

VOL. 2

NO. 2

SECOND SESSION OF THE  
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before we get into the friendly hour, I thought I had better give the House a report with respect to a telex that I forwarded to the hon. Jean Chretien on Saturday morning, as well as his response to me, which came to hand only about half an hour ago, and that is why I do not have a formal statement as such. I have given a copy of the telexes to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). I apologize. I do not have a formal statement, but I do want to read the text of the telexes and make a certain comment with respect to them.

On Saturday morning I received a telex from Mr. Mason, President of Mobil Canada, indicating that Mobil Canada and the partners would be here in St. John's on Monday at 7:00 p.m. for the purpose of a meeting with these people to discuss the defiance of our order to cease Winter drilling and matters relating to Winter drilling. As soon as I got that I sent a message to the hon. John Chretien at his office and, because it was Saturday, his home address as well. I will give the text of it here. 'Since issuing our order to cease Winter drilling we have been attempting to arrange a meeting with Mobil and all partners to discuss with them all matters relating to the order and their non-compliance with it. It was only this morning that I received notification from Mobil that the companies concerned can be in St. John's at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 7, to meet with government. The meeting will be held in the Cabinet Room at Confederation Building. At that meeting we shall once again be drawing to the attention of

MR. MARSHALL: the companies the circumstances and factors, the urgency of which required us to issue that order and which still requires compliance with it. Included in our discussion will be the presentation of a report prepared by our Petroleum Directorate after consultation with other experts and agencies such as the International Ice Patrol.

'We remain as firmly convinced as ever that a reasonable and prudent assessment of facts would lead to no other conclusion than Winter drilling should be halted for the remainder of this season.

'I really believe from public statements you have made that you are not fully aware of the facts which point to the seriousness and urgency of the situation. I therefore invite you to personally attend with me that meeting in St. John's Monday evening.

'I sincerely believe once you are aware of the facts and circumstances upon which we based our decision, you will fully appreciate the potential enormity of the consequences of continued ignoring of our order.

'I do hope you can attend that meeting and will be very happy to welcome you there.'

The following response, as I say, came to hand about twenty minutes ago that I will read it in total as well.

It is addressed to me from  
Mr. Chretien, and

MR. MARSHALL:

it reads as follows: "I have received your Telex with respect to your meeting this evening with Mobil and its partners. I understand that tonight's meeting was originally scheduled for last Thursday. At that time you did not see fit to invite me or any federal representatives. You suggest I am not familiar with the facts respecting operating conditions off-shore Newfoundland. This is not so. Safety is my uppermost priority and therefore my most senior officials keep me fully briefed on a daily basis about weather and ice conditions affecting drilling operations.

"Winter drilling is proceeding under conditions which are within the safety standards agreed upon by the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland last November. At that time our two governments agreed that drilling on the Grand Banks should continue throughout the Winter.

"It is true that ice conditions off the East Coast are unusual this season. There is heavy pack ice near the shore and an unusual number of icebergs. However, the pack ice does not affect drilling rigs operating some 280 kilometers from shore. There are no icebergs presently threatening the safety of the crews or their rigs. The nearest iceberg is grounded sixty-three kilometers Northwest of the West Venture rig. The next closest is 300 kilometers Northwest. No icebergs pose a threat at this time for drilling operations. Nevertheless, in addition to the normal iceberg watch, three ice patrol aircrafts are flying daily to survey ice conditions, two by Mobil and one by the atmospheric Environment Service. The International Ice Patrol also sends out a plane from Gander for the same purpose.

MR. MARSHALL: "Mobil as operator is also confident that operating conditions are well within safety limits. Mobil has standing instructions from me to cease operations at any time it has reason to believe that safety requires such action. And if I ever had such a belief I would exercise my jurisdiction to make these orders necessary to ensure safety.

"I regret to say once again that you are using safety as a political tool."

AN HON. MEMBER: That is untrue.

MR. MARSHALL: "It is too much of a coincidence that you issued your 'order' just after the Newfoundland Court of Appeal decision on jurisdiction. If you were not playing politics, you would have been prepared to consult with federal officials. COGLA's chief engineer, Mr. Leo Brandon, was in St. John's meeting with your officials in the Petroleum Directorate the day you issued your 'order', but he was not told about your concerns. Further, Sunday, February 27th., you refused to allow your officials to meet with COGLA officials and Mobil to discuss operating conditions offshore.

"I note that you now want to resume a co-operative assessment of conditions offshore. I therefore ask Mr. Brandon, who is my chief engineer responsible for offshore operations, to attend the meeting this evening. I look forward to receiving Mr. Brandon's report of your meeting. I can assure you and the families and friends of all of those working offshore that while there are dangers inherent in offshore oil and gas operations at any time, I would not allow operations to continue unless safety standards and conditions are met in all seasons."

Now just a brief comment on that Telex, Mr. Speaker, so that I can put it in context.

First of all I can say

MR. MARSHALL:

I sincerely and deeply regret that Mr. Chretien cannot personally attend the meeting as I had asked him because I really believe that if the gentleman were in attendance here tonight before the companies, and if he did have an opportunity to assess the report that has been prepared by the Petroleum Directorate on the basis of independent evidence, that he would come to an entirely

MR. MARSHALL:

different conclusion than the conclusion indicated in this Telex and from his statements themselves. When the gentleman says in his Telex that, 'I understand tonight's meeting was originally scheduled for last Thursday' and he was not invited last Thursday, now is that a reason for not attending a meeting tonight? You know, I cannot see it. Originally the meeting of Thursday was convened for the purpose of discussing the defiance of the companies with the order of the provincial government. We expanded it when it could not be held last Thursday to discuss the urgency of the facts relating to the matter and it was with a sincere desire to see that Mr. Chretien was fully apprised of this that I sent him the telex.

He talks about Winter drilling and that the two governments agreed that drilling on the Grand Banks could continue throughout the Winter. I would add, not wishing to be argumentative, that one of the things in the statement was that we presumed there would be an adequate presence of Search and Rescue, which was proven not to be on February 16th and 17th. Furthermore, those Winter drilling regulations, Mr. Speaker, were not written in stone. And it was the Government of Newfoundland, by the way, let nobody mistake it, which promulgated those guidelines. And we consulted with the federal government. But the fact of the matter is that neither Newfoundland nor Canada, while they might prescribe the guidelines for Winter drilling, Mr. Speaker, it is nature which prescribes the conditions in which those guidelines operate and it was nature that came in with all its fury on February 16th and 17th which

MR. MARSHALL: required us to have an objective assessment of it. And the review is necessary. I repeat just again, the review of that is necessary because of that experience of February 16th and 17th, as has been made fully public, because of the response of Search and Rescue and because, very importantly, Mr. Speaker, of the forecast of such concerns as the International Ice Patrol which comes out with such startling statistics that in the area of Hibernia this year there are 120 icebergs which were sighted as compared to 40 in 1972. And in 1972 it happened to be the worst year on record for ice conditions. If you take the International Ice Patrol statistics since 1900, you will find in this area an average of 9 per year balanced out over the period of time as opposed to 120 this year. And that is the reason for our concern and our deep and our heightening concern. It is no answer, as the hon. gentleman says, to say that there are no icebergs presently threatening the West Venture. There were no icebergs threatening the West Venture, Mr. Speaker, the Monday before the Wednesday, and on Wednesday you had a tempest, an inferno in the North Atlantic with 68 foot waves, 80 knot winds and a 100,000 ton iceberg threatening the West Venture with another one within 14 miles of the West Venture and another one within 5 or 6 miles. And this situation can - God help that it does! - but it can pertain at any given time when you consider the scientific facts available. An item that I would draw to everybody's attention that I think is very sad here - and I identify it because the people in the press have not got the telex yet, but they will - but I particularly draw their attention to Paragraph 8, where it says that 'Mobil as operator is also confident that operating conditions are well within safety limits. Mobil

MR. MARSHALL: has standing instructions from me to cease operations at any time it has reason to believe that safety requires such action. And if I ever had such a belief, I would exercise my jurisdiction to make these orders necessary.. Now, here you go, You see, Mr. Speaker, all of the onus is on Mobil. They are going to leave it to a company that is drilling out there the entire decision with respect to safety of individuals concerned. Are they not just a little bit concerned, as we are, Mr. Speaker, that there might be a slight conflict of interest between the economic desires of that company not to lose money and the safety of workers themselves? So, Mr. Speaker, this is an indication of the federal government's complete capitulation of responsibility -

MR. WARREN:

Bunkum! Bunkum!

MR. MARSHALL:

If the hon. gentleman over there, who seems to want to interrupt in a very serious matter, would know anything about the federal regulations, he would also know that inherent in the federal regulations is precisely that they rely on the companies. We do not rely on the companies; we rely on the Petroleum Directorate, the International Ice Patrol and independent factual agencies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention this business of it being political and this business of jurisdiction. Look, he talks of Mr. Brandon having been in. He mentions it; it is not my penchant to mention names of public servants, But he has it in the Telex that Mr. Brandon was in the Petroleum Directorate, and so he was that afternoon. So he was fully informed, Mr. Speaker, of all of the facts relating to the situation on the basis of which we were going to make a decision. But obviously

MR. MARSHALL: no public servant could presume what the decision of Cabinet would be. They were told that day exactly in full force of all the seriousness of the factors that led us to the decision; they were brought before them.

When he talks about 'You refused to allow your officials to meet with COGLA officials that day,' yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly did, because Mr. Mason, the person whom me relies on so avidly, called me up and said to me he wanted to have this meeting. And it ~~was quite obvious he wanted to have a technical meeting to~~ give the impression that this Province was reconsidering the rationale of its decision to stop Winter drilling. This government is not going to reconsider that, Mr. Speaker, In the light of the experience of February 16th and 17th, in the light, Mr. Speaker, of the inadequacy, the proven inadequacy of Search and Rescue, and in the light of the reports from concerns like the International Ice Patrol, Mr. Speaker, anybody who want to reconsider their position knowing those facts - if they do not know the facts you can say, 'The poor individuals do not know the facts' - if they know the facts, though, Mr. Speaker, and they permit it when they have any moral or legal responsibility, you could only style and describe them as complete and absolute madmen.

So that is why, Mr. Speaker, I did not agree with that. At the same time, I indicated that I wanted to speak with the oil companies with respect to their defiance of the order and that is the purpose of the meeting tonight, and that is the real pity, Mr. Speaker, as to why the federal minister cannot see his way clear to come down. I genuinely regret his attitude, I regret his whole attitude with respect to these things since the breakdown of the negotiations. I regret that the hon.

MR. MARSHALL: gentleman has to descend to depths of questioning the integrity, the good faith and the bona fides of individuals.

This whole situation, Mr. Speaker, is extremely serious, and I want to say to this House that my concern, the government's concern, the people on

MR. W. MARSHALL: this side of the House, and I hope all Newfoundlanders, is to realize, have an appreciation of the potential gravity of that situation out there on the Grand Banks and to get those rigs in. Then after this regrettable episode is over, and we get that as a result of telegrams like this, I think all Newfoundlanders can afford then to wring their hands in frustrations and wonder what will happen to the offshore when responsibility lies with a government that so obviously is prepared from 2,000 miles away to listen to nobody but the oil companies, and at the same time there is reasonable and probable grounds to believe, on the basis of independent assessments, that the lives of the people who are working out there are in danger.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that the official position of the Liberals in this Province for over a year now has been that Winter drilling be banned. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we were not able to persuade the hon. gentleman who just spoke, and his boss and the administration, to follow our suggestion and that was to ban Winter drilling. The matter has been raised in this House, it was raised in this House on two or three occasions in the last session, and I have the hon. gentleman's comments here in Hansard, when the hon. gentleman refused point-blank to listen to a very valid suggestion and recommendation that we made from this side of the House. The hon. gentleman pooh-poohed it because it was made from this side of the House. Last October and November, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues agreed to allow Winter drilling, Mr. Speaker. They dediced to allow

MR. S. NEARY: Winter drilling and they allowed Winter drilling in November, December, January and up to a few days ago when the hon. gentleman took his decision to order the rigs to come in to shore. The situation in January was just as bad as it was when the hon. gentleman took his decision. So Mr. Chretien may be right in asking the hon. gentleman why he decided to wait until the Newfoundland Appeals Court had made its decision before he decided to do something about this matter. We brought a resolution to the National Liberal Party Convention in Ottawa in November and had it passed to ban Winter drilling, that is how serious we were about it, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. gentleman pooh-pooed everything that we said about Winter drilling. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed, I am amazed to hear from Mr. Chretien's telegram that he had a meeting ten days ago and invited the hon. gentleman to send along an official to that meeting and the hon. gentleman refused to send an official to attend a meeting that was convened by Mr. Chretien on this very matter.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it would almost seem to us from the way the hon. gentleman has been conducting himself in this matter, I am almost convinced that he is hoping that something will happen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is not within ~~the rules of this House to impugn the motives of anybody,~~ and I do not think that anybody could impugn the motives of anybody in a more diabolical fashion. I would ask that the hon. gentleman withdraw that remark?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is certainly a very good procedural point that hon. members are not permitted to impugn motives of other hon. members and I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) not to do so.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, it does not make any sense for the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) to come here to attend a meeting.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: As I Had' understood Your Honour's ruling, I thought Your Honour's ruling was to the extent that you are not allowed to impute motives, that the hon. gentleman was imputing motives and that the hon. gentleman is duly bound to withdraw.

MR. NEARY: You do not run the House, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

The Speaker made his ruling.

Mr. Speaker, to that point of

order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to

me that the minister is challenging the Speaker's ruling, Mr.

Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Withdraw.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon.

gentleman wishes to challenge Your Honour's ruling, there is

a procedure. The hon. gentleman cannot stand in his place

in this House and challenge the Speaker's ruling and expect to

get away with it.

So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker,

that all my hon. friend is doing is trying to cut into my time

because he cannot stand the criticism that is being levelled at

him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The Chair ruled that it is

certainly out of order for any hon. member to impugn the motives

of another hon. member. The Chair did not give the opinion

that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was doing

so, and certainly did not get the idea from the President of

Council (Mr. Marshall) that he was challenging the Speaker's

ruling.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, it would seem -

AN. HON. MEMBER:

Sit down! Sit down!

