

VOL. 2

NO. 3

SECOND SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIP

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before we commence today's proceedings, I would like to extend a welcome to those in the galleries who are here in recognition of International Women's Day and representing the following organizations: the Women's Institutes of Newfoundland and Labrador, the Association of Registered Nurses of Newfoundland, the Women's Network, the Day Care Steering Committee, the Professional Secretaries Association, the Newfoundland Status of Women's Council, the Newfoundland Organization of Women, the Women's Association of Memorial University of Newfoundland, the Women's Resource Centre of Memorial University of Newfoundland, the Newfoundland Teachers Association, Special Interest Council on Women's Issues in Education, Training for Tomorrow, Career Explorations for Women, the Women's Health Education Project, the Catholic Women's League, Transition House, the Provincial Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Newfoundland and Labrador. On behalf of all the members, I welcome you ladies to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, last evening the Premier and I met with representatives of oil companies involved in drilling presently being carried on offshore under the supervision of the operator, Mobil Canada. At that meeting the facts relating to the issuing of the provincial order to cease drilling were fully set before the representatives of these companies.

The report of the Petroleum Directorate entitled A Preliminary Analysis Of Operating Conditions At The Hibernia 1-46 and North Dana 1-43 Locations was given to all present. I am tabling a copy of this report for the information of hon. members.

This report is a thorough and objective analysis of weather and ice conditions from February 12th. to the 20th. this year, the capacity to respond to the emergency which these conditions made imminent and forecasted conditions in Hibernia during the residue of the Winter drilling season.

This report show conclusively, Mr. Speaker, that this Province acted solely on the basis of facts that were before us. At the time the order was issued, I might point out, another storm had been forecast and the decision was made at a special Cabinet session convened to consider the urgent indications that were presented by that forecast.

The summary of this report, Mr. Speaker, reveals some chilling factors and I would like to read into the record the summary of the report. It reads as follows: "In 1983", now this is a report put out by the Petroleum Directorate, I might emphasis, Mr. Speaker, professional experts in the field who have done it after consultation with

March 8, 1983

Tape No. 90

NM - 3

MR. MARSHALL: such agencies as the International
Ice Patrol and other forecasting concerns.

MR. MARSHALL:

"The 1983 Winter drilling season is proving to be one of the worst ice years on record," the report says. "Storms, freezing rain and low visibility, combined with the presence of icebergs, which are occurring earlier and with greater frequency than normal, have resulted in an increased risk to personnel working offshore, the rig itself and the environment.

"Preliminary indications are that the number of icebergs in 1983 will equal, if not exceed, that in the previous extreme year of 1972. The International Ice Patrol reports that already at least , up to this time, at least 126 bergs have passed the latitude of the Hibernia location compared, Mr. Speaker, to 40 by this date in the previous extreme year of 1972, and I might add, compared to an average of 9 since the early 1900 when the Titanic sank.

So we have a comparison, 126 to 40 and 126 to 9," During the period February 16th to February 19, 1983 , the following situation existed at Hibernia 1-46 step-out well being drilled by Mobil." I might add that that particular step-out well was being drilled by the West Venture.

"There were 84 people on board the drilling unit "West Venture with at least 10 icebergs and bergy bits in the vicinity of the rig during a severe Winter storm which lasted 2½ days." I could add also to describe that storm, Mr. Speaker, the fact, as the report will show, that the seas had reached crests of 68 feet, that the wind was in excess of 80 knots an hour, that within a very dangerous area of the rig , I think within about 10 to 14 miles, there was a 100,000 ton iceberg on the seas, and within a shorter distance another huge iceberg. You have to picture

MR. MARSHALL: the conditions that were there.

"Icebergs could not be towed away due to rough seas," Mr. Speaker, in 68 foot seas you do not tow away a 100,000 ton icebergs. The vessel was moored, Mr. Speaker, on all ten anchors, the West Venture. "Anchors could not be pulled due to rough seas; the last attempt on the night of the 16th" - the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) probably finds this rather amusing but I do not think it is to most people. "Anchors could not be pulled due to the rough seas. The last attempt on the night of the 16th was not successful." I underline the fact that there was an attempt to pull the anchors. At the very best it was a dangerous procedure to be done, but in 68 foot waves it would be suicidal to attempt it so the anchors could not be pulled.

MR. MARSHALL: "No personnel, Mr. Speaker, could be removed from the rig by helicopter or supply vessel, during the period the rig was threatened by icebergs, due to weather conditions." I emphasize again our guidelines that we put out had it down that four hours before any forecasted winds of 80 knots per hour the people would be evacuated from the rigs. It could not be done in this case because of weather conditions.

Another factor, "At 0100 hours, at 1:00, on Friday, February 18th, a bergy bit was within seven nautical miles of the rig but flying conditions prevented Mobil from evacuating any personnel from the rig. Under the adverse conditions that existed at that time, the shearing of anchor chains would have been highly hazardous and may not have been completed in time."

Another factor, "Successfully shearing the anchor chains would set the West Venture adrift, as it had no means of propulsion, and it would not have been possible to get a towline to a supply vessel due to the rough seas."

Another one, "Successful abandonment via the rig's lifesaving equipment would have been unlikely due to the high winds and the rough seas.

"Based on this incident," Mr. Speaker, and I emphasize, based on this incident alone and other factors in the report, "the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador concluded that unsafe operating conditions existed and that a stop drilling order was justified.

"While weather and ice conditions have moderated for the present, the extreme number of bergs present to the North of the drilling area and the normal occurrence of frequent severe storms during this period

MR. MARSHALL: indicate that these favourable conditions will not continue during the rest of March.

