for 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83 and 1983-84 (projected) detailing: Members of the Board, their expenses for travel, and other miscellaneous items, and their salaries paid to each member for the above years.
- (b) A list of meetings held in the past year;
- (c) A list of expenditures for professional services - for above years, listing individuals or firms contracted.

ANSWER:

See Attached Schedule.

SCHEDULE FOR QUESTION 103

The following is a list of expenditures of
the Region Appeal Boards as requested by
Mr. Eugene Hiscock (MHA Eagle River)

(a)

EASTERN REGION APPEAL BOARD

<u>Member</u>		<u>1980-81</u>	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>Projected 1983-84</u>
George Innes	Travel	\$ -	\$ 123.44	\$ 75.00	\$ 200.00
	Per Diem Allowance	2,825.00	2,200.00	1,900.00	2,000.00
K. Pendergast	Travel	90.60	99.12	26.57	100.00
	Per Diem Allowance	2,575.00	2,205.00	1,650.00	1,500.00
Mrs. E.J. Carter	Travel	-	18.00	-	100.00
	Per Diem Allowance	2,320.00	1,995.00	1,575.00	1,500.00
Eric Butler	Travel	1,262.49	1,412.37	711.65	800.00
	Per Diem Allowance	1,670.00	1,700.00	1,125.00	1,200.00
R. Fagan	Travel		(RESIGNED)		
	Per Diem Allowance	925.00	630.00		
Ray Picco	Travel			164.00	800.00
	Per Diem Allowance			300.00	1,000.00

CENTRAL REGION APPEAL BOARD

W. French	Travel	\$	\$ 62.40	\$ 110.36	\$ 150.00
	Per Diem Allowance	600.00	550.00	600.00	600.00
N. James	Travel	27.60	55.60	-	100.00
	Per Diem Allowance	315.00	390.00	150.00	300.00

<u>Member</u>		<u>1980-81</u>	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>Projected 1983-84</u>
C. Locke	Travel	\$ 100.80	\$ 116.20	\$ 39.80	\$ 100.00
	Per Diem Allowance	315.00	210.00	150.00	300.00
R. Short	Travel	-	-	-	100.00
	Per Diem Allowance	-	-	-	300.00
C. Abbott	Travel	-	-	16.40	100.00
	Per Diem Allowance	450.00	180.00	150.00	300.00

WESTERN REGION APPEAL BOARD

P. Seaward	Travel	\$ -	\$ 39.20	\$ 37.20	\$ 200.00
	Per Diem Allowance	-	300.00	700.00	1,500.00
D. DiCesare	Travel	-	-	(REPLACED)	
	Per Diem Allowance	1,575.00	1,150.00		
J. Murdock	Travel	475.08	205.62	(REPLACED)	
	Per Diem Allowance	1,410.00	815.00		
T. Ryan	Travel	335.06		(RESIGNED)	
	Per Diem Allowance	1,045.00			
W. Downey	Travel	1,531.61	1,089.00	783.75	800.00
	Per Diem Allowance	1,675.00	1,040.00	900.00	1,000.00
A. O'Reilly	Travel	-	159.60	150.00	
	Per Diem Allowance		225.00	825.00	1,000.00
D. Warren	Travel		89.16	74.40	100.00
	Per Diem Allowance		150.00	450.00	600.00
R. Janes	Travel			54.00	200.00
	Per Diem Allowance			225.00	600.00

LABRADOR REGION APPEAL BOARD

<u>Member</u>		<u>1980-81</u>	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>Projected 1983-84</u>
N. Avery	Travel		(RESIGNED)		
	Per Diem Allowance			\$ 200.00	\$
C. Moreau	Travel			336.28	500.00
	Per Diem Allowance			300.00	500.00
C. House	Travel			334.78	500.00
	Per Diem Allowance			300.00	500.00
J. Shea	Travel				500.00
	Per Diem Allowance				800.00
J. Pardy	Travel				500.00
	Per Diem Allowance				500.00
A. Flowers	Travel				500.00
	Per Diem Allowance				500.00

- - - - -

(b) The number of meetings held by Region Appeal Boards during the fiscal year 1982-83 were as follows:

Eastern	9
Central	3
Western	5
Labrador	1

(c) Professional services under Appeal Boards covers the per diem rates paid to members. There are no other individuals or firms retained. There would also be approximately \$3,000.00 expended for advertising appeals as required under the Act.