MR. NEARY:

Would the hon. lapdog keep quiet

for a few minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! hear!

MR. NEARY: It does not want to make any sense, Mr. Speaker, for the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) to come here to attend a meeting set up by the Minister of - well, I do not know. I am not sure if the hon. gentleman is the Minister of Energy or not - set up the hon. Minister without Portfolio, who speaks for the

MR. NEARY: Petroleum Directorate. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman unilaterally tried to shut down the drilling on the Grand Banks without prior consultation with the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien). Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not playing politics, I do not know what is! The hon. gentleman, if he was sincere and genuine in conducting these negotiations, would not rush into the House with his telex and a copy of a telex from Mr. Chretien he received a few minutes ago that he had not time to digest, unless he wanted to play politics. These negotiations are better conducted, Mr. Speaker, in privacy.

MR. MARSHALL: I had time to digest it.

MR. NEARY: Beg your pardon.

MR. MARSHALL: Maybe you would not have time to digest it but I had time to digest it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman admitted when he read Mr. Chretien's telegram that he had only received it a few moments ago. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the hon. gentleman had prior consultation and had communicated his desire to have the rigs brought in off the Grand Banks, if he had to have prior consultation with Mr. Chretien to shut down drilling off the East coast during the Winter months, I am sure that the situation would have been resolved.

It is unfortunate now that we have this squabbling and bickering going on in public, Mr. Speaker. It is just another example of how the Administration cannot sit down to the negotiation table and settle anything. They cannot settle their differences even when it involves the lives of the people who are working offshore.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, we in the Opposition took the position last fall that there should be no further Winter drilling on the Grand Banks until such time as procedures were put in place to evacuate these rigs to protect human life on board of these rigs. We were ignored then, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman ignored calling in the rigs

MR. NEARY: during the worst storm that we had in the Winter so far this year, two or three weeks ago.

The hon. gentleman waited until after the Newfoundland Appeal Court had handed down its decision before taking the drastic action that he took. So, Mr. Speaker, rather than carry on this squabbling and bickering and confrontation that the Administration is noted for in this Province, would it not be better if the hon. gentleman swallowed his pride, admit, Mr. Speaker, that he is now looking like a school boy, that all he is doing is yapping? Yap, yap, yap! That is all you can hear from the hon. gentleman day in and day out. Why does not ~~the Administration swallow their pride and sit down with the~~ federal authorities at the negotiation table and settle this matter Mr. Speaker, before another disaster takes place in this Province. The hon. gentleman was warned before about a disaster and he pooh-poohed it -

MR. WARREN: And he would not listen.

MR. NEARY: - and he would not listen.

MR. WARREN: Right on!

MR. NEARY: And now he is not listening again.

He would prefer, Mr. Speaker, to come in to the House and take to the radio and television and squirt his poison, get his revenge on Ottawa, get out his spite for the Newfoundland Appeal Court for the decision they handed down, instead of going about his business quietly in a statesman-like way and

3

MR. NEARY: sit down to the negotiating table man-fashion and come up with a deal, come up with some kind of an arrangement immediately, Mr. Speaker. I challenge the hon. gentleman to do it immediately, never mind coming into the House trying to get his revenge and his spite out on Ottawa and squirt his poison at Mr. Chretien and Ottawa.

MR. TOBIN: Do you support Chretien?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. lap dog should keep quite when we are talking about serious matters in this House. We are talking about serious matters.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. gentleman to put aside partisan policies for a while, especially on this matter that involves the safety of the workers who are working on the rigs offshore, and sit down man-fashion and see if they cannot come to some kind of an agreement. Never mind the one-upmanship, never mind the hon. gentleman trying to show everybody that he is the boss, he is going to throw his weight around when the Newfoundland Appeals Court told him he was not the boss. Forget that. I know the hon. gentleman is still smarting under that, The hon. gentleman has to forget that and put it aside. The hon. gentleman has to realize, Mr. Speaker, that he is looking sick on this matter, he is looking like a little schoolboy and it is time for the hon. gentleman to behave like a statesman and try to get this matter resolved in the best interest of all concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

It is the general understanding that members of the Opposition replying to a Ministerial Statement are permitted half the time that the minister has taken and the time has expired for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before we continue, I would like to welcome to the galleries a delegation from the Municipal Council of Peterborough in the person of Mayor Hibbs, Deputy Mayor Sheppard and Counsellor Sampson. On behalf of all hon. members I welcome you to the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other Ministerial Statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a subject I want to ask a few questions on, but I would like to ask the hon. the Premier if he can clarify something for me before I ask my questions. It has to do with a statement that the hon. gentleman made a few weeks ago in connection with the appointment of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), when the hon. the Premier stripped the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) of the Mines portfolio and stripped the President of the Council, the Government House Leader, (Mr. Marshall) of the Energy portfolio.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there seems to be confusion over who is the real Minister of Energy in this Province - every time I hear a CBC report they refer to the hon. gentleman, the President of the Council, as Minister of Energy - could I ask the hon. the Premier to tell this House and the people of this Province who is the real Minister of Energy?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I mean, it is really incredible, I think we went through this once before. Just imagine, in this House now today the first question that would be asked in Question Period is the clarification of how

PREMIER PECKFORD:

the Government of Newfoundland operates, I mean by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I find it absolutely incredible, and surely it must demonstrate to the people of the Province just how much the Opposition over there knows about the functioning of government. It is good, Mr. Speaker, that they are on the side of the House, I must say, because they would not know what to do if they did get over here.

Quite some time ago, a long time ago, there were a number of changes made in the operations of government as it related to ministers, And the minister, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), became the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate and the Minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and all the rest of the functions of the ministry of Mines and Energy went with the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor). Just recently there was a change where the Minister of Development was no longer the Minister of Mines and Energy and was transferred to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). Now that is as clear, Mr. Speaker, as I can put it.

There is a Ministry of Mines and Energy which has certain responsibilities. One time the Ministry of Mines and Energy had a whole bunch of responsibilities which also included the Petroleum Directorate and Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. However, the Ministry of Mines and Energy right now is not responsible for the Petroleum Directorate and the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. That is the responsibility of the President of Council (Mr. Marshall). All of the other things which flow naturally under the Minister of Mines and Energy is still under the Ministry of Mines and Energy. I do not think I can make it any clearer than that to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I have on a number of occasions tried to inform

PREMIER PECKFORD: him, explain it to him, explain it to the press and so on. So that is the situation, Mr. Speaker. The President of Council (Mr. Marshall), the Government House Leader, is the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate. He is the minister responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. And then the Ministry of Mines and Energy - there are energy elements left in the ministry, plus the mines part of it - is the responsibility now of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

MR. WARREN: You are not confused, are you?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, no. I know the hon. member opposite is still confused. We have seen quite a bit of evidence of the hon. member's contribution to this House over the last couple of years. Undoubtedly, Mr. Speaker, when I sit down the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) will still be confused and, you know, that is all I can do. I can only ask the press and the rest of the members whether they understand the situation. I did not say when I got up here, Mr. Speaker, that I intended to ensure that the member for Torngat Mountains understood what I was going to say. I never said that, Sir. I can only leave that for the other members of the Opposition to explain to the member for Torngat Mountains what I have said, and if he would like, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are hon. members in the backbench who can, after the Question Period is over, have a little meeting with the member for Torngat Mountains and explain to him what it was the Premier said in the House this afternoon.

MR. SIMMS: A good answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is about as clear as mud. And it must be obvious to everyone that the Premier does not understand how the British Parliamentary system operates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in case the hon. gentleman does not realize what he is saying, let me tell him what he is saying; he is saying that the President of the Council, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is a minister without portfolio responsible for the Petroleum Directorate and for the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation. That is what the hon. gentleman is saying. And from now on I hope when people are referring to the hon. gentleman that they will say, 'Minister without Portfolio'. The gentleman does not have a full-fledged department of government.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Nobody is arguing that point.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, nobody is arguing it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) never asked me whether he is minister without portfolio.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

As all hon. members know, there is thirty minutes allocated for the Question Period, and I am sure that the answers as well as the questions should be brief.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now that we have that matter clarified we now know who to put the questions to regarding certain responsibilities. I am glad that I reminded the Premier that there is such a thing as a minister without portfolio. Let me start out by asking the Premier a question about a statement made by the former Minister of Energy in this Province, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who apparently appeared to be awfully disturbed and upset over the fact that the gentleman responsible for the Petroleum Directorate did not consult with the federal Minister of Energy before making a unilateral decision to cancel Winter drilling. Now what does the hon. gentleman have to say about the former Minister of Energy, who now sits on the government side of the House, what does he think of that statement? Is the member for Mount Scio correct when he makes that statement? Was there indeed no prior consultation with Mr. Chretien before the minister took his decision or was there consultation? And if there was not consultation, why not? And was the hon. member for Mount Scio correct when he said that it has always been the custom and tradition in the past, when the hon. gentleman was Minister of Energy, to have prior consultation with the Government of Canada before decisions of this magnitude, of this nature were carried out?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know how many questions are there, Mr. Speaker, but I guess I will be allowed the liberty to answer them so that it does not -

MR. L. SIMMS: If he wants the answers.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, if he wants the answers. It might take me a little while to answer them, Mr. Speaker. Number one, the member from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is entitled to make whatever statements he wishes to make and he has made some. And I think on that occasion, as I informed him a few days ago, some of the statements the member for Mount Scio made he indicated, he qualified his answer by saying, 'Now, I do not have all the information or all the facts on this matter,' and of course, as I indicated to him, he did not have all of the facts as it related to this matter when he made his statement. So I agree with the hon. the member for Mount Scio in his statement that he did not have all of the information. Obviously, how could he have all of the information if he was not a part of the government decision? So that is what I have to say on what the member for Mount Scio had to say. And I am sure the member for Mount Scio can speak for himself in or outside of this House and if the Leader of the Opposition wants to speak to him or ask a question or two about it afterwards or some other time I am sure the member for Mount Scio will, either in a speech or in a consultation with the Leader of the Opposition, talk to him about it. As it relates to the incident itself, government was faced with a very, very difficult situation. We had another storm brewing offshore and we were apprised and possessed of a whole bunch of facts relating to February 16 and 17. And the day we made the decision to order a stop to drilling we had to say, 'Will we wait for the next day or two-when there was a storm on the horizon much the same as the previous storm-and take a chance that this second

March 7, 1983

Tape No. 48

MJ - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: storm would cause a disaster or not?

Armed with the information that

PREMIER PECKFORD:

we had that day from the Petroleum Directorate, we were not willing to take that chance, Mr. Speaker. As it turned out, who was to know? The storm did not stop like the other one did exactly, it did not intensify to the degree that the other one did exactly, and therefore there was no disaster - but that is all after the fact. We were armed with a lot of information over several hours which told us that what had happened on February 16 and 17 was a very dangerous situation and there could have been a major disaster. Armed with that information, we felt we had no other alternative in thinking about the safety of the people offshore, knowing that the West Venture could not propel itself, knowing that the West Venture on February 16 and 17 could not shed its anchors when it tried to, knowing that people had not detected an iceberg until it got within a number of kilometers of the rig - it was not detected all the way up to, I think it was eleven kilometers, was the first time that it was detected. It was not detected at twelve kilometers or thirteen kilometers or twenty kilometers knowing that the helicopters could not land in part of that storm when it was really serious because it was freezing rain. Armed with all of this information, if something had happened and this House opened today, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would have gotten up in his place and he would have said, 'Mr. Speaker, I understand from 'my sources' that the Premier of this Province and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and a number of ministers were armed with information from February 16 and 17 knowing that a disaster could have occurred out there. And even with this information, and knowing that another storm was brewing just like the one on February 16, the Government of Newfoundland failed to exercise its at least moral authority to the people out there by ordering those rigs in.' That is what the Leader of the Opposition would

PREMIER PECKFORD:                    have said today rather than  
what he is saying now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:                    Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:                    And, Mr. Speaker, I was not  
willing and the government was not willing to take that chance,  
so we had to move swiftly. We had the information; the document  
will become public tomorrow after we meet with the companies  
tonight. And as soon as we made the decision, we communicated  
it to the federal government. But because there was a storm  
brewing that day if there had been no storm and there had  
been nothing there that was going to impinge upon safety  
obviously full consultation would have taken place - but with  
the circumstances of that day, knowing what we knew of February  
16 and 17, knowing that another storm was brewing and following  
the same path as the one on

PREMIER PECKFORD:

February 16th and 17th, we took what we felt was the only responsible action we could have taken at that time and that was get them out of there before that storm comes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has no problem using an instrument, an invention by Alexander Graham Bell when he wants to, he has no problem with telexes when he wants to use telexes, and they seem to be going out of the Province now daily aimed at criticizing Ottawa: Why did the hon. gentleman not pick up his phone and follow the tradition that was - and I am not trying to embarrass the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), by the way; I am not trying to put the hon. gentleman in the hot seat. There are an awful lot of people in Newfoundland and Labrador who respect the hon. gentleman and agree with his position and agree with what the hon. gentleman is saying, Mr. Speaker. But instead of having this confrontation, why did they not pick up the phone and call Mr. Chretien or call his office and say, 'Look, we are thinking about calling the rigs in from the Grand Banks'? Why did they not have prior consultation on the phone? It would have only taken five minutes, Mr. Speaker. We could not persuade the hon. gentleman a year ago to ban Winter drilling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's answer is so full of holes that it is almost as bad as the satellite station at Shoe Cove, which I will deal with in

MR. NEARY: a few moments. Why did the hon. gentleman not pick up the phone and have five or ten minutes of consultation instead of making a unilateral decision?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is easy to answer.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in all the consultation that we have had with COGLA during that February 16th and 17th storm, it was obvious to us that on the day that we made that decision to order in the rigs ~~that there was absolutely no way that the~~ Minister of Energy in Ottawa (Mr. Chretien) could be sensitized to the importance of this situation. It was impossible. COGLA did not even know there was a storm off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador on February 16th and 17th, it was just a normal meteorological activity with no intensity to it, no danger to it. We were the ones, Mr. Speaker, who had to order Search and Rescue out of Greenwood, Nova Scotia, and out of Summerside. We were the ones who had to set up all the contingency plans, and if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants to take the position now that suddenly the decision that we made to try to get those rigs in out of there before that storm would happen - we telexed the Minister of Energy immediately as we took the decision, but we knew, Mr. Speaker, as we later found out, the federal government are putting all their eggs in the basket of whatever the company says is safe that is what is safe. The evidence is overwhelming, Mr. Speaker, that this would not have mattered a hoot to the federal government. We knew it on February 16th and 17th because COGLA would not get themselves - there were only three people here, one person who is in charge; the people in Ottawa and the people here

PREMIER PECKFORD: did not realize the seriousness of the situation.