"Moreover, as the experience of February 16th indicates, conditions can deteriorate quickly with little notice given present forecasting capabilities. Bergy bits often cannot be detected until within the vicinity of the rig, particularly during storm conditions. This leads to the problem of having insufficient time to secure the wells." If you want an indication of that, those people who look out and may say - although they cannot today - that conditions are fine, the Monday before February 16th, forty-eight hours before, they were fine as well and then, within forty-eight hours, we had this occurrence.

"Based on this analysis, Mr. Speaker, it has been concluded," the Petroleum Directorate says, "that the risks associated with drilling operations on the Grand Banks at this particular time are simply too high and drilling should be suspended, pending the following: Operating conditions, especially the coincidence of a high number of icebergs and severe weather, must improve in order to lower the risk. This combination may reach an acceptable level by the end of March or early April," this combination of weather and icebergs. "Second, there must be a full review of all aspects of Winter drilling operations, particularly with respect to icebergs and storm conditions. Third, there must be a significant improvement in search and rescue capability in this Province." Because as the report indicates

MR. W. MARSHALL: Search and Rescue was called at one o'clock on that particular day of February 16. It took four and a half hours for one helicopter to get here from the Gaspé Bay Peninsula in Quebec, it was twenty-one hours before two other Search and Rescue helicopters managed to get to St. John's from Summerside, and even from Gander it was twenty-one hours. We are absolutely determined that there will not be, under the provincial aegis, any further drilling until such time as we have adequate search and rescue to protect the lives and the security of the people involved.

Mr. Speaker, the representatives received this briefing with a soberness befitting the seriousness of the information, i.e., the representatives of the company last night. They will absorb the facts and be back with their decision in forty-eight hours. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we made in very clear, crystal clear, that continued defiance of our order was totally unacceptable and the result of that meeting in no way implies there is a moratorium placed upon our directive. Our position, Mr. Speaker, is quite clear, that that directive, in the name of safety as well as anything else, should have been complied with the moment it was given and there is no excuse under the sun for it not having been complied with up to now. We advised the defiance is received very seriously and should anything happen offshore, Mr. Speaker, they, that is the company representatives and those responsible for not responding to that order, would stand condemned in the face of the facts presented to them last night in this report. The government just cannot understand the positions taken in face of the urgent and compelling facts. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the representatives of the company left very concerned and troubled persons, as well they might. There is no doubt

MR. W. MARSHALL: in my mind that they too feel these rigs should be brought ashore. However, it is obvious and very unfortunate that the federal minister is preventing their taking this action. He is viewing it as totally political. It most certainly is not, it is a question of safety, I challenge him to read that report and deny any fact in it. I hope that, fortified by our analysis in that report, his representative at the meeting - and there was a representative; unfortunately Mr. Chretien could not see his way clear to attend personally to review these very essential and urgent facts - but I hope his representative at the meeting and the corporate representatives, armed with this report can convince him of the wanton recklessness of his position.

MR. MARSHALL: In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chretien bears a very heavy and I might say a very unnecessary responsibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of public record in this Province that on a number of occasions following the Ocean Ranger disaster we in the Opposition raised the matter of offshore drilling during the Winter months both inside and outside of this House. It is tragic and unfortunate and sad indeed that the hon. gentleman who just made that pious statement did not listen to what we said at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: It is too bad and it is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman did not listen to Captain Nehring, who is now being invited to give testimony before the Royal Commission hearing on the Ocean Ranger disaster, whose correspondence and report I sent to the hon. gentleman in January, two months before the Ocean Ranger disaster.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: It is too bad the hon. gentleman did not listen to that warning signal that went up at the time.

AN HON. MEMBER Why?

MR. NEARY: Why? I do not know why. Only the hon. gentleman can answer that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Because it was not in his political interest.

MR. NEARY: I say this to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that he stopped playing his little game, that he stopped his one-upmanship and that he sit down with the federal authorities and tried to resolve this matter through negotiations.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman was invited

to a meeting -

MR. MORGAN:

Tell your buddies about it.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very

serious matter, and as the hon. gentleman indicated to my colleague, who lives on the sea, that I would like for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to keep quiet while I am speaking on this matter.

The Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) called a meeting ten days ago, convened a meeting to discuss this very matter. Did the minister who just took his seat, who made the Ministerial Statement, did he agree to attend? No, he did not. He would not even send an official to the meeting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, the hon. gentleman is talking over there as if he were in full command. The Newfoundland Appeals Court, three Newfoundland judges, Newfoundlanders

MR. NEARY: whom the Premier praised on another matter that was before the Court -

MR. DAWE: The issue was safety boy.

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

MR. WARREN: Why do you not straighten out Transportation?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I have, silence please?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - praised these judges on the Constitution and on another matter that was before the Appeal Court. These three Judges in their wisdom ruled only a couple of weeks ago that the offshore came under the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada. Is the hon. gentleman ignoring that fact? That is a decision of the Court! Three Newfoundland judges were unanimous. Mr. Speaker, in view of their -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is addressing himself to a statement that I made concerning a meeting with the representatives of the companies last week. I do not see that the decision of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland is relevant. I think the hon. gentleman could as well spare us a revulsion of hearing a Newfoundlander exulting in the loss of a decision of that nature by the people of this Province. I think he could spare us from exulting over the fact that the Grand Banks of Newfoundland have become the Grand Banks of Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. members, I am sure, will agree that the ruling on someone being relevant

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): is perhaps one of the most difficult that the Chair has to deal with. I would perhaps remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he has very limited time to speak in reply to the Ministerial Statement and maybe he could be a little more relevant.