That brings us right back to the whole business of management and control of the thing. This is what we have been saying right from the start: even on safety things, somebody 2,000 miles away cannot be sensitized to it, they were not brought up to it and they do not understand it. Mr. Chretien's people had been informed February 16th, February 17th and right on through the bit and piece about the seriousness of it. ~~They did not take it with the degree of seriousness that~~ we did. We knew it, we knew it in our heart and soul, we knew it factually, we had to go and take the action.

And that happens on so many things, not only on offshore, it happens on the fishery every day and it happens in other areas, where Newfoundlanders and Labradorians believe and think that the Government of Newfoundland has this power or that power, 'Oh, but you understand and they do not; therefore, you give me the lobster licence, even though it comes under federal control. It goes on a whole range of things.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And on this one, Mr. Speaker, the evidence is overwhelming that the federal government were not on February 16th or 17th, or thereafter, sensitized to just how important this is, and that is why we would like to get it to Mr. Chretien directly. They still do not understand. And that telegram there today, read by the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, is a case in point. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) for Canada is saying, 'If Mobil believes it is too bad out there, Mobil will come in.' Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry. I do not have that kind of confidence in companies who have to look at their balance sheet and also look at safety. That is the responsibility of the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and we should not try to slough it off on the companies. We are responsible for the safety of those workers and not the corporations who are trying to make a profit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should be well aware of where the Leader of the Opposition stands on these matters. It was the Leader of the Opposition who first mentioned in this Province, or probably in Canada, about banning drilling off our coast during the Winter months and the hon. gentleman would not listen. Now he is a Johnny-come-lately, Mr. Speaker, and he is trying to take the ball now and run with it for political reasons. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's answer is so full of holes that it is almost as bad as the one on the tracking station down at Shoe Cove, when on February 15th the hon. gentleman told the people of this Province through a news conference that he held that the Shoe Cove tracking

MR. NEARY: station provided up to date data on iceberg movement, the location and character of pack ice and sea state conditions. Mr. Speaker, that statement was completely untrue. How can we ever believe anything the hon. gentleman ever says again?

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: You know, this is the Question Period and the hon. gentleman is making a speech, he is into Supplementary Questions. I am sure there are lots of people in the House who would like to ask questions during Question Period. There is a time for a speech and there is a time for questions and the hon. gentleman's preambles are too long.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair today has mentioned the fact that there are only thirty minutes allocated for the Question Period and there are a number of hon. members, I guess, who would like to ask some questions. Again I can only repeat and ask hon. members for their co-operation in keeping their answers and their questions as brief as possible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier why he made that statement to the people of this Province when we are told that the government knew that it was not true that the Shoe Cove Satellite Station tracked icebergs?

MR. TOBIN: Who?

MR. NEARY: Who what?

MR. TOBIN: Who told you?

MR. NEARY: I will come to that shortly. But I want to ask the Premier why he made that statement to try to mislead the Newfoundland people if he knew, if indeed he did know, that at the time he made the statement that it was incorrect, it was untrue,



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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is trying to say that the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station should be removed from this Province, let him come right out straight and say it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If he is supporting Mr. Chretien and the rest of the federal government on taking away a high technology -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - station from this Province, let him come right out and say it, let him not hide behind trying to use one phrase or another phrase, let him come right out straight. I mean, let us not play games with this thing. Is the Leader of the Opposition and the Liberal Opposition in favour of keeping the Shoe Cove Tracking Station? Are they in favour of seeing the industrial parks go ahead in this Province? Are they in favour that the federal government should have put money into the syncrolift? Are they in favour of the Government of Newfoundland when they said that the Fisheries College should be located in St. John's? Let the Leader of the Opposition come clean, let him not try to hide behind a few weasel words that he is trying to use there now. Let the Leader of the Opposition support the government in keeping what we have here now and stop playing games with technicalities. That is what I ask the Leader of the Opposition to do.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not answer my question. The hon. gentleman knows full well that one of the worst things that a Premier or a minister can do in his capacity as Premier or minister is to lie or deceive

MR. NEARY: or mislead the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not saying that the hon. gentleman did.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is making some inferences which appear to the Chair to be unparliamentary and I would ask him to discontinue that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to ask the hon. gentleman again to tell this House and to tell the people of Newfoundland why he made an incorrect statement on February 15th when he issued a statement here in Confederation Building at a news conference -

MR. WARREN: On the 11th floor.

MR. NEARY: - on the 11th floor when he said that 'more particularly for Newfoundland the Shoe Cove station provided up-to-date data on iceberg movement, the location and character of pack ice and sea state conditions.' Why did the hon. gentleman make that statement if he knew that it was wrong and incorrect and would only have a tendency to mislead people and dupe people in this Province?

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's credibility and his believability is at stake and I ask him to answer the question honestly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition is opposed to removing the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station, let him come out and say so, let him not try to hide behind statements of mine or statements of other people. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition should have been on his feet every when this House was closed and now that this House is open supporting the government in its attempt to have a very valuable

PREMIER PECKFORD: research station stay in this Province. And by doing what he is doing he is ensuring that the federal government gets away with another punishment of Newfoundland.

MR. NFARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: My supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is for the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate. Would the hon. gentleman tell this House, because the integrity of the Premier and his administration is at stake, would the hon. gentleman tell this House whether he intends to stand by a public statement that he made that the government knew when they took a stand on the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station, when they took that stand, and they went public on it, that the government knew that the tracking station was not supplying the oil industry with daily ice information

MR. NEARY: when they began to fight to save this facility. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to stand by that statement?

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

MR. MARSHALL: What a body blow, Mr. Speaker. What a body blow the hon. gentleman is dealing to the administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: I will tell you what the hon. gentleman is trying to do, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He is trying to get Chretien off the hook.

MR. MARSHALL: He is trying to confuse it once again. He is trying to confuse the situation as to the security on the offshore by pointing to the Shoe Cove Tracking station, which he full well knows would be such a valuable addition to the detection of icebergs and weather conditions in the timely manner that is necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But what he is trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to save his friend, Jean, from -

FREMIER PECKFORD: From another embarrassment.

MR. MARSHALL: - embarrassment. Why does not the hon. gentleman address the fact of the Search and Rescue and the fact that it took eighteen hours. He is trying to push that under the table. It took twenty-one hours to get here to St. John's on February 15 and 16. Why does not the hon. gentleman address himself to the ice conditions out in the North Atlantic? Why does not the hon. gentleman, even more importantly, concede the fact that it is necessary to assess the role of the Shoe Cove Satellite Station knowing full well what an aid it can be to the detection of icebergs and weather conditions?

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, these body blows are great body blows.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He had a call this morning ordering him to say what he is saying now.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, he had a call, I am quite sure this morning from his friend, Mr. Chretien, the apologist for the federal government on the other side. Well, that is fine. You can do it. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my concern for the safety and security of offshore operations and the lives of the people involved out there. And, Mr. Speaker, while he is about it -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not through - perhaps the hon. gentleman might exhibit the same degree of concern for the people from Thailand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: If a tracking station is no good for the people of Newfoundland maybe the hon. gentleman can inform his friends in Ottawa that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and it is no good for the people in Thailand either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we are not going to be intimidated by the hon. gentleman. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the government duped the people of this Province, misled the people of this Province by coming out and saying that that station had to remain intact because it provided

MR. NEARY: information on icebergs and ice. And in actual fact, Mr. Speaker, that is not true. Now who is my authority on it for saying it is not true?

Well, in the March 5 edition of The Evening Telegram it says, "Marshall says government was aware station did not provide ice information," None other than the hon. gentleman himself! Only a few days before that we were told by the Premier, and the Cabinet went down to Shoe Cove in force, en masse, a big turn-out - they would not go to Burin to try to save the fish plant, they went down to the satellite station in Shoe Cove -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asking me a question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would like to know who the question is directed to, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WARREN: Sit down, boy! Sit down!

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

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, it will be recorded that this is a sad day in this House; it will be recorded that the Premier would not answer a direct question put to him by the Leader of the Opposition. I will repeat it, and I will give the hon. gentleman a chance to protect his integrity and his honour by asking him again why he made that statement that he did at his press conference, if, as the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) says, the government knew all along that the station did not provide ice information? Why did the Premier say

MR. S. NEARY: that more particularly for Newfoundland the Shoe Cove Station provided -

MR. L. SIMMS: That is what was reported in newspapers.

MR. NEARY: This is not newspapers, this is a press release from the Premier's Office.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are quoting from -

MR. NEARY: I am quoting from - the Premier has not denied it. The hon. gentleman may squirm, the hon. gentleman can squirm all he wants, he is not going to rescue the Premier, he is not going to get his little favours.

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

I would request the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to direct a question to somebody.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier again. Could the hon. gentleman tell the House and tell the people of this Province why he made that statement if, as the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said publicly on Saturday, the government knew all along that this station was not used to track ice and icebergs? Then why did the Premier make that statement? It has nothing to do with me, whether I am for or against dismantling that station. The hon. gentleman's integrity is at stake and his honour is at stake and he should realize that, that the people of this Province may never believe him again, Mr. Speaker, may never believe another word he says.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no question, I guess on the first day that the House opens that the best defense is an offense, and I guess that is what the Leader of the Opposition is trying to do there today. He knows he is in trouble as it relates to not only the Shoe Cove Tracking

PREMIER PECKFORD: Station, but as it relates to the Fisheries College, synchrolift, and every other issue that came up in the Throne Speech last week, that came up before that time. He knows that he has a problem on his hands and I guess he has made a determined effort to try, through picky little things, to show that the government is not doing its job. Now, I admire the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) for that. That is a fine tactical maneuver for the Leader of the Opposition to make. If I were Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I would take the same kind of an approach that the Leader of the Opposition is taking, but that does not mean that now that I am not the Leader of the Opposition, I am the Premier, and he is asking me this question, that I am going to let the Leader of the Opposition off the hook from saying that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland should get its act together and support the government on those things that the federal government are trying to punish us about. It is a good try, Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful try. I admire the Leader of the Opposition in trying to take this tack, but when we see through his tack, when we see through his strategy, Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation to the people of Newfoundland to tell the people of Newfoundland that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to hide away from his Liberal buddies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
The time for Question Period  
has expired.

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills:

A bill entitled "An Act To Amend The Regulation of Mines Act".

"An Act To Amend The Occupational Health and Safety Act".

"An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977".

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills:

"An Act To Repeal Certain Obsolete And Spent Statutes".

"An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act".

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting Dentistry and Dental Surgery In The Province," and "An Act To Amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act".

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend The Livestock (Health) Act," "An Act To Amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, 1973", and "An Act To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following bills: "An Act To Amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act", "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act," "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act," "An Act To Amend The Accident And Sickness Insurance Act, 1971" "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act".

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce two bills, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Education Act", and "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act".

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I stand to present a petition signed by 246 residents from the community of Nain. The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker is quite lengthy, "Whereas the Labrador Services Division of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, operates a retail store in the town of Nain, which is the primary supplier of food to the residents of this municipality; whereas the above named store has the facilities to store and market fresh food products such as fruit, vegetables and dairy products; whereas this same store does not presently provide for sale on a regular basis good quality fresh food products; and whereas it is commonly known that the intake of such fresh food products develops physically and mentally healthier human beings; and whereas such fresh food products are available in other Northern Canadian communities, many with populations much smaller than Nain; now therefore let it be known that the persons who have attached their signatures hereto hereby petition the government of Newfoundland and Labrador to immediately supply the government operated retail store in Nain with a weekly supply of good quality fresh fruits, vegetables and dairy products, ensure that the storage facilities in the Nain store are maintained in good working order to ensure proper storage and to avoid spoilage, and to ensure quick, safe and well secured transportation facilities from point of origin to final destination and provide

MR. WARREN:                   adequate instructions and training to their staff at the Nain store to enable them to display and market only those fresh products which are fit for human consumption and empower the management of the Nain store to reduce the price of such products which are known to be not of top quality.

                                  This appeal to your government is being made to try to get improvements to what we, the residents of Nain, consider as a disgusting situation in regard to the condition of food which is ~~placed on sale in the Nain store and because we are~~ concerned about the health of ourselves, our families and our friends."

                                  Now, Mr. Speaker, there is not much more that I can say in presenting this petition but one thing I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the store in Nain - the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) is responsible for the operation of this store, and the store in Nain - as within the other communities in my district, are not stocked on a weekly basis with fresh fruits, vegetables and milk products. Therefore, it is an obligation of the minister and of the government that he represents to make sure that there is fresh fruit and vegetables for the people in Nain. Only just last week, Mr. Speaker, Bell Island was cut off for one week without water transportation and all of a sudden the water bombers were bringing over fresh fruit and vegetables to Bell Island at no extra cost. I would say, more power to the Bell Islanders for getting fruit and vegetables at no extra cost but the people in my district have to pay an extra 55 cents a pound. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think what is sauce for the goose is sauce also for the gander and therefore, if we are going to

MR. WARREN: supply one community in this Province with fruit and vegetables on a weekly or daily basis then surely goodness, Mr. Speaker, the people in Labrador are entitled to the same treatment.

With this, Mr. Speaker, I will place the petition on the table of this House and let it go to the minister to whom it refers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot remember the number of people who are identified as signing the petition presented by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), but in excess of 200, I think, was the number that he mentioned.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this particular subject has been a topic of discussion between the member for that district, the chairman of the council and some council members from Nain and some of my staff a couple of weeks ago when they visited the area. I advised the member for Torngat and the other people who were in that particular delegation

MR. GOUDIE: that we would be taking a look at the situation which they identified, and we are indeed actually doing that now. There was also a recommendation from one of the people in the delegation that perhaps we should start buying our fresh produce, etc., and shipping it in from Chimo, which I guess is a suggestion at least and one which can be looked at.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that I think it was in the early 1950s that the government of this Province took over or actually installed facilities in several coastal communities of Labrador, when the Hudson Bay company moved out of the area, and have been providing a service since that time. I do not know how it was all financed originally but certainly in recent years it has been financed through what is referred to as the Native People's Agreement, a cost shared agreement between Ottawa and the Government of this Province. And in most communities along the coast new facilities have either been constructed or are being constructed in terms of depots, good storage facilities in them, etc., etc.

The hon. gentleman referred to residents of Bell Island being provided food, I think, by water bombers or some such activity during the situation where ice is infesting the gut or the tickle or whatever it is they call it out there. What is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: I believe it is the tickle.

MR. GOUDIE: The tickle. That is, I guess, a step that had to be taken to provide food for the people of Bell Island. Well, I should point out that it is a little bit of a different matter, Mr. Speaker, to fly food from here to Bell Island via water bomber or anything else than it is to fly food from here or Goose Bay, or Chimo for that matter, or Shefferville, to Nain or any other

MR. GOUDIE: community along the North coast of Labrador. It is an entirely different matter altogether. He mentions that some food items, I do not know which ones, but some food items are an extra fifty-five cents a pound, I think, in the community of Nain. Well I should point out. Mr. Speaker, just as one example, and this is the only example I can think of at the moment, two years ago if we were to fly in a 100 pound sack of potatoes to Nain from Goose Bay it would cost \$100 to do that per sack, so, obviously, some residents in some coastal communities of Labrador are receiving a rather high subsidy at this point in time. But I will conclude by saying it is not true that there is no subsidy. The hon. gentleman obviously does not know what he is talking about, in his own district.

Mr. Speaker, I gave the undertaking at the meeting that we held two or three weeks ago, and I give the undertaking again, that all options will be looked at to provide fresh produce, fruit, etc., etc., to residents of coastal Labrador and as soon as we can put a mechanism in place it will be done.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) on behalf of 246 residents, I believe it is, voters, in the community of Nain in Northern Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say right from the beginning that it is becoming increasingly obvious that something is happening in Northern Labrador. Every service in Northern Labrador seems to be deteriorating, in the last few years. Health services are deteriorating, water and sewer services are installed badly, they freeze up in the Wintertime. And now, Mr. Speaker, we have evidence that the stores that are operated by the government in Northern Labrador are deteriorating. Not only is the cost of living extremely high, where they are paying fifty-five cents a pound more for practically everything than they are on the Island here or in other parts of Labrador, but they just cannot get the produce. They cannot get fresh fruit in the Wintertime. They cannot get fresh vegetables, Mr. Speaker, in the Wintertime. And I hope that this deterioration of services in Northern Labrador is not deliberate, that this neglect is not orchestrated and deliberate so that the hon. gentleman can call in private enterprise.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says, 'No, it is not'. Well, I hope it is not, Mr. Speaker, I hope it is not. I hope it is not being deliberately planned to downgrade services in Labrador, to downgrade these stores in any way, shape or form so that they can put the stores up on bids and invite private enterprise to come in to operate these stores. There has been some talk of it, as the hon. gentleman knows. And the hon. gentleman has indicated in his public statements that he

MR. NEARY: is all for private enterprise operating these stores. Well, I hope the hon. gentleman does not go ahead with inviting private enterprise into Nain without having prior consultation with the people themselves.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: The people, themselves, should have -

MR. GOUDIE: (Inaudible)

or did you hear it from Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. WARREN: What he is saying is right.

MR. NEARY: I hear it all anyway because they call me all the time and tell me -

MR. ROBERTS: How frustrated they are -

MR. NEARY: - how frustrated they are since things started to deteriorate. But, Mr. Speaker, let us hope that it is not true that these services are being deliberately downgraded. Private enterprise may be able to function in the right environment in certain localities, certain regions, but, Mr. Speaker, in Northern Labrador the hon. gentleman has to be very careful. First of all, the store in Nain has to be upgraded. That is what the petitioners are asking for. They are asking to have the store upgraded before the hon. gentleman even considers,

MR. NEARY:

even harbors the thought of inviting private enterprise in to take over that or any other store in Northern Labrador.

MR. GOUDIE: Why?

MR. NEARY: Why what?

MR. GOUDIE: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is what they are asking.

They are asking for better service.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in it.

MR. GOUDIE: Because they ask for it, we have to give it to them?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker that is the trouble.

The hon. gentleman is back to the Conne River situation again.

Mr. Speaker, you can ask the hon. gentleman for anything, he is not going to do it. He does not want to do it. But, what they are saying, the message is coming through from Northern Labrador, is that the hon. gentleman should not lift a finger to discuss these matters with private enterprise until the service and the stores are improved and then, if the hon. gentleman wants to proceed with discussions pro and con as to the government operating the stores or private enterprise operating the stores, then it should only be done with input from the people, prior consultation with the people, and they will decide the course of action, Mr. Speaker

MR. GOUDIE: Will they?

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe the hon. gentleman wants to foist his opinion and his ideas, and he wants to bring his political buddies in to operate these stores. Maybe that is what the hon. gentleman wants, But there is such a thing as democracy and a consensus in opinion. The hon. gentleman may not like it, he may be listening to the Premier, his boss, too much and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). But the fact of the matter is that these people are living in isolation and living in remote

MR. NEARY: areas of the Province and they do have problems that are unique, unique to these communities, Mr. Speaker. And as far as flying produce, fresh produce in, they now have landing strips that are put there by the federal government and, so the hon. gentleman might be well advised to take a look at providing fresh produce to the Northern Labrador communities during the Winter months.

MR. WARREN: The water bomber can land there.

MR. NEARY: Even a water bomber. And, Mr. Speaker, they have an aircraft down from Winnipeg. I do not know but the hon. gentleman was aboard of it. The Dash 7 carries fifty passengers and can land on these landing strips in Northern and Southern Labrador. So the hon. gentleman should not shake his head and shrug his shoulders and dismiss this matter lightly. It is a very serious problem as far as the people of Northern Labrador are concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I hope the hon. gentleman will take steps to remedy this situation at an early a date as possible.

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

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I can bring the attention of the House from the most Northerly community in our Province to a community in my district that is about, I guess, mid-way between here and Nain, the community of Conche.

MR. ROBERTS: I have here a petition signed by 318 of the men and women of Conche. I might add that is about every grown man and woman in the community. It certainly represents the feelings of every man, woman and child in that community.

The prayer of the petition is very short. "We, the undersigned, do strongly protest the decision to close the Grenfell regional nursing station in Conche." I see the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is here and I hope he will have a few words to say because I know he is familiar with the issue.

The petition, Mr. Speaker, is a little unusual in two senses. First of all, it is now badly out of date. It was taken up in November, 1982, it was conveyed to me physically early in January, 1983 when I was in Conche and, of course, since the petition was taken up, the Grenfell Regional Health board at Goose Bay or St. Anthony, wherever they are, I guess their headquarters - the chairman, Mr. Fahey, lives in Goose Bay - have announced their decision to close the station at Conche, and I guess in fact it has been closed in that the permanent staff there, the non-professional staff have been given layoff notices and I guess, in fact, are laid off. So in that sense it is a little unusual in that not only is it late or out of date or out of time because of events but, also, and more importantly, the decision was not directly one taken by this government. Even so, Mr. Speaker, the decision taken by the board within their proper sphere of responsibilities was, of course, one that was dictated to them by the government, by the Minister of Health announcing government policy. He did not say, 'Close Conche,' he did not say, 'Close Englee,' he did not say, 'Lay off people in Melville and do not fill jobs in St. Anthony.'

MR. ROBERTS: What he did say was, 'You cannot have as much money as you need to operate what you have now got. Cut where you wish, but cut.' That is like saying to a person, 'You have to have one of your hands lopped off or one of your feet lopped off but do not blame me because one of your hands or one of your feet is in fact cut off.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the station is closed then we must deal with the situation that results so I will simply say to the minister as a first point that I hope he will find it possible this year to provide the Grenfell board with enough money to enable them to reopen the station. There is no reason it cannot be reopened. Nothing has been changed or altered, nothing has come up to prevent it reopening. The heat is still on, in fact the nurse is still living there; she will be there until June which happens to be her retirement date, an English girl who has been in Conche for about twenty-five years, or, say, on the Coast for about thirty years, in Conche for twenty-one or twenty-two.

So, Mr. Speaker, my first request is very briefly and very sincerely and strongly on behalf of the people of Conche to ask the minister to do what needs to be done, namely, to provide money and then I have no doubt the station will be reopened.

MR. ROBERTS: If he does reopen it, and if it does not reopen it will be the government's doing. Let that be recorded. If he does not reopen it, then let him take what measures he can to alleviate the effects of its closing. I have already written to the board at some length and they have made some moves. I have been in touch with the minister and, more importantly in this connection, with his colleague, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) to point out the most important step that can be taken is to improve the road between Conche and Roddickton, the only road available to these people, the road now over which they must go for everything, including their health services. Formerly they had health services ready to hand in Conche, a very competent nurse, a lady who has been there, as I said, for twenty or twenty-one years, as long as the station has been there.

The Minister of Health (Mr. House) I know will agree with me, the road to Conche, the road between Conche and Roddickton is a disgrace. And when I see what this government are spending money on elsewhere in the Province, and what their priorities are elsewhere, I very seriously wonder about their grasp of reality, that they will not provide the relatively modest sum of money that is needed to enable the road to Conche to be upgraded and improved. It is literally a lifeline for these people, literally a lifeline. So I say to the minister that I would ask him when he stands now to pledge himself to do what he can to bring the ministry to the point of reality with respect to the road and to speak where he can and when he can, and he can speak in places I cannot, he can speak in the Cabinet, he can speak - I do not know if he is on Treasury Board - but he can speak in the financial committees to see that the people of Conche get access to their health services, and to do that they must

MR. ROBERTS: have an improved road. So if he will not reopen the station, which is our first request, the second request is that he provide the money, or that he help his colleagues provide the money to enable them. The people of Conche deserve it in simple justice, and in simple decency.

And I will close, Mr. Speaker, my time is just about up, I will close by saying that we hear a great deal from the Premier and a great deal from his colleagues about justice and decency, and they make deep appeals for this in Canada, and I agree with them, we are entitled to be treated justly and decently, but I would say to the Premier that he should apply the same standards throughout this Island, and throughout this Province, and I will say he does not, that this administration is the most discriminatory, the most - well, now, that is not parliamentary - the most discriminatory, and the most unfair and irrational group of men and women who have ever had the conduct of the affairs of the people of this Province in their hands. So I will leave it for now by simply saying to the Minister of Health that this is a very heartfelt plea that I make in behalf of the people of Conche, I would ask him to do what he can, Sir, to meet these legitimate needs.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to address and accept the petition. The member who presented it, of course, was exactly right when he said the Minister of Health (Mr. House) did not close the clinic. As a matter of fact, it was the board who have the responsibility for providing the medical services in the area. I am familiar with it of course, with the decision by the board to

MR. HOUSE: close that clinic. And if I am correct in the assessment I got from them, they did not think that it would be a big hinderance to the delivery of health care in the Province, there was a clinic reasonably nearby. He was right also with regard to the facility itself. It was not a very up-to-date facility.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will acquaint the Board with the petition, but again I must say we did support them in the closure here because they did not think it was really necessary to good health care delivery in that area.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that I support the petition presented by my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), on behalf of 318 of his constituents. I am not sure if I understood the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House) correctly when he said that they did not seem to be too concerned in the beginning about the closing of that clinic. Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly? Is that what the hon. gentleman said?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: No, I said the Board closed it and they did not seem to think that it was essential to have it open for good health care.

MR. NEARY: The people or the Board?

MR. HOUSE: The Board.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the Board not the people.

MR. HOUSE: Who delivers health care?

MR. NEARY: Because obviously, Mr. Speaker, with 318 voters, adults over the age of eighteen, in that community, signing the petition, I would think they would consider it to be a very serious matter indeed.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman missed the point, the very valid point that was raised by my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, and that is

MR. NEARY: in connection with the condition of the road between Conche and Roddickton. That is the point, the main point of my hon. friend's plea and my hon. friend's request for the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and the Board to reconsider this matter. The hon. gentleman can try to weasel his way out of it all he wants, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman can say yes, we are not directly involved in the decision making, technically speaking that is correct. But indirectly the hon. gentleman is involved and the administration is involved, because they have refused to give the Board, the funds necessary to keep that nursing station open, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman may not be directly involved, he does not sit in on the meetings and make the decision, but the hon. gentleman pulls the strings from the outside, and through his refusal and the refusal of the administration to grant the funds that are necessary to keep that nursing station open in Conche, they are forced to close it down.

So the hon. gentleman should not play with words. The hon. gentleman should reconsider this matter if for no other reason than on the basis of the condition of that road. I am told by my hon. colleague to my right that it is virtually impossible.

MR. NEARY: in the case of a storm, to get an emergency case to Roddickton, back and forth over that road, it is virtually impossible. And, Mr. Speaker, until that road is upgraded and paved, reconstructed probably and paved, government should keep that nursing station open. There is no valid reason for closing it. We have Sir Humphrey Gilbert celebrations that are going to cost \$500,000. We can pay rent for apartments down in Tiffany Place, we can squander and waste and mismanage public funds right, left and center, but when it comes to people's health, Mr. speaker, no stone should be left unturned to make sure that we do not have to close hospital beds or nursing stations, that we are not taking our money so that ministers can trip all over the world, so that we can have Sir Humphrey Gilbert celebrations and the like, that silly nonsense.