MR. NEARY: I appreciate Your Honour being concerned about my time, but I believe, Your Honour, that I am relevant as Your Honour did not rule me out of order. The hon. gentleman is only making these point of orders to try to use up my time. Let me say this again, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman I heard on CBC radio this morning - in spite of the fact that I tried to clear it up yesterday - and the hon. gentleman is not Minister of Energy, he is Minister without Portfolio.

The hon. gentleman must realize, Mr. Speaker, that he is no longer in command. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can titter and laugh all he wants. The hon. gentleman has pangs of conscience because of the Ocean Ranger disaster. Mr. Speaker, let me say this, it is outrageous that the hon. gentleman should take this unilateral decision without any prior consultation with the people who were given the jurisdiction over the offshore by the Newfoundland Appeal Court. Now who is playing politics? The hon. gentleman did not raise this matter until after the Court decision and even last night, when I heard the hon. gentleman comment on this very serious matter, he was hurt, his pride was hurt because the oil companies did not send their top executives, they only sent junior executives to consult with the hon. gentleman. And then at the end, both he and the Premier had to have a few darts at Mr. Chretien.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is that the way to resolve the matter? Mr. Speaker, who was playing politics when they made these statements last night in answer to questions by news reporters about Mr. Chretien?

MR. DOYLE: The federal government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the administration would be well advised to follow the advice of the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the former Minister of Energy, who has a great deal of respect in this Province. There are an awful lot of people subscribe to his thinking and his point of view that what they should do, as the hon. gentleman, the member for Mount Scio, said publicly - he is on public record as having stated it - that the policy and the trend and the tradition has been to have prior consultation on these matters before the government makes a decision. That did not happen in this case. And I believe they should take the advice of the member for Mount Scio, and sound advice, and stop coming into the House with Ministerial Statements and inflammatory statements that can only prolong these discussions, and get back to the negotiating table and sit down and try to resolve this matter in a statesmanlike way and stop playing their little silly political games. That is what the hon. gentleman did today, that is what he is doing every day in this House, that is what he is doing outside the House. The press are falling for it. They should research Hansard and research the newspapers to see what the hon. gentleman said about this matter a year ago, see what the hon. gentleman said about it in November past before the decision of the Newfoundland Appeals Court. It would be worthwhile to put together a package of the Premier's remarks and the hon. gentleman's remarks in connection with drilling during the Winter months off our coast.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: It would be worthwhile for the

MR. NEARY: press, the media of this Province, to research Hansard and go to their own morgues and look at the statements made by the hon. gentleman and see who is being hypocritical and who is playing politics with this very serious matter, Mr. Speaker.

So in conclusion let me warn and advice the hon. gentleman that instead of coming in here with his political rhetoric and his little political game-playing that he take the matter seriously and attempt to negotiate a resolution of this matter before we have another disaster off our coast.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, just yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) tried to avoid taking a stand on the closure of the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - by trying to highlight a supposed error in a press statement on the subject issued by me on February 15, 1983.

PREMIER PECKFORD: More particularly, the Opposition Leader (Mr. Neary) disputed the truth of the statement that the Shoe Cove station provided realtime data on "iceberg movement, the location and character of pack ice and seastate conditions."

Moreover, a statement from the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate to the effect that Shoe Cove was not providing "daily" ice information was used to back up his accusation.

The assertion on iceberg movement, while perhaps overstated, is not entirely without foundation. The statements on pack ice and seastate conditions are clearly and unequivocally true. As well, the assertion by Federal Energy Minister Chretien that Shoe Cove did not provide real time, up to date and ongoing data shows a woefully inadequate knowledge of the science and technology that was used at Shoe Cove. As well, there is a difference in the meaning of the words "real time" and the word "daily" when applied to Shoe Cove.

Before I elaborate further, let me review the situation, Mr. Speaker. In December of 1982, the provincial government, through the Department of Development, submitted - the people around on the opposite side of the House and others who do not like us say we only took the position on Shoe Cove a week or two ago - in December of 1982 the provincial government, through the Department of Development submitted a discussion paper to the federal government in an effort to convince it not to close the Shoe Cove station. I have in my hand a copy of that document. In addition to pointing out the valuable services provided by the station in offshore monitoring, the paper pointed out the tremendous potential of the station in the offshore, general marine and scientific research areas. The paper appended a list of nearly eighty customers who used the services provided by Shoe Cove. The first one on the list of the eighty is none other than the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Department of Fisheries and Oceans, the federal government; Whale Research at MUN, MacLaren Plansearch; the Department of Environment, the Province of Newfoundland; the Minister of Lands and Forests, the Province of Quebec; Hunter and Associates; Atlantic Biological Services; the University of Colorado; Bedford Institute of Oceanography in Nova Scotia; MacLaren Marex; Cat Arm Consultants; Geosight, the University of Miami Oceanography; the University of California; Naval Department, Sydney, Nova Scotia; Remotec Applications Incorporated; Physics Department, MUN; C-Core; Dome Petroleum; the Newfoundland Forestry Research Centre; the University of BC Oceanography; US Geological Survey; the Department of Development, the Province of Newfoundland; Dalhousie University Oceanography; Alberta Remote Sensing Centre; Nordco, Fenco; Reading Univeristy, England; Ice Climatology, Ottawa; Javelin Limited; a group from Quebec; a group from Denmark - I cannot pronounce the words, that is why I am saying a group from Denmark. The Physics Department, MUN; Bowaters Newfoundland; Noranda; the Department of Earch Services, MUN; Ice Central - Ice Central, Mr. Speaker, Ice Central, Atmospheric Environmental Service, the federal government, Ice Central used to get information from Shoe Cove. Now let us play with words, Mr. Speaker, let us start playing with words today as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) tried to do yesterday. McGill

PREMIER PECKFORD: University, the Marine Science Centre, the Health Sciences at Mun, A.E.S., Downsview, Ontario. Downsview, Ontario has a centre, but they could not get all of the information themselves they had to go to Shoe Cove to get the rest of it, a federal government agency again.