MR. WINDSOR: You are against Tourism?

MR. NEARY: Beg your pardon! Mr. Speaker, am I against Tourism? I am against waste and extravagance and squandering taxpayer money. So, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition and I urge the minister and the administration to reconsider their funding to the Grenfell board to enable them to keep this nursing station open.

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

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1. The Address in Reply.  
The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, normally in a time of recession one would have anticipated that this was a difficult Throne Speech to reply to, because even members

MR. LUSH: of the Opposition like to be seen as rational and making responsible statements in reply to the Speech from the Throne. One would not want to be seen, Mr. Speaker, as making political points during hard economic times. Certainly there would have been philosophical differences and ideological differences which one could have debated but, of course, this Throne Speech is completely devoid of any philosophical approach, of any ideological approach, Mr. Speaker. It contains no policies, no programmes at all indicating how the ~~government intend to fight these hard economic times.~~ So, Mr. Speaker, normally one would have anticipated that this would have been a difficult Throne Speech to reply to because one would want to assist the government in helping our people to understand that during these times of scarce financial resources there is only a limited amount that the government can do. And certainly the Opposition would want to have been seen to be a part of that philosophy and certainly not want to raise the expectations of our people or to give them any false hopes or any false impressions, Mr. Speaker. We certainly would have thought that that is the kind of approach that the government would have used. Mr. Speaker, they did not use that approach. There was only one philosophy, there was only one approach used in this particular speech, this 1983-84 Throne Speech and that, of course, was for the

MR. T. LUSH: government to carry on attacking the federal government. That was the clear indication put forward in the Throne Speech. There was no attempt, Mr. Speaker, to try and instruct the people of Newfoundland, to try and enlighten the people of Newfoundland with the crisis that is facing this nation today and to try and appreciate and understand the difficult circumstances which the federal government is in. None of that, Mr. Speaker. The attempt was certainly just to fight Ottawa and lay the blame on the shoulders of the federal government for all the economic woes which this Province is facing. Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of approach that was used in this Throne Speech. We thought it would have been a different one. We thought it would have been an honest approach to tell the people about the financial circumstances not only faced by this Province but by the Canadian nation and thereby to try and get us all united, thereby to try and form a united front so that all of us as Canadians could attack the tremendous problems which we are facing in Canada today, and in the world. But, Mr. Speaker, that was not the approach. The approach was that every other government in Canada is out of step but this one. One, Mr. Speaker, could not help but think of the song, "Oh Lord it's hard to be humble". Mr. Speaker, there was no attempt at all to try and put across to the people of this Province the tremendous financial difficulties that we are in not only as a province but as a nation, just an attempt to blame all of the problems on the federal government. So, Mr. Speaker, it was not difficult to understand the kind of speeches that we heard from the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply. It was uncharacteristically and unusually political. Mr. Speaker, that only sort of - and, as I say, I do not blame

MR. T. LUSH:                   them, I understand it because it sort of was fitting in with the tone and the mood of the Throne Speech. So, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a Throne Speech that is completely void of any kind of policy, any kind of programmes for the people of this Province and one which deliberately attempts to blame the federal government for every problem that we face today. So, Mr. Speaker, instead of trying to create unity, instead of trying to establish understanding of the problems that we face nationally, the provincial government, Mr. Speaker, took the cowardly way out. They put together all of the anti-federal words, all of the anti-federal phrases, all of the anti-federal sentences which they have been using for the past several years and compiled it into one of the most empty Throne Speeches this Province has ever seen. Mr. Speaker, it was nothing but one big, vindictive, malicious attack

MR. LUSH: on the federal government. It was a document, Mr. Speaker, that should never have been put into the hands of any Lieutenant-Governor. I was embarrassed for His Honour when he was reading this speech. I was embarrassed for His Honour that he was forced to read this attack on Ottawa, Mr. Speaker. It was shameful to put that into the hands of any Lieutenant-Governor, to have that kind of nonsense read before this House and to the people of Newfoundland. It was a capricious document, Mr. Speaker, a document which broke away from all the precedents and all the tradition of Throne Speeches. It demonstrated a complete and blatant disregard for parliamentary tradition, parliamentary custom and parliamentary decorum as we know it in this part of the world. It was a shameful document, Mr. Speaker, a shameful document. It was unrefined and uncouth and a vicious attack on the national government. As I have said, no attempt to demonstrate to our people the economic recession that this country is in and the whole of the Western World and, indeed, the whole world, Mr. Speaker, just an attempt to try and convince our people that all of our economic woes, all of our economic problems are the fault of the federal government. There was nothing in this, Mr. Speaker, nothing in this document for our stomachs, nothing in this document for our heads. This document was aimed at the heart, aimed at the emotions of people, as this government has been trying to do for the past two to three years now.

Mr. Speaker, it was not a Thorne Speech, not in the tradition that we know Throne Speeches. It was not a Throne Speech, I call it a Throne screech, Mr. Speaker, one continuous vicious attack on our national government. It was simply, Mr. Speaker, an attempt to erode and destroy the credibility of the national government. And in that respect, Mr. Speaker, it was shameful.

Mr. Speaker, it was reflective and demonstrative of a government which has acknowledged defeat in

MR. LUSH: terms of coming to grips with solving the fiscal and economic problems of this Province; demonstrative, Mr. Speaker, of a tired government, of a group of Cabinet Ministers who have no ideas on how to develop this country; demonstrative of a government which has become totally bereft and void of any policies or any ideas with respect to coming to grips with the severe financial problems which we now face.

It was not an honest document,  
Mr. Speaker, it was full of

MR. LUSH: distortions and full of misrepresentations with respect to the federal government. Did it ask our people, Mr. Speaker, to try to understand the national problem, the national crisis? No, it did not do that. It did not do that, but it asked the people to come together to fight this great federal wolf, this culprit, Mr. Speaker, that is trying to exploit the people of Newfoundland. That was the approach. That was the approach, Mr. Speaker, a vicious attack on the national government. I would go so far as to say that there was ~~never a document, there was never a Throne Speech presented~~ in this hon. House so vicious against the federal government, never one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: While they are asking for financial help on just about every project on the other hand.

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: They are asking for financial assistance on every project -

MR. LUSH: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - roads, the Trans-Labrador highway.

MR. LUSH: That is right, saying on the one hand that we do not want any transfer payments - and this is what the Throne Speech was all about, Mr. Speaker, on the one hand we do not want them, on the other hand they were condemning the federal government because they were not giving us enough of them.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa was blamed for every condition, was blamed on two fronts, in the main. And now I will get to the document itself and comment on some of the items there specifically.

MR. LUSH: Ottawa was blamed on two fronts. First of all, Ottawa was blamed because we were not generating additional revenues. So Ottawa was blamed on that. It says, 'The tragic irony in Newfoundland's situation is that at the same time as we are failing to generate additional revenues, primarily due to federal government insensitivity on offshore resources and hydro development, this same federal government is also reducing its commitment to social programmes through established programme financing, especially in the areas of health and post secondary education.' So, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa was blamed on two fronts, one, because we were not generating additional funds in this Province, and because they were cutting back on social programmes for the Province, another misleading statement that I will get around to momentarily.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about the first part, the fault they put on Ottawa for not generating enough revenues, then, of course, they talk about the offshore and talk about the failure there to negotiate, the failure to come to a political settlement. And the government expresses in the document the fact that they want a political settlement. The Throne Speech goes on to say, "My government fails to understand why this issue must be a legal one at all." It was my understanding that it was the provincial government that made it a legal one. They were the first people to initiate a court action, Mr. Speaker, when they placed it before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: A phony issue.

MR. LUSH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they went on a phony issue. They went on a phony issue as they have been always looking for phony issues and it was they,

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it was they who made the first move to have this matter settled in the court. That was when the Premier gave it away. That is when the Premier gave up. That is when he walked away from the negotiating table and said, 'This job is too big for me, I cannot handle this job.' So he was going to give it to the Supreme Court judges of this Province to take care of. Well, they did it, Mr. Speaker, they did it alright.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was not ~~the federal government that made this a legal issue.~~

MR. LUSH: It was not the federal government, it was the provincial government that put this in court. It was the provincial government who gave up on negotiating. It was the provincial government who gave up in terms of getting a political settlement.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think our people are a little fed up with it really. I think they are a little fed up with this offshore. I think they are a little fed up with these confrontation tactics, and constantly fighting Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, it would make one sick to hear this government talking about, "Oh, we are not going to give it away. We are not going to give it away." Well, that statement is running a little thin now, Mr. Speaker, it has about run its course. For twelve years this is what this administration now have been uttering, "We are not going to give it away." Well, Mr. Speaker, in twelve years what have they done? They certainly have not given it away. That is for sure. But they have done nothing, absolutely nothing. That is the sad record, Mr. Speaker, that is the sad record over the past twelve years, they have done absolutely nothing. The record is zilch. No, Mr. Speaker, they are not going to give it away. They are not going to give it away. The Premier gave up negotiating and went out and started wringing his hands, Mr. Speaker, and making fists. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier should know that a closed hand gets nothing but a shut fist. The Premier should know that. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what the Premier has done. That is what he has done. He has closed his hand and he is going to get nothing but a shut fist.

MR. LUSH: It is time, Mr. Speaker, that this provincial government got together with the federal government and started negotiating. Get back to the people, and get back to the table. That is the mandate that the people of this Province gave the Premier in April of 1982. That was the mandate, not to put it in court. The mandate the Premier was given was to negotiate a settlement, the best settlement that he can get certainly.

There is no Newfoundlander, Mr. Speaker, who does not want a good deal, who does not want the best deal that we can possibly get, but we want a deal. We want a deal. We want to negotiate. We want to get the matter resolved. The people are getting sick and tired of this breaking off negotiations and blaming the federal government. Looking for excuses. Just political grandstanding, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we are not getting any revenues from offshore exploration and development would seem to rest squarely on the shoulders of the provincial government. They are the people, Mr. Speaker, and they are the ones responsible for the delaying tactics. They are the ones who put it in the court. They are the ones, Mr. Speaker. Political grandstanding, making political points on the backs of Newfoundlanders, on the poor, the unemployed, that is what they are doing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Looking for a federal election.

MR. LUSH: I just want to comment on that, Mr. Speaker, that kind of devious tactic, I have been saying that we have been attacking the federal government of course, but the reason why for the vicious attack is the Federal Liberal Government, trying to give the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the only ones capable and willing to help Newfoundland are the Tories. What a lot of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, what a lot of nonsense. But in their attempt to do this, with their

MR. LUSH: vicious attacks on Ottawa, I am afraid that they have done irreparable damage to the view or to people's concept and attitude towards Canada, one probably that the Premier will be sorry for creating. But we have developed an attitude, we have developed attitudes and feelings about the federal government, about the Canadian nation, Mr. Speaker, that I am afraid is going to be hard to reverse and correct. Do not think for one moment that the people of Newfoundland, you know, will all of a sudden forget the kinds of attacks that have been leveled at the federal government and assume that, after all, it is not the federal government we are talking about it is just the fact that they are Liberals. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that will not wash. I am afraid it is not going to wash.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it goes on to talk about regional development. That is another area in which the federal government have fallen down. And under this one they talk about the rural development agreement, an agreement that in the past was funded 90/10 - 90 per cent by the federal government and 10 per cent by the provincial government. Now, Mr. Speaker, they are afraid that this is not going to come through. Of course, another fear that they have, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the federal government does not seem so favourably inclined towards giving the provinces this money that they did in the past. And they are a bit concerned about that, that the federal government would want to deliver these packages directly. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not so sure but if I were a federal Cabinet Minister that I would want the same thing when I look at the way those people spend money, spending money, Mr. Speaker, for political purposes. That is what has brought this about, it has been the way in which the Province have been spending their money. It is not something that I do not think I would subscribe to if I were a member of government in the meantime. But the way that I viewed the spending of money by this provincial government, I am not sure but I would be in the same position as the federal

MR. LUSH: government is presently. But, Mr. Speaker, these programmes that we are talking about here are the programmes that are sponsored jointly by the federal government, the regional development. So they talk about the fact that the rural development plan is not going to be signed. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is going to be signed but the federal government, naturally, are concerned about it. They are concerned about how this money is going to be spent and they want to work out the guidelines. And so they should to ensure that that money is going to be spent equally across this Province. The Premier talks so much about equality, well, rural development funds have not been distributed equally and

MR. T. LUSH: they have not been spent, Mr. Speaker, in the most prudent manner.

MR. S. NEARY: They are playing politics.

MR. LUSH: They have been playing politics with this money, there is no question about it. And that is why the federal government is holding up, Mr. Speaker, they want to ensure that this money is going to be spent on a regional basis and is going to be spent, Mr. Speaker, where the needs are. And it is going to be spent in those areas where we can develop natural resources and not spent, Mr. Speaker, for political purposes. That is the reason why this programme has not been signed.

Mr. Speaker, the next issue I want to get into here, where they are talking about joint programmes, is search and rescue and defense. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that is the first time that that has come up in a Throne Speech in this Province for a long, long time, and just brought up recently again by the government as a result of political grandstanding, Mr. Speaker. Imagine the nonsense of the situation of just a week or so ago when the Minister acting for Energy wires a telex to order the rigs in, Mr. Speaker, from the offshore. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker! My understanding of this is that there is a procedure. If the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) had gone about what he did today, instead of ordering the rigs in, gone through that channel and tried to meet with federal government officials, to see if they could not come up with some scheme. But, Mr. Speaker, how green do they think the people Newfoundland are? What do we think, that every time there is a storm that the Minister of Energy is going to wire a telex to Mobil and tell them to bring their rigs in? Is that how haphazardly we are going to have the thing organized? I would have thought that there is going to be some systematic

MR. T. LUSH: way of doing this, that there is going to be some time in the year when the weather gets bad, from December to March or something, that there would be some regulations, there would be some rules as to governing these rigs in times of storm. But certainly you are not going to pick up the phone and call Mobil today because we hear there are going to be heavy winds tomorrow. Certainly, it has to be more systematic than that. Is that what the Minister of Mines and Energy was suggesting, that every time there is a storm that either he or some federal person is going to call and have the rigs brought in? Certainly, there has to be some system to it. What nonsense. You would not know but it was a plough down on Duckworth Street he was trying to call in, Mr. Speaker. What a silly way of going about something, and expecting the people of Newfoundland then to agree. Trying to gain political points, Mr. Speaker, on the workers of oil rigs. What a ridiculous thing to do. And it is so transparent that every person in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, can see through it. Then, Mr. Speaker, on the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station: we had known for months that was going to close down. Did we hear anybody on the government side say anything about it? Not a word, Mr. Speaker, until these two things came together and then suddenly somebody realized that the people in certain parts of Newfoundland would be worried about that and they had not said a word, so they started their grandstanding again. It is like closing the barn door, Mr. Speaker, after the horse has gone. That was the same kind of situation. Well, the Premier would like to see more money for transportation. So would I, Mr. Speaker, so would I. The Premier says the Province cannot develop unless it has a well-developed transportation system. I have been making that same statement about the Terra Nova District for



MR. LUSH:

Thirty minutes? My golly!

Well, Mr. Speaker, so they have looked at the items first of all that come under the joint programmes which they say the federal government is trying to stymie because they want to have more direct input, or they want a more direct delivery system. Now they get into the other programmes, the social programmes, Mr. Speaker, the programmes which are funded under what we call EPF, the established programme financing. And giving the impression, Mr. Speaker, that has been cut back, giving the impression, Mr. Speaker, that we are losing \$125 million. Now just so that hon. members can understand this, we should look at this established programme financing. This is an agreement by the federal government to help provinces with medicare and with post-secondary education, and they agree to this for a certain fixed time. And the last agreement that we had was from 1977 until 1982, from 1977 until 1982. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not meant to be a permanent programme. The federal government refer to it as transitional relief, and, hopefully, somewhere along the line, when the provinces start generating money, they can get out of this expenditure. So it is something that has to be negotiated when the terms are up.

So in 1982 they negotiated a new one. They came up with a different formula, agreed upon by the ministers. The Premier gives the indication that it was not agreed upon. It was agreed upon by all of the ministers of Canada. Certainly it was a different formula, Mr. Speaker, it was a different formula. One would expect it to be a different formula in these rough times. But the Premier does not accept any cuts in Ottawa. We can cut all we like here, but the federal government, no understanding of that. They are not supposed to cut. Running now, Mr. Speaker, to a \$30 billion deficit, they are not supposed to cut. Well, the Premier says, we are going to get \$125 million less over the life of this agreement, over the

MR. LUSH: life of this latest EPF, giving us the impression, Mr. Speaker, that we are not getting as much money.

Well, in 1982-1983, Mr. Speaker, this Province received \$280 million from the EPF program \$280 million. That is counting the cash plus the tax, because there is a tax point system worked into this. In 1983-1984, Mr. Speaker, in this year, we will be receiving \$305 million. That is a 9 per cent increase over what we got last year. So, Mr. Speaker, in 1982-1983 we got \$280 million, this year we will get \$305 million, a 9 per cent increase, and yet the Province is trying to give us the impression that we are losing money. Certainly we are losing money on an old formula, but nobody was under the impression that that formula was going to stay into effect. Nobody was under the impression that formula was going to stay into effect.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. LUSH: Nobody is under the impression that this present formula is going to stay into effect beyond 1987, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Prime Minister himself and all his ministers had indicated this formula can only increase and not decrease.

MR. LUSH: It has increased. It has increased.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Not as fast as the cost-

MR. LUSH: No certainly. Certainly

MR. NEARY: No, not as fast as the hon. gentleman would like it.

MR. PECKFORD: The Prime Minister said on a number of occasions, when he introduced the programme, and his ministers asked him, that it would increase as fast, and we quoted those things back to the Prime Minister at the last economic summit and he agreed (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that is a sizeable increase for a government with a \$30 billion deficit, that is a sizeable contribution. And trying to give our people the impression that we are getting a cutback in this area, Mr. Speaker, it is a misrepresentation of the facts, a distortion of the facts. And this is what I meant when I said this document is a misrepresentation, a distortion, half truths, Mr. Speaker. This is an indication of it here, because we are, this year, receiving 9 per cent more on the EPF than we did last year.

MR. NEARY: In dollars how much is that?

MR. LUSH: \$305 million.

MR. NEARY: More.

MR. LUSH: No, last year we received \$280 million, \$25 million more. In addition to that the federal government forgave \$70 million in equalization. They forgave \$70 million this year and last year, forgave \$70 million in equalization.

MR. TULK: Answer that now!

MR. LUSH: And giving the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government is doing nothing for this Province. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to defend the federal government but I like to see the truth, I like for the people to know the truth.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: And this is what I said, I thought this document would be the kind of document -

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

MR. LUSH: Can I just finish, Mr. Speaker? I only have a minute left.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave, may the hon. member finish?

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): By leave.

MR.LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I simply just wanted for the people of this Province to know the facts about the EPF programme and these are the facts. I just wanted to finish by saying that this document, this Throne Speech is a confession really, it is a document of confession, confession of defeat, a submission by this government that they have no ideas to develop this Province, that they have no purpose, they do not know where they are going, they have no hope, Mr.Speaker, or ~~they have given no hope to the unemployed people of this~~ Province. The 45,000 or 50,000 people that are out there now , Mr.Speaker, without jobs, they have given then no hope. They have given no hope to our business community. It is a sad, sad Speech from the Throne and I would suggest one of the worst documents ever presented to this hon. House.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.STAGG: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, as usual I am not impressed by the dialogue from hon. members opposite. One hopes from year to year when you come back into the House that you will hear something different from hon. gentlemen, but unfortunately the refrain is still the same.

MR. STAGG: On the one hand they would like to disassociate themselves from their soul mates in Ottawa but on the other hand they would not want to say too much because they never know when they are going to be out of a job and looking to Mr. Rompkey or one of his friends for a job. There were ten of them put on these rolls last year, Mr. Speaker, and - who knows? - I would say after the next election there is going to be some considerable number more of them.

MR. HODDER: What about the rents on the base? ~~Tell us about the rents on the base.~~

MR. STAGG: 'Tell us about the rents on the base.' The hon. gentleman opposite is asking about the rents on the base. It is the member for Port au Port. I am reading this into the record now so that I can send it out to my constituents. The hon. member wants the rents on the base raised as high as possible - he owns a couple of properties in Stephenville - so they can rent them at the highest possible price. That is what he wants, Mr. Speaker, that is what he wants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: I have stood steadfastly for reasonable rents on the Harmon complex. The hon. gentleman masquerades as a person to the left but he is well to the right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: He is well to the right, Mr. Speaker. So I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he not ask any more questions like that.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): On a point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I just want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman's remarks with regard to properties that I may or may not own are untrue. I would like to say as well, Mr. Speaker, that I certainly did not go through the whole base during election time, the Harmon complex, promising everybody, and got elected on the base on the promise that I would not raise rents.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Ayward): To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the House Leader for the Opposition (Mr. Hodder) should go back to school and read Beauchesne and the rules of order of this House. That is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. The member for Port au Port does not want the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to speak because he knows he will be crushed right to the ground, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of getting into this point of order until the Premier stood and made the most ridiculous comment I have ever heard made on a point of order. Here you have one of his members, a private secretary to one of the ministers -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Parliamentary Secretary.

MR. NEARY: - slandering and libelling my hon. friend from Port au Port, lowering the decorum of the House. My hon. friend rightly raised a point of order

MR. NEARY: to defend himself against such slander and libel and smear tactics and character assassination, Mr. Speaker, there is not an ounce of truth in the statement the hon. gentleman made no more than there is truth in anything the Premier told us about the satellite station down at Shoe Cove -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: - or Burin or Corner Brook, or the \$60 million deficit -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - no truth in any of these statements. And now, Mr. Speaker, obviously it is becoming prevalent throughout the backbenches. Now they are going to start misleading the House, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Untrue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the Premier would just restrain himself, just keep it down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend has a very valid point of order, the only parliamentary device he has available to him at this moment to clear up a misleading statement made by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). And I would hope that Your Honour will rule that there is a valid point of order and ask the hon. gentleman who made that statement to withdraw and apologize to my hon. colleague.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! I rule there is no point of order in the exchange that I heard merely that the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) took the opportunity to clarify statements attributed to him and his intentions.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

Now I suppose I can get started.

MR. HODDER:

(Inaudible) the next time.

MR. STAGG:

The hon. member, you know, is going to persist in this kind of interruption. The hon. member will be lucky if I do not go down to Port au Port and put him into premature retirement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

The hon. member had better watch his bobber on matters of that type.

MR. HODDER:

You go knocking the federals and I am going to get you.

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, on the weekend I had the opportunity to speak to a fraternal service group that I was once a member of and, to my great chagrin, that the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) also was a member of at one time, the Stephenville Kinsmen Club, and I must say that one of the things that I noted that evening is -

MR. HODDER:

At least I became president, and that is more than the hon. member did, although he tried to on a number of occasions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STAGG:

I would have to say that the hon. member ran for President of the Kinsmen Club, I ran for member for the district, and I would suggest that they were both signal accomplishments, the hon. member getting elected as president especially.

MR. STAGG: The thing that I noted especially about these former Kinsmen who were, let us say, Kinsmen of mine, that they looked so young. That is one of the things that I noticed about them, they all looked so young. And they are the people between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-five, actually the age limit is up to forty, but generally speaking the people in clubs of that type are between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-five and there is a considerable onus on these people in this Province at this time, the people who are raising young families, most of them would have children. As a matter of fact while I was there that evening there was a phone call came in that a child had been born during the meeting, so that is an indication that people in Kinsmen Clubs and Jaycees and others, they have young families and there is a heavy onus on these people to acquaint themselves with the issues in this Province at this time. And what are the issues in this Province at this time, this pivotal

MR. STAGG: time in our history? Well, this year we are celebrating the 400th anniversary of the taking or possession of this Island by Sir Humphrey Gilbert in 1583, 1583-1983. And I was struck to say to these people in the service club that Newfoundland, which has the honour of being Britian's oldest colony, is running the risk of becoming Canada's newest colony because of the actions that are set out in no uncertain terms in this Speech from the Throne. Let there be no mistake about it, this Speech from the Throne is an exposé on the kind of activities, the subversive activity, the predatory tactics of the federal government as they are applied to this Province.

MR. BARRETT: Aided and abetted by the local Liberals.

MR. STAGG: Aided and abetted by the local Liberals, yes. Well, the hon. members opposite do not aid and abet too well because even they, on occasion, are chagrined by the kind of tactics that their colleagues are perpetrating on this Province.

Third, you will find no apologies on this side of the House for this exposé on the federal Liberals and the federal government. There is one excerpt that I would like to read from the Speech from the Throne; it is an excerpt from the 1979 Speech from the Throne when we heralded in an era for this country, at least so we thought at the time. In 1979 the following statement was made: 'The great question posed today is whether we, in this Province, are ready to move away from a paternalistic, centralized federalism' - which I would equate with colonialism. 'Are we ready to trust more in our own abilities as a society than in federal transfer payments?' Are we ready? 'We are further challenged by the need to ensure that such a decentralization be accomplished without impairing national unity or affecting the level of social services in a so-called 'have not' province. Can we, in a great, historic act of self reliance, break the vicious circle in which we now find ourselves? Can we build an economically and culturally

MR. STAGG: vibrant society in which, while private initiative is the keystone, social justice remains an even higher goal?'

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government has been consistently putting forward that philosophy and that theme really since 1972 but particularly since 1979 when we entered the June or July session of the House of Assembly in 1979 full of optimism with a federal government that was, for the first time in years, on our side. Now, of course, events have overtaken us in that regard and we are fighting a rear guard action. But that Throne Speech of 1979 bears the test of time. There has been consistency on this side of the House. We do not waffle, we do not waiver, we are consistent. Now the price of consistency is that occasionally one has to hear criticism from people whose vision is very narrow or whose ability or willingness to look to the future is very narrow as well.

3

MR. F. STAGG: Well, that is one of the problems of government, that is one of the problems of leadership. That is why the people of Newfoundland when the chips are down opt for the group that has the long-term vision for this Province. Occasional it is necessary for the Province to put forward what the problems are that they are encountering, and these problems are put forward in no uncertain terms. There are no back doors about this document just as there were no backdoors about the document of last March, which hon. gentlemen will remember, and there were no backdoors about our proposal to settle the offshore on January 25, 1982 which was released to the press of this Province on March 16, 1982, which hon. gentlemen opposite read some two or three months later. That is the kind of Opposition, unfortunately, that we have in this Province. What kind of government are we dealing with in Canada? We are a government that deals in acronyms: We have DREE, we have NEED, we have CCDP, we have DRIE and MSERD and FIRA and all of these things. Beginning in November of 1971 - I remember it well; I had just gotten elected to this House of Assembly for the first time, October 1971 - and on came LIP, November, 1971, the great brainchild of Bryce Mackasey. Bryce Mackasey in 1971 perpetrated LIP on this country. There was an unemployment problem in the country and LIP was the answer to it. Well, there are whole generations of Newfoundlanders - and we are now looking at some twelve years later, from 1971 to 1983; eleven and a half years later - there is a generation of Newfoundlanders who have worked at nothing other than LIP and OFY and CCDP and Canada Works and that type of thing, and unfortunately the federal government has made applications for that kind of activity an art form. There are actually courses now on how to fill out applications for federal grants: How do you fill out the applications? How do you get the money?

MR. HODDER: You never see a provincial grant, not for job creation.

MR. STAGG: I invite the hon. gentleman into the debate. He can have the floor when I finish, he usually does. If there is one thing I succeed in doing it is to rouse the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) to his feet, because he is afraid that some of the points that I have made are so cogent and so precise that he has got to get up and try to muddy the waters. And that has been the federal government's involvement with Newfoundland, these projects, and that philosophy is essentially counterproductive, DREE, NEED, CCDP and all of these things. You see the public money how it is being spent and it is short-term pain for long-term pain as far as this person is concerned.