The Department of Mines Newfoundland, the Canadian Forestry Service, again, the Placer Development Limited, The U.S. Navy, Petro-Can, Utah Mines, Esso Resources Frontier Explorations Limited, Nova Scotia Department of Lands and Forests, for God sake, Selco, Geography Department, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, R.A.F., Laval University, Acre Consultants, the Geography Department at McGill, a group from France, I cannot pronounce the name again, and on it goes. Eighty.

MR. T. HICKEY: That is the one they say is obsolete.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The list is quite diverse including universities, government departments, research laboratories, and consulting companies from all over the world.

The document also contained letters of support from the station's continued operation from none other than Petro-Canada, Gulf Canada, Mun Engineering, Mun Physics and Chemistry, The Maritime Remote Sensing Committee, The Canadian Remote Sensing Committee, The Newfoundland Centre for the Canadian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society, Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services, C-Core, Remotec, The National Research Council of Canada, a beast of the federal government, and Fisheries and Oceans Canada. Letters of support saying keep Shoe Cove.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you just a few quotes of what these organizations had to say about Shoe Cove. Petro-Canada: "Within our department the analysis of

PREMIER PECKFORD: satellite data has become an integral component to the successful support of our exploratory drilling programme in Labrador."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Maritime Remote Sensing Committee; "The Maritimes stand at the threshold of signing into action a comprehensive programme of remote sensing technology transfer with the Canada Centre for Remote Sensing. Without the real time" - not necessarily daily - "Without the real time" - and Mr. Marshall in his statement was talking about daily, he wanted it upgraded, is what the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate was saying in his statement. We want it upgraded even further. Forget about taking it away. Real time is pretty good, a day, two days, three days, but we would like to have it daily.

And what I was saying in my statement is it does provide ice information, a day and a half, two days, three days, it could provide it daily if you upgraded it. Without the real time image advantages available from Shoe Cove, the Maritimes Technology Transfer programme stands in jeopardy."

The Newfoundland Centre for the Canadian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society, what did they say? "Should the Tracking Station be closed, The Oceanographers and Research Engineers in this community will lose a valuable research tool for several years, satellite imagery has been used by researchers to study and monitor sea ice movements offshore Newfoundland and Labrador."

C-Core: "The present generation of satellites tracked at Shoe Cove have provided a source of information for the East Coast region where traditional surface collected data is extremely sparse."

And finally, Remotec said, "Landsat Data has proven to be useful for offshore studies concerned with what? the detection of ice and icebergs."

MR. MARSHALL: There you go!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Surely, Mr. Speaker, these learned people are aware of what they are talking about and they are very sensitive to the important role played by Shoe Cove both in offshore sea and ice monitoring, as well as marine related research.

Mr. Chretien's statement that Shoe Cove did not provide "real time" data also shows a basic lack of understanding. Shoe Cove used to track the Landsat satellite and the NOAA satellite. NOAA provided data feed to the station twice daily, and Landsat very 16 days. A couple of years ago there were two Landsat series satellites and they provided a data feed every eight days. The data from both Landsat and NOAA and fed into a sophisticated computer system which, combining the information from both satellites, did provide a continuous picture over time, of offshore ice conditions - over time it did provide information on ice. What the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate wanted in his role there he wanted to see it upgraded so it was even quicker time. There was already time and ice information from Shoe Cove, but let us make it better. While, as Mr. Marshall said, we may not have been guaranteed an accurate ice picture for a given hour or a given day, we did get a pretty good idea on ongoing and developing ice trends. And what we wanted to do and why the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate said what he said was we wanted to improve it, the ongoing thing, the four or five days to one day. We did nevertheless have a pretty good idea of ongoing developing ice trends by the computer mating of data from the two very different satellites.

And, as the hon. minister for the Petroleum Directorate's statement said, we are concerned

PREMIER PECKFORD: not only with keeping it but the "potential" for Shoe Cove, and this in no way detracts from my statement that we were getting a certain amount of ice data all along on an ongoing basis.

With Shoe Cove gone, we can still get NOAA data from the Atmospheric Environment Service in Downsview, Ontario, but, Mr. Speaker, this data is in facsimile form, that is photographic form, the same sort of photograph we see used on the Evening Telegram or the evening T.V. weather forecasts, that kind of photograph.

PREMIER PECKFORD: However, such data is next to useless for scientific purposes. The Shoe Cove data is stored on magnetic computer tape, and, as such, it is much more amenable to scientific data manipulation and analysis. Therefore, for all practical purposes the two satellites feeding into Shoe Cove gave us a very respectable real time 'picture' of our offshore situation, which we wanted improved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: And finally, Mr. Speaker, as for iceberg detection, this has been done, though not widely so, using Shoe Cove data. The Remotec company invites the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and other interested parties to view a Landsat photo on which icebergs can be detected. Admittedly, this technology needs some development. That is why we want to keep Shoe Cove, because we want to build on what we have. We have something which is important, that is what I said and what the hon. the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) said, and we want more for the offshore. This technology needs some development to be put into widespread use but it has been and can be done. The potential here, as the minister said, is one of our main areas of interest in Shoe Cove.

 Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Leader of the Opposition to stop trying to throw up technicalities and semantics in words as regards the Shoe Cove station. On that score I can meet him datum for datum in this regard, as I have shown in this statement.