MR. STAGG:

We try, on this side of the House, to rectify this as best we can. We do not have the constitutional power to rectify it so we use the power of free speech to do so. And the ultimate in free speech in this Province is the Throne Speech and there it is. It is set out in no uncertain terms where Newfoundland stands with regard to its problems with the federal government. You will find no apology from this side of the House. If there are twenty-five attacks on the federal government, as the press care to characterize it, let them call them attacks. If telling the truth is an attack, well let it be an attack. Who cares! That is the problem we have in this country today. We are forced into court on major issues, forced into court on the Upper Churchill, forced into court on the offshore. Why should we have to spend, the leaders of our Province, the best minds in our Province, why should they have all their time tied up in being in court? Why should our leadership have to be fighting rear guard actions at all times, crisis management on crises that are not of their making? Why should that be?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we do have a government in Ottawa that really treats us as a foreign power or a potential power, and we are to be subjugated at all costs. And that kind of attitude is illustrated in the answer to the House Leader's (Mr. Marshall) telec to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) which was outlined here today the kind of answer that we get from him and the attitude, the deprecating attitude exhibited towards this Province by the federal government and the federal leaders is something that we deplore.

MR. STAGG: What would have happened, Mr. Speaker, if Newfoundland had won, so-called 'won', in the offshore case that was recently erroneously decided by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland? Well, if we had won all the federal government would have done is what they did to Alberta. Their answer to Alberta, which you know in 1980 sent some \$2 billion, I believe it was, a tremendous amount of money into Canada, into the federal coffers by way of equalization, their answer to Alberta which was a growing economic power was the National Energy Policy. And the National Energy Policy to some extent has brought Alberta to its knees.

MR. STAGG: We all know, we all have relatives who travelled to Alberta, we all know people who have travelled to Alberta in 1979, 1980 and 1981, and suddenly the land of promise is no longer the land of promise. Suddenly you have the mayor of Calgary saying, 'Send the Eastern bums home' and that sort of thing. What brought it all about? The National Energy Policy, the brain child of Mark LaLonde, who is the friend of Allister Gillespie, and his deputy minister, Mr. Cohen, and those mandarins in Ottawa who will not allow, it is not in them to allow any other part of this country to gain either political power or economic power. They do not have that in them. They do not believe that strong regions make a strong country, that is not their philosophy. They are more gallic in their philosophy, more for the center, that the power and whatever is meted out comes from the center. That is their philosophy. So if we had won the offshore in our court, which our court, as I said before erroneously decided, they would have resorted to their familiar guerilla tactics which they used on Alberta and Saskatchewan to bring them to their knees. Well, what happens when you bring Alberta to its knees? When you bring Alberta to its knees you bring the country to its knees, you practically have self-immolation. You remember during the Vietnam war you used to have the monks who every now and then used to go out and pour gasoline over themselves and catch themselves afire? Well, in effect that is what the Liberal party is doing to Canada. Their National Energy Policy is one that is pouring gasoline over Canada, and fortunately the match has not been struck yet, but it is the sort of thing that is designed to

MR. STAGG: bring people to their knees, bring provinces to their knees and it is not the way this country should be managed. It is the manifest destiny of Canada, to use an American phrase, the destiny of Canada that that kind of philosophy will fall into disrepute. It is in disrepute but it will be unsuccessful, it cannot succeed, it must not succeed. Do hon. gentlemen opposite care about that type of thing? N-o, N-o, they do not care about it. They do not care. They would love to become Senators before the government changes, ~~that is their philosophy. They would like to say, "My God,~~ if there were eight vacancies in the Senate would we ever love to get there so that our futures would be secure."

"The future of the Province?" "Who cares about the future of the Province as long as I am secure myself." Well, we on this side of the House we walk to the razor's edge, we walk on the razor's edge and we put our money, if we had any, if we had any money we would put it where our mouths are. We stand for something over here. This side of the House stands for something. What do hon. gentlemen opposite stand for? I would suggest that you ask yourself that sometime: What do you stand for? What do you stand for? A very good question. I would suggest that hon. gentlemen opposite stand for whatever is expedient at the time, whatever they think is going to work. Fortunately it never does. What happened in Canada between 1904 and 1930? You have the Western provinces of Canada going bankrupt,

MR. STAGG: not unlike the problems that we are encountering in Newfoundland today. Their big problem was that they did not control their natural resources. Now, I have not seen the debates. I intend to get some of the debates. I would imagine there were great debates in the Alberta parliament and the Saskatchewan parliament and the Nova Scotia parliament, the legislatures of these three provinces, why these provinces should have their natural resources. I intend to get that and research it because I would imagine you could change the time and maybe some of the geography and the speeches that were made then would be exactly identical to the speeches that we could be making in this House of Assembly from now until whenever the inevitable happens; and the inevitable is that Newfoundland will control its offshore resources, it will control its fishery, it will control its destiny. These are inevitable.

Now, somebody said to me one time, 'In the long run you are dead.' That may very well be so. It may take us a long while; it may very well be, you know, that the Prime Minister may be able to put his road show on the road in 1984 and get re-elected, Who knows? Stranger things have happened in this country. Who knows? It is not absolutely definite that he is going to be defeated. It is 90 per cent definite that he is going to be defeated. But let us say it did happen, that Pierre Elliott Trudeau would happen to get re-elected. So then we are into another series of years of problems because you may depend on it that we will not get any differing philosophy from that group of individuals. But I maintain that it is an inevitability that Newfoundland will get control and must get control or reasonable participation in the management of these resources.

MR. STAGG: Occasionally it will be pressed upon us that we should be less strident on the subject, that we should be less definite on the subject, that we should not talk about it quite as much or that our methods should be somewhat different. Well, I do not care what the methodology is, the ultimate objective as far as we are concerned on this side of the House, the forty-four of us who are over here, the approximately 85 per cent of the Legislature that is sitting on this side of the House, we are as one on this issue. And if it takes ten years, ~~well, we will be here in ten years time because the people~~ of the Province believe in what we are doing.

MR. STAGG: What are some of the issues that we have a quarrel with our federal counterparts on? They have been dealt with in some detail here. The Shoe Cove situation; I mean, it is absolutely ridiculous that this marvellous facility is being dismantled. I did not know very much about it until comparatively recently but it is a world class facility. And Canada is putting one in Thailand. They say that the Manitoba station will look after us, and apparently it will not, and this in the face of the Ocean Ranger situation and any number of other potential Ocean Ranger situations that are out there and the Search and Rescue problem that we have.

Originally the former Minister of Fisheries, the hon. Harold Collins, some years ago originally outlined, and brought at least to my attention, the number of public federal civil servants in this Province vis-a-vis federal civil servants in other provinces and we have fewer federal civil servants in this Province than in others. That is because they decide Newfoundland should not have the jobs or think that the geography of Newfoundland should be administered from elsewhere.

MR. HODDER: Bring up Shoe Cove again. Tell us more about Shoe Cove.

MR. STAGG: The shoe is on your foot,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: The shoe is on your foot. The shoe is on the hon. Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) foot, getting up today and playing petty politics with Shoe Cove and we do not even know whether he is for it or not. I did not hear any press conference called by the Leader of the Opposition to defend Shoe Cove. Does anybody recall seeing anything in the press -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. STAGG: - that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) had come out and blasted his federal counterparts? I am sure that it would have had something to say.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I have twenty minutes left. Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Three minutes.

MR. STAGG: I would like to give the Stephenville report now in the brief time that I have left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: I am very happy to announce that Stephenville is not on the misery list -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: - not on the misery list that the Leader of the Opposition parades around as something that he thinks he can get elected on. But anyway Stephenville is not on the misery list, the first time in many years. As a matter of fact I believe the only time Stephenville was really on the misery list was when I was not the member, between 1975 and 1979.

There was

MR. STAGG: a marked transformation in the economy of Stephenville. In 1971 to 1975 it was a boom town and then in 1975 to 1979 the people temporarily backtracked a while and elected a Liberal. 1979 in comes Stagg again -

MR. BUTT: And off we go!

MR. STAGG: And off we go, Abitibi paper mill, the best paper mill in the world at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: The best paper mill in the world.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, oh! Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms)!

MR. BUTT: Followed by Grand Falls.

MR. HOUSE: We support Grand Falls.

MR. BAIRD: You had better be careful this way too.

MR. STAGG: I must admit, Mr. Speaker, it may cause a certain amount of chagrin amongst some of my colleagues, but I have to say it; it is the best paper mill in the world. I invite my colleagues to have paper mills similar to it built in their districts, which have a long and storied history in the paper industry. Soon to be announced will be the international trade zone for Stephenville. An international trade zone, a matter that puts Stephenville in the forefront again.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about it.

MR. STAGG: I will have to save the elaboration for later. I can explain it. Basically it has to do with a free port, bringing items in that -

MR. DAWE: Like Hong Kong.

MR. STAGG: Like Hong Kong, the hon. gentleman says, yes.

The Bay St. George Community College is a thriving institution.

MR. STAGG: The Sir Thomas Roddick Hospital, which the Minister of Health (Mr. House) tells me conducts its affairs in an exemplary manner, especially as far as budgeting is concerned. The great Stephenville Airport, which unfortunately, at the present time, Mr. Steele is ignoring. We still have Air Canada -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I must apologize to the Chair, first of all, for my delay in raising the point of order, but I had to refer to Beauséjour and this is the first opportunity I have had to raise this very grave and serious matter.

Mr. Speaker, during the hon. gentleman's remarks there a few minutes ago, the hon. gentleman referred to a recent decision of the Newfoundland Appeals Court as an erroneous decision. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: as an Officer of the Court the hon. gentleman knows that that is very unprofessional, it is uncouth and it is unethical, but it is also, Mr. Speaker, against the rules of this House. And I am going to quote from Beauchesne on Page 103, Mr. Speaker, If Your Honour has Beauchesne there. Page 103, Section 316(h). There are two things you cannot do in this House Mr. Speaker, there are two things only that we cannot do under our Oath of Office; we cannot cast a reflection on Her Majesty The Queen and we cannot cast reflections on the courts. Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend in his remarks in the ~~heat of debate may have gotten slightly carried away or indeed~~ he may have been parroting statements that have been made by other Ministers of the Crown, and I will deal with these matters at some future date, Mr. Speaker. I want to put you under notice that I intend to deal with other statements that have been made on this matter in due course. But today I want to raise my Point of Order in connection with statements made by the hon. gentleman.

MR. STAGG: We have it now.

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman may have it but he is going to get a little more of it. He may be smirking and smarting over there and he may feel uncomfortable, because the hon. gentleman should know better, as a trained lawyer he should know better and as an Officer of the Court, but especially as a Member of this House. The hon. gentleman should know that you can in no way, shape or form, through innuendo, Mr. Speaker, or in any other way cast reflections upon the conduct of Judges of the Superior Courts, unless the hon. gentleman is prepared to bring in a substantive motion to question the decisions of the court. Also, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that on Page 114 Paragraph 321.(1) 'All reference to judges and courts of justice of the nature of personal attack and censure have always been considered unparliamentary, and the Speaker has always treated them as breaches of order. Members have been interrupted in

MR. NEARY: Committee of the Whole by the Chairman  
when they have cast an imputation upon a judicial proceeding.'

What has been done here today, Mr. Speaker,  
is one of the most grave and serious matters -

MR. STAGG: Sit down.

MR. NEARY: No, I will not sit down, Mr. Speaker,  
because it is a very serious matter. The hon. gentleman may  
not like it because the hon. gentleman has been very unprofessional  
today and very unparliamentary in his reference to the  
Newfoundland Appeal Court decision. Your Honour may want to  
take a few moments to consider this matter.

I believe I read the first reference for  
Your Honour, No. 316(h),

MR. NEARY: that a member while speaking must not cast reflections.

Listen to this, Mr. Speaker:

a member while speaking cannot cast reflections upon the conduct of Judges of Superior Courts, unless such conduct is based upon a substantive motion." We did not hear a substantive motion, Mr. Speaker, we did hear reference to the judges of the Newfoundland Appeals Court, and I ask Your Honour to direct the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to withdraw the unparliamentary remarks that ~~he made and if he does not withdraw~~ then Your Honour has no choice but to name the hon. gentleman.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, seldom have more ridiculous points of order been brought up. First of all, if the hon. gentleman wants to bring up a point of order, he has to bring it up at the earliest possible opportunity. Of course, after twenty-one or twenty-two years in the House, he has to research these things to find out. I mean, you know, this is ridiculous. But the second thing, and let us make it quite plain, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said that the decision of the court was erroneous. And the decision of the court, in the opinion of the hon. member and the opinion of the government, was erroneous and that is why the decision is under appeal. To say, Mr. Speaker, that a court erred and that you are going to appeal a decision is not to impugn the integrity of a judge, or whatever he calls it, cast reflections upon the conduct of a judge. The hon. gentleman has just repeated what the government has said over and over again and will continue to say, that they feel that that decision is

MR. MARSHALL: erroneous. Now, I realize that the hon. gentleman there opposite does not like it. He wants to accept the decision. Oh, he exults with great delight, Mr. Speaker, that the Supreme Court of Newfoundland has found against Newfoundland. He loves the fact that the Grand Banks of Newfoundland are now the Grand Banks of Ottawa. If he could he would wrap them up. And gift wrap them and give them to his buddies up in Ottawa. But this government will not do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how ridiculous is it! It is not, first of all, risen at the earliest possible opportunity, but we do not rely on that. To say that a court erred, everybody from time to time says a court erred and is erroneous and that is why you have appeal courts. And that is where we are going at the present time. And we will not stop there either, Mr. Speaker, to the chagrin, I know, of the hon. gentleman there opposite.

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG:

I will yield to the hon.

gentleman. I would like to hear what he has to say, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

I was not in the Chair when the hon. member made these remarks. If he did I would like to check into it and I will rule at a later time.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, could I be allowed

to make a submission to this Point of Order?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No! No!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I understand I

have your concurrence?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No!

MR. NEARY:

You do not run the House you

know. You do not own the House. You know, you have gotten quite arrogant over there but you do not own the House. We know you are trying to get a dictatorship.

MR. STAGG:

'Give-away Neary' give it

all away.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

The submission by the hon.

the House Leader opposite has compounded the offense in that the -

MR. NEARY:

You are getting worried. You are on the skids. You are on the skids. Well, I will tell you one thing, they will not have to pay rent for me. Nobody will have pay

MR. NEARY: my rent. Nobody will have to pay my rent for me.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, can I have protection from my own side here.

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am not going down, I am not going down in the ditch with you.

MR. WARREN: You are already down there, boy.

MR. NEARY: You will before we are finished.

MR. WARREN: You are already down there.

MR. NEARY: You have no authority from this House to spend money on rent.

MR. WARREN: You are already down in the ditch. You have been down in the ditch for the last four years.

MR. NEARY: We will see. We will see.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if I could have some order while I make the submission?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out to Your Honour that when the House Leader opposite made his submission on the point of order which was raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), he compounded the point of order in that he too said that the judgement was erroneous. And, Mr. Speaker, as you are aware you were in the Chair at that particular time. Mr. Speaker, if we read Section 321 of Beauchesne, it does not refer to judges alone as the House Leader opposite would like us to believe. The references are to judges and courts of justice. And, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that when members of this hon. House say that a judgement is erroneous then certainly that is casting a

MR. HODDER: reflection on the courts of justice. And, Mr. Speaker, it does not matter whether the case goes to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland or to the Supreme Court of Canada or that it may be under appeal, that does not matter whatsoever. Many times in the past eight years this particular point of order has arisen in this House and I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is wrong, doubly so, Mr. Speaker, in that the House Leader opposite when he made his submission, made it and compounded the error.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have, maybe, a final word on this?

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: I would not go as far as the former Minister of Finance (Mr. John Crosbie) in 1972 who said, 'Under certain circumstances the

MR. STAGG: Supreme Court of Canada can go to hell". I would not go far as to say that. That was said here in the House of Assembly. But I would say that it is quite in order for lawyers to say that the learned trial judge erred. That is customary procedure. It is rooted in antiquity, that if the learned trial judge erred he made an erroneous decision. So if the hon. gentleman wants to get involved in semantics I can semantic with him all day. And it is my submission that the two hon. gentlemen opposite, untrained as they are in the law, both erred.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

That point of order has been taken under consideration by the Speaker and it will be ruled upon in time.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have one final -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point order order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe under the rules of this House you are allowed thirty minutes, each member is allowed thirty minutes in the Throne Speech debate except the Premier, who has unlimited time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Speaker is aware of the point of order the hon. member is making. And I wish to inform the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) that his time has elapsed. If there is leave of the House he can continue. Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no..

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the Speech from the Throne, let me first say that I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder who in my opinion as two junior members in this hon. House have made fair district speeches which I think their constituents should be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something now which is most uncommon. In fact, it is not very often that members on this side of the House disagree with each other. However, I think I have to say that over the past four years, since 1979 when I was first elected to this House - I have continuously said so myself and I am sure that my seven colleagues have said time and time again - that the government has not done very much in our districts. I have to disagree with that, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the government has done a lot in our districts. In my district in particular, Mr. Speaker, they have done a lot and I am sure that in the other districts they have also pulled up their socks and done many, many things.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the things that this government is doing that was elected in 1979 and re-elected in 1982 with an outstanding majority, with sixty-odd per cent of the people

MR. WARREN: supporting them, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, this government said that they are a government of the people.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in due course, Mr. Speaker, I will illustrate in my half an hour how this government can stand up and say they are a government for the people and in particular in my district.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at number one. There was an agreement signed, a federal-provincial native agreement, for the native people of this Province including Conne River and the towns in my district. This past year the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has withheld - and we were told in a meeting with the minister just a little over two weeks ago - had withheld \$486,000 of the people's money and have deferred it back into the Exchequer Account. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what you call honest government, this is what you call a government helping the people. That is one way that they helped.

MR. NEARY: Withheld \$400,000.

MR. WARREN: \$486,000 withheld. As the Premier says, 'withheld', okay.

MR. NEARY: A half a million dollars.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at something else that this government has done for the people. They have taken the hardware, the furniture and the clothing out of the government owned stores. This is how this government is concerned for the people because it is the peoples' government. They

MR. WARREN: have taken the hardware, the furniture and the clothing out of the general stores. This is what the people elected this government for.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at something else. I have a list of them here, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that it will amaze the members to know what kind of a government was elected for the people. There was a motor vessel Oderin which was purchased several years ago under Mr. Moore's term and this motor vessel Oderin was purchased by the provincial government ~~out of federal-provincial funds for operation of the~~ fisheries in Northern Labrador. And, Mr. Speaker, take a guess where that boat is to today? That boat is on the Northeast Coast of the Island helping out some of the P.C. flunkies. That is where that boat is to today. Now, Mr. Speaker, that boat was purchased out of federal-provincial money but it is used on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland.

MR. STAGG: Name the flunkies. Name the flunkies.

MR. WARREN: Oh, no. I will leave that for the last five minutes or probably tomorrow when I close up the debate.

Let us look at what the Department of Transportation is doing. This year they said that everybody should pay the same number of dollars for registration of motor vehicles. Okay? However, here in St. John's or on the Trans-Canada Highway or in Harbour Grace, whatever the case might be, when there is a snow storm there is a government plow that plows the roads and keep them open for the operation of these vehicles. However, in Coastal Labrador where they

March 7, 1983

Tape No. 85

IB-3

MR. WARREN:                    are paying the same amount  
of money they can only use their vehicles five months  
of the year. The government will not plow any roads.

MR. WARREN: Here is something else that they have done. So you can see that this governments' record is good.

Let us look at some other things. Now, here is a dandy one. And it is too bad the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is not in his place because with all this, the Minister's bible or the Minister's blue book - and it is a good book. Let us see now, A mid-year economic and fiscal review, in this book the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said he was going to put out the Labrador Gear Subsidy Programme. Now, you are going to save the government some money. Let me tell you something. Let me tell you what happened. By the way first I should tell you who qualifies for this programme. It says a fisherman must be a full-time fisherman. Okay, that is good. Item number two, he must be a resident of Labrador in the regions specified. Now that is very plain, straightforward and it is under the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. Mr. Morgan. Now this book came out from the minister's office and it says you must be a resident of Labrador. Now, they have cut out the programme. But, do you know why they cut it out? Every longliner - I will not say every one - practically every longliner from the Province that went fishing on the Labrador coast last year received this gear subsidy. Now, Mr. Speaker, they received this gear subsidy which was for the Labrador fishermen but the minister's officials okayed payment to the operators of those longliners. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what this government has done. This is why this gear subsidy was cut out. It was cut out because it was costing too much to keep the Newfoundland longliners

MR. WARREN: up in Labrador. That is the reason why, Mr. Speaker. But the minister never had the gall to say, 'Look, we are cutting it out because it was costing too us much money for the Newfoundland longliners'. No, Mr. Speaker. That is why. And, Mr. Speaker, I have documents with the names of longliner fishermen who have received money from the provincial department. I have the names, Mr. Speaker. From Carbonear, for example, Mr. Speaker, longliner fishermen who have received this money. Now this is what this government is doing. This is what you call equality, Mr. Speaker.

Another thing the provincial Department of Fisheries has done - and I brought a resolution into this House on Thursday past - is that because of them over 200 fishermen have to pay back U.I.C. benefits they received over three years ago. Mr. Speaker, over 200 fishermen and some of those fishermen have to pay back up to \$1800. And do you know why? Because the minister's department - that is what he said in this hon. House that he is responsible for every individual or every office member in his department. Now if he is responsible for that, therefore, Mr. Speaker, he should be also responsible for chastising those guys who made the mistakes and reimburse the fishermen accordingly.

3

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. WARREN: Here is the kind of government we have, Mr. Speaker. Yet the Premier (Mr. Peckford) can get up and shout and shout, Mr. Speaker, but what kind of a government do we have. We have a government that is divided up into sections, Mr. Speaker. The petition that I presented today was from the people in Nain, the most Northerly town in the whole Province. And all the people in Nain want is to have fresh fruit and vegetables on the shelves, a very simple request. But in order to have that they have to pay an extra fifty-five cents a pound. The people on Bell Island got it for nothing, no extra freight at all. I congratulate the minister for doing so. But why could the minister not also - he is in Cabinet, the minister is in Cabinet - why does he not show his true colours and say, 'Look, I will get it for Bell Island and I will get it for Fogo and I will get it for Change Islands and I will get it for Nain the same time'. Mr. Speaker, we are all human beings in this Province. Not only the people on Bell Island but the people everywhere deserve the same kind of treatment. And the water bomber, the government water bomber that is lying in the hanger over there, that water bomber can land on Fogo Island, it can land in Nain, it can land in Makkovik. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why the people in Nain have to pay fifty-five cents a pound extra when the people on Bell Island get it for fifty-five cents less.

A measly grapefruit, Mr. Speaker, in Postville costs \$1.24, \$1.24 for a measly grapefruit whereas on Bell Island it costs thirty-seven cents. Why, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY:

How much was it?

MR. WARREN: Thirty-seven cents on Bell Island, \$1.24 in Postville.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. WARREN: That is just an example. Because of the fifty-five cents on freight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of government that is helping the people. Remember not too long ago, in the last session of the House, the Premier stood up on three occasions to give away the rights of the native people by bringing a unanimous resolution into this House. But he could not get away with it, Mr. Speaker, and he is not going to get away with it. He is not going to get away with it, Mr. Speaker. And I am surprised that this government -

MR. NEARY: A grapefruit, one grapefruit costs four times more.

MR. STAGG: Are you against Bell Island?

MR. WARREN: No, I am proud that the people on Bell Island are not paying more for freight. But I must also say the people of Nain should not pay more either. This is my argument, let us treat everybody equally. Equality is the answer.

This government and this department stood up and would not listen to the Mayor of Makkovik and left a \$4.5 million water and sewerage system probably to go to ruins. For the sake of \$65,000, only just a measly pittance to what we pay for Mount Scio house, Instead of using \$65,000 to get that water and sewerage system working the minister himself just turned a deaf ear to it and listened to his senior staff in Goose Bay. In my opinion it was just a personal conflict between him and the Mayor in Makkovik. This was all that happened, the minister just listened to him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: And these kinds of people, Mr. Speaker, are the ones who are doing harm to the people on the Labrador coast. Mr. Speaker, the same government paid the lowest price for salmon and char last year. The lowest price anywhere in the Province that the people received per pound for salmon and char was paid by the two fish plants in Makkovik and Nain.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of thing - and like I said this government has done things. You see what kind of a record, Mr. Speaker -

MR. DOYLE: The galleries are full.

MR. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not need the galleries full when I make my speech. But I could say this over and over again and I will say it over and over for many, many more years, that until this government is removed from office the people in this Province will not get equal treatment. That is the reason, Mr. Speaker, no equal treatment by this government.

MR. DOYLE: Equal treatment for Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: But not for Labrador. What about Fogo Island?

MR. WARREN: It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to know that Labrador has -

MR. BUTT: What about the Shoe Cove station?

MR. WARREN: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) brought up the Shoe Cove station. Let me say something else that maybe a lot of members on that side do not know anything about. The hon. Leader of the Opposition

MR. WARREN: (Mr. Neary) may not know this. And there is not very much he does not know. But I am going to tell you something now, the only people I would think that may know this are the Premier (Mr. Peckford) and the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Marshall). \* But I am going to just relay it now. In early December - now I will not say it is true because I do not have any documents to substantiate it but it is close to it - in early December officials of the minister's division that he is looking after, the Petroleum Directorate -

MR. NEARY: I know all about it.

MR. WARREN: Okay. Officials of his department visited one of the oil rigs. Now, listen to this. At the time they visited the oil rig this particular rig was drilling a particular well. At the same time the storm was not too bad but they discovered one of the anchors were separated from the drill rig, one of the anchors were separated. And do you know what the minister and his officials ordered Mobil to do? You stay there and finish that well before you go ashore.

MR. NEARY: What! This government?

MR. WARREN: This government, oh yes. 'You stay there. Do not worry, there is only one of the anchors gone. Do not worry about the anchor gone but you stay there.'

MR. NEARY: Let her go adrift.

MR. WARREN: In December.

MR. NEARY: Oh, in December.

MR. WARREN: In December. Now this was the government that told Mobil, 'You stay there now'. Now, all of the sudden, because of the Shoe Cove station they say, 'Oh, come ashore'.

March 7, 1983

Tape No. 88

IB-3

MR. NEARY:

And the court case.

MR. WARREN:

ashore'.

And the court case, 'Come

So, here is what is happening, is that there was no danger when the ship had an anchor gone, no danger then. There was no danger on December 6th. But now all of the sudden on February 16th. and 17th. it is dangerous. But there was

MR. WARREN: the oil rig with one of her anchors let go and she was told to stay there and finish drilling before she came ashore. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that what you would call consistency in this government?

The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) asked a simple question and he said it three times. He said, "What do the hon. members opposite stand for? What do you stand for over there?" Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we stand for dignity and for the betterment of Newfoundlanders and the Labradorians. That is what we stand for. We stand for what is best for Newfoundland and Labrador, not what is best for the Liberal Party, not what is best for any political party. We stand for what is best for the people. But the only thing that you people stand for, every one of you, the only thing you stand for is what is best for the P.C. Party in this Province and that is what you stand for.

MR. NEARY: That is right, go the Tory way.

MR. WARREN: The Tory way or no way.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come, as Mr. Moores said one time, the time has come when the people have finally seen the light. And as the old saying goes, Tory times are hard times. And now the people can see, Mr. Speaker, what they have elected. What the Premier (Mr. Peckford) has done on April 6th. will never, never, never happen anymore, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate now as it is close to six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): It has been noted that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has adjourned the debate.

The hon. President  
of the Council.

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

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