 The fact is that Shoe Cove was providing ice information on a real time basis. With further upgrading, rather than closure, this capability could be enhanced using current satellites, and that is

PREMIER PECKFORD: what the minister was talking about. In the 1990s the federal government will be launching a series of radar satellites which will make ice and iceberg detection even more timely and accurate, providing we have Shoe Cove to track the satellites and analyse their data.

Rather than trying to attack my credibility, Mr. Speaker, by nitpicking on what was or was not said on Shoe Cove - which can be proved to be consistent, I saying that what we had there already provided real time data on ice, the hon. the minister saying we want it even upgraded - the Opposition Leader (Mr. Neary) should recognize that it has provided offshore ice information and has the potential to go far beyond its present capabilities. Rather than attack me, Mr. Speaker, why does not the Opposition Leader state where he stands on the Shoe Cove close down? That is the question he has been trying to avoid, Mr. Speaker, and the question he should answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, instead of lecturing me and the Opposition, the hon. gentleman should be lecturing the gentleman who sits to his right, because what triggered this whole controversy, Mr. Speaker, was not I, but the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). The President of the Council made a statement to The Evening Telegram. And what did the President of the Council say in that statement, Mr. Speaker? What did he say? He contradicted what the Premier said. Here is what it said: "Marshall says government was aware that station did not provide ice

March 8, 1983

Tape 100

EC - 3

MR. NEARY: information." On March 5, 1983,
"Marshall says government was aware station did not provide
ice information."

MR. S. NEARY: And the opening paragraph of that statement made by the President of the Council, "William Marshall, the Province's minister responsible for the offshore, says the Province was aware that the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station was not supplying the oil industry with daily ice information when it began a fight to save the facility." So the hon. gentleman's fight -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Real time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he was speaking and I trust he will afford me -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: - afford me the same courtesy, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might have to learn the rules of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is -

MR. TOBIN: The paper told the truth.

MR. G. WARREN: Oh, yes, since when?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman's argument is not with me, it is with his colleague. It is his colleague who contradicted the hon. the Premier publicly. I cannot help it, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman's pride is hurt. I cannot help it if his feelings are hurt, Mr. Speaker. It is not I who hurt the hon. the gentleman's feelings. And, Mr. Speaker, now the hon. gentleman is trying to redeem himself, he is trying now to brainwash the press that are up over here gaping down at the hon. gentleman all day long and the Minister of Energy with the silly grin on his face, instead of the press being up where the ladies are today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please! I have to remind hon. members both to my
left and right that when a member is speaking he does have
the right to be heard in silence.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the
Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is addressing
himself to a statement made by the Premier relating to the
Shoe Cove Station and I fail to see whether the press gapes
at us or, as he wanted this morning as he said in his letter
to get them over there to gape at him that that has any
relevance at all to the Shoe Cove Station. We are talking,
Mr. Speaker, about gaping at satellites, not at the press
gaping at the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - that is just an example of
the silly, childish attitude of the hon. gentleman and the
arrogance of this administration. It is not a valid point of
order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The point of order
is not valid but I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition
has strayed a little from the rule of relevancy.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. the
Premier is trying to do, he is trying now to portray the
image of a gentleman who did not mislead the people of this
Province when in actual fact the hon. gentleman did make
erroneous statements, made false and misleading statements,
as confirmed by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall)
in his statement to The Evening Telegram Now, why is the

MR. S. NEARY: Premier making such an issue out of the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station, a station which we are told, Mr. Speaker, cannot penetrate the clouds, does not give ice reports, does not give iceberg movements? - Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is trying to convince us to his way of thinking, he is making a very poor job of it, because I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, this matter, which is federal jurisdiction, can be better handled by learned gentlemen - as he refers to in his statement - by learned gentlemen, scientists and learned gentleman who make decisions on these matters. Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman saying -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Do you agree with that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. the gentleman I would ask him to observe the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman telling this House that the people who made the decision to close that tracking station did not know what they were doing? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying,

MR. NEARY: Or is he playing politics with it? Mr. Speaker, is he trying to give a little comfort to his colleagues? Mr. Speaker, is he trying to give a little comfort to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), who planned a demonstration down at Shoe Cove? Is that what the hon. gentleman is up to? Is he trying to retrieve his bad reputation as a person who covers up and misleads people - covered up on the \$60 million deficit in this Province, covered up on the closing of the Burin fish plant, covered up on Corner Brook - and now, Mr. Speaker, misled the people on Shoe Cove. Is that what the hon. gentleman is trying to do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that if we are going to have demonstrations, this whole thing is designed - I hope the press do not fall for it - is designed, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - this whole matter is designed to distract attention from the real issues in this Province. And what are the real issues, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) on a point of order.

MR. HICKEY: I organized that protest to distract from nothing other than to bring to light the ineptness of a

MR. HICKEY: federal minister who does not know whether he is coming or going and who does not know the first thing, and not only that but who will not listen to the people with the brains, the technologists.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To the point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that if the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) can organize a demonstration on Shoe Cove, will he go down and organize a demonstration for the unemployed and the situation that they are in, or for the people who are on social assistance and the misery he has put them through?

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. HICKEY: Join me and I would be glad to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Hon. members are rising on points of order which indeed are not points of order at all but an opportunity to express opinions.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden now the Minister of Social Services has become a scientist. He is going to tell the scientists now and the technicians how to run their affairs, He cannot even run the Department of Social Services!

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that all of this is designed to distract from the real issues in this Province. The real issues are Corner Brook, Buchans, Burin, St. Lawrence, Grand Bank, Fermeuse, Gaultois, Ramea, Labrador City, Wabush, Happy Valley, Goose Bay and Bell Island. They are the real issues in this Province. I did not see the minister leading a demonstration in these communities, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

I would like to inform the hon.

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that the allocation of time in response to the Ministerial Statement has expired.

Are there any other Ministerial Statements?

The hon. Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, before I begin my statement I would just like to pause for a moment and observe that today is International Women's Day and it is good to see so many women in our galleries.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS.VERGE: I am pleased to reaffirm government's commitment to lower the pupil-teacher ratio for the next school year to 23 to 1.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS.VERGE: At the same time, Mr.Speaker, I wish to announce a number of restraint measures to offset part of the resulting extra expenditure for teacher salaries.

Government's promise to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio was announced by me on April 21, 1981. At that time there was mapped out a three year plan for the provision of resources - school construction grants and teacher salary units - to coincide with the phase-in of the expanded high school programme.

The programme began with Grade 10, or level 1, in September 1981 and will produce the first Grade 12 graduates in June, 1984.

Over the three years from the 1980-81 school year to the 1983-84 school year, government will have completed its plan to lower the pupil-teacher ratio in three stages:

24.92:1 to 24.5:1 starting September 1981;
24.5 :1 to 24.0:1 starting September 1982; and finally
24.0; 1 to 23.0:1 starting September coming.

Next September there will be 450 more teaching positions than there are this school year, resulting from the combined effect of the reduction in the ratio to 23.0:1 and the growth of student population with Grade 12.

MS. VERGE:

The decision to proceed with the improved ratio will cost government approximately \$8 million in the 1983-84 school year. It is virtually impossible for government to undertake this financial commitment without finding offsetting savings in other areas of expenditure in education. For this reason government has decided to implement the following cost reduction measures:

1. Adjusting the calculation of student enrolments to reduce the increase in the teacher allocations by about 30 across the Province to those school districts where high school students take pre-vocational programs in vocational schools.
2. Freezing the allocation of what are known as E.M.R. special education salary units at existing levels for all school districts which have already been allocated units equivalent to 10 or more per cent of their regular teacher allocations.
3. Freezing appointments of assistant superintendents and program co-ordinators at existing levels.

As a fourth measure, government will reduce spending on salaries for substitute teachers and we have informed the Newfoundland Teachers' Association of our intention to seek their agreement with the method of doing this.

Altogether these restraint measures will reduce the projected cost increase of the 23.0:1 ratio by approximately \$4 million. This amount represents about one-half of the additional cost to government of improving the ratio.

MS. VERGE: It is important to point out that the lower pupil-teacher ratio will assure sufficient teachers to launch Grade XII as the culmination of the reorganized high school programme and, also, will permit continued adequate personnel in lower grades where enrollments are continuing to decline.

Within the next few days, the Department of Education will give each of the Province's thirty-five school boards details of its teacher salary allocations for next year.

Government is pleased to be proceeding with the implementation of the promised improved pupil-teacher ratio. We are doing so in these difficult economic times on the basis that savings must be attained in other areas to assist with the cost of its implementation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. LUSH: It is interesting to note why the minister would have to make this announcement today. This was a commitment made by the government back in 1981. When it announced its intention to establish a new reorganized high school programme, this was one of the major elements in it. First, that we needed x number of teachers, somewhere around 700 I believe, to meet the minimum requirements. And this is one of the contentious points with respect to the ongoing NTA negotiations and it is strange that the government would not give the NTA this commitment. And as I said, this has been one of the contentious points, one of the issues that they would not make any commitments to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association on. So we have to thank the Newfoundland Teachers' Association

MR. LUSH: for this because it looks like the government had intended to renege on this twenty-three to one ratio, and the NTA over the past couple of weeks have been exerting tremendous pressure and I am sure that they are delighted that finally the government has decided to go along with that formula to give the minimum required teachers to carry out this high school programme. Because without these teachers of course the programme would have been in severe danger and right up until now, as I say, the government have not indicated or would not indicate to the NTA that they were going to carry out this particular part of the programme. This is a most important element to give our school board the minimum number of teachers to carry on the programme.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are delighted, certainly we are delighted, but the government had no choice but to do it, or either that to throw out the new high school programme. They could not do it without these extra teachers. So we are glad to know that the government is now carrying out that commitment so that schools will be able to carry on the programme in terms of meeting the minimum requirements.

Mr. Speaker, what we would

MR. LUSH: like to know now is whether or not school boards are going to be given enough money to build classrooms for those teachers, because some of those teachers are going to be without classrooms and that is going to be a very difficult situation. The minister says no. Well, only recently the Avalon School Board said that they did not know what to do with students in Mount Pearl, so that is a current story that they have students going in there next year and do not know what to do with them. I expect, Mr. Speaker, that there are other school boards in the same situation, so now what we have to know is what arrangements there will be to provide space for those teachers to instruct the students, to offer the minimum programme that is set out by the government.

Mr. Speaker, the areas in which they are going to cut costs, I do want to say that one or two of them are very, very sensitive and will take further study, 'number one, adjusting the calculation of student enrolments to reduce the increase in teacher allocations by about thirty to those school districts where high school students take pre-vocational programmes in vocational schools.' Mr. Speaker, that one needs a little more study. I do not know what repercussions that will have on the particular school boards, so that one needs further study whether it will affect the programmes in those areas concerned and one would have to study that a little more fully. Freezing the allocation of EMR is certainly a very delicate issue, students who need more teachers instead of less -

MR. HODDER: That is right.

MR. LUSH: -people who need special instruction; that is a very sensitive area.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the other one, on substitute teachers, is another very delicate area and I again would want to see the details on this. The minister has indicated that the details have not been worked out. But this is a very sensitive area. We are talking about substitute teachers, Mr. Speaker, who go in for a week, go in for a month, go in for two months, and I am not so concerned about substituting on a daily basis, but teachers who substitute on a longer period of time, two weeks, a month, two months, this sort of thing, and I would hope that there would be some special consideration for that and that these teachers in on a longer term basis would certainly get full pay. Because if they do not, I expect that school boards will have a great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in getting substitute teachers, and that is very, very important so I again would want to know the details with respect to bringing in this measure before I could comment on it further.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and I would like to bring him back to some of the realities of this Province, and bring the government back perhaps to some of the realities of this Province and their responsibilities, and that is the processing sector of the fishing industry. That is a provincial responsibility, Mr. Speaker, as I have said many times in this House. In other words, let me put it in baby talk for them: It is the responsibility of the provincial Minister of Fisheries to decide if a

MR. TULK: certain fish plant in this Province is to reopen, what conditions will be attached to that reopening and when it will be reopened.

With fish plants closed all over the South Coast of this Province, let me ask the minister a question, a particular question. Let me take a particular example, the people of Burin. Will the minister through this House tell the people of Burin when their fish plant is going to be reopened or if indeed it is going to be reopened? It is his responsibility. Would he tell us, please?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ask Rompkey.

MR. TULK: It has nothing to do with Rompkey, it is the minister's responsibility. Would he tell them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: The processing sector -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: - is the responsibility of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

MR. TOBIN: You finally asked a question on the fishery -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: - after three days in the House
you were so concerned.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am assuming I will
be given a chance to answer the question if the Opposition
Leader will keep quite so his colleague can hear the answer.

Mr. Speaker, the question with
regard to Burin is the same as the question with regard to
St. Anthony, with regard to Fermeuse, with regard to St.
Lawrence, with regard to Gaultois, with regard to Harbour
Breton and Ramea, that these plants are owned by companies that
are finding themselves in very deep financial difficulty to
the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars. And irrespective
of whose responsibility and whose jurisdiction it is under,
the fact is that Mr. Kirby in his report has recognized it,
the federal Prime Minister of the country has recognized it
and is appointing a special Cabinet committee headed by Mr.
Donald Johnson, the Minister of State for Economic Development,
and a number of other ministers, a total of seven, to deal
with that very serious financial problem in the Atlantic Coast
fishing industry pertaining to three companies - three large
companies - Fishery Products, The Lake Group, Nickersons and
also including T. J. Harding and John Penney and Sons.

MR. NEARY: That is not true.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is true that
T.J. Harding is owned by Nickersons 50/50 and they are asking

MR. MORGAN: for \$4 million to \$5 million. So, I mean the hon. member can argue or make believe it is not true but it is true. And that Cabinet Committee, Mr. Speaker, is being appointed, as I say, by the Prime Minister. Mr. Kirby, the author of the Navigating Troubled Waters report has been asked to do all the necessary analysis of the situation and to do a very thorough analysis of the financial situation of these companies and to make a report to that Cabinet Committee. And that Cabinet Committee has assured the Premier of the Province and the Newfoundland government, myself as the Minister of Fisheries, that no decisions will be made on that matter pertaining to Burin and other plants I mentioned prior to consultation with the Newfoundland government and, of course, the other parties concerned and involved. And until that matter has been addressed and a decision made by the Cabinet Committee - Newfoundland's minister in the federal Cabinet is a member of that committee - and until that federal Cabinet Committee deals with that gigantic financial problem involving hundreds of millions of dollars, then I am not in a position to comment on any of the discussions ongoing or negotiations ongoing or matters being discussed between the levels of government or the parties concerned until it comes to a

MR. MORGAN: conclusion. And hopefully, Mr. Speaker, the conclusion will be finalized and decisions made as quickly as possible.

We said to the company which owns Burin, as the member for Burin (Mr. Tobin) is quite aware of since he has been very much involved in the whole issue from the very beginning, and, indeed, my colleagues who are members for areas where plants owned by these companies are closed, that we have taken a very firm position that nothing should have been changed, no decisions made by these corporate citizens to close any plant, including Burin, until this whole process I am talking about has had a chance to deal with the issue and how to put in place some kind of financial restructuring to put these companies on some kind of an economic footing for the future.

MR. TULK: That is not true.

MR. MORGAN: But unfortunately the company chose not to listen to the Newfoundland Government. They went ahead and made decisions to close Burin and to curtail other activity. At the present time, as again I want to reiterate, the decision regarding Burin is the same as the decisions regarding other plants. However, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that some other plants are also under the provincial government jurisdiction for processing licence the federal government has chose to make a decision, make a decision directly without even consulting the parties concerned, and that is on St. Anthony.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, during the Oral Question Period -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Sir.

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

MR. NEARY: During Oral Question Period, Mr. Speaker, I think the answers have to be concise and brief. The hon. gentleman is making a political speech, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the Chair to direct the minister to obey the rules of this hon. House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Fisheries, to the point of order.

MR. MORGAN: I heard the hon. gentleman outside of the House crying and bawling and screaming about 'Open the House of Assembly to discuss the fisheries and to discuss the problems of the fisheries.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now I am trying to give information of what is happening in the fishing industry and the hon. gentleman is saying I am too long giving information.

MR. TULK: Tell the truth.

MR. MORGAN: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that it is almost impossible to give a brief answer, a concise answer to such a complex problem regarding the issue that was addressed in the question.

MR. ANDREWS: Look at Kirby's answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

As I said yesterday, I believe, there are only thirty minutes allocated to the Question Period. Sometimes by the very nature perhaps of the question asked the answer might have to be a little longer than normal, but I would remind hon. members that their answers should be as

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): brief as possible.
The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, I find it strange
that the minister who is responsible is waiting for Kirby,
waiting for the federal government for their plan of action.
It seems to me it should be the reverse, that the minister should
have a plan of action for the fish plant in
this Province.

MR. TOBIN: What about St. Anthony?

MR. TULK: So let me ask him a very
specific question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Did he submit any plan of action
to the federal government in regard to keeping the Burin fish
plant open. He said that some companies closed down the
plants without consulting the provincial government. Well, need
I remind him that he has control of the processing licence.
Did he say to Fishery Products, for example, "Unless you open
the Burin plant, we will take your licences away?"

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honour just drew attention
to the fact that answers had to be brief, Mr. Speaker, Also
questions cannot be speeches. The hon. gentleman is commenting
on the answer. There is a procedure set down in the Standing
Orders if he wishes to

MR. MARSHALL: avail of it, but in the meantime this is the Question Period, the time for asking questions.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. That is not a valid point of order. The hon. gentleman is being silly again and just showing the arrogance of the administration. My hon. friend asked a specific question, I heard it. He asked a question of the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan); he was about to take his seat when he was interrupted by the hon. gentleman, who does this from time to time, Mr. Speaker, just to stall for time when the heat is on a minister, when the heat is on the government. When they do not want criticism, the hon. gentleman uses the parliamentary device of points of order. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask Your Honour to direct the hon. gentleman not to be interrupting the hon. gentleman while he is asking questions. Because the time -

AN HON. MEMBER: Go and sit down, boy. Sit down.

MR. NEARY: - the time is deducted from the half hour Oral Question Period that we have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It appears to the Chair that members either rising on points of order, or responding thereto, are equally as guilty perhaps of wasting the time of the House and the thirty minutes of the Question Period for that purpose.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: In answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, it was just yesterday, in fact, on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland that I met with Mr. Johnson, a federal minister; Mr. Lalonde, a federal minister; Mr. LeBlanc, a federal minister; Mr. De Bane, a federal minister; Mr. Rompkey, a federal minister; Mr. MacEachen, Deputy Prime Minister, the same meeting. And, Mr. Speaker, that kind of

MR. MORGAN: meeting involving the Newfoundland Government is the kind of meeting that we are not going to be discussing in public. We are determined as a government to take the right position, to make the right decision as it pertains to the processing problems of the Province and the processing sector of the fishing industry.

Sure we have our views on the plants that are closed, sure we have our views on the restructuring, but we are not going to take a final decision and a final position until we are totally sure the position we are taking is the right one for this Province. We are not going to be forced into taking any position or decision. And, Mr. Speaker, because of that we intend to ensure, through the consultation process, of getting the views and opinions of all concerned, and the Premier and his senior committee of Cabinet, the P and P Committee, has arranged to meet with and get the opinions from the banks, the companies - all of them have the same problems - and the union. In fact in the next two days it will be done. It is going to be done. It is arranged. So as we get input through a consultation process, input from all parties and listen to their views and opinions, because it is a major problem, and the decision that we make is going to influence the fishing industry for twenty or more years to come and we want to make sure the decision we make as a government here, and hopefully in conjunction and co-ordination with the Cabinet Ministers in Ottawa I just mentioned, including my colleague and friend, Mr. De Bane, that we make the right decision.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition would love me to stand up in the House and criticize Mr. De Bane and tear into him and all this. No, Mr. Speaker, I got a good buddy, we are cheek to cheek, we are heart to heart, Mr. De Bane and myself. We work in co-ordination every day. We talk to each other every day on the phone, meetings here,

MR. J. MORGAN: meetings in Ottawa, meetings in Montreal. No, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that my colleague and friend, the hon. Mr. De Bane, realizes that there is no future to the Liberal Party in Newfoundland, that he is going to have to work with the PC Government here to do things for our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I could have written the Minister's script. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I said to the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder) this morning I had a fair feeling of the way he was going to react.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is his responsibility to handle processing in this Province. Now, is he committed in this Province to seeing that not one fish plant on the Southwest Coast will close or is he committed to closing certain ones? If he is, will he tell us which ones? He must know by now, Mr. Speaker, he has had a year and a half. What is his commitment to the people of the Southwest Coast? Would he answer that question for me?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I can assure this House of Assembly that the policy of this government is not the policy of the Liberal Party, advocated, tabled in the House of Assembly, now in Hansard, in the records of this House by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), now leader of the party; the policy and the headlines were carried in the local press the following day, and rightly so, and quoted the hon. gentleman quite properly, did not miss a word he said. 'Let the companies go bankrupt, Neary says' was the headline, 'Let the companies go'. The advice to Morgan, 'Let the companies

MR. J. MORGAN: go bankrupt'. I can assure the hon. House of Assembly that we are not going to adopt that kind of a policy - let the companies go, let them go bankrupt, let the plants close, let the people lose their jobs in plants, let the fishermen lose their markets for their fish. That is the policy of the Opposition Party, Mr. Speaker, but the policy of this government here is to do the right things to make sure that our fishing industry is going to be an economically viable industry in the future.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the policy of this government is quite clear, to sit back and do nothing and to let the industry fold. But let me ask the minister another question. Sometime ago the Premier of this Province met with Mr. De Bane and when he came back he used the term 'negative fallout', saying that he knew that there was going to have to be restructuring in the industry, that it was going to have to happen, but that there would be some negative fallout and he would hope that both the federal and provincial governments could co-operate in taking that negative fallout. Would he tell us what that negative fall out is? I presume it means the close down of fish plants, the decimation of communities, but would he tell us whether in fact that is what the Premier meant? He must know, he is his minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will try not to be partisan in answering this time. Mr. Speaker, the fact is it is a very serious issue because Mr. Kirby in his report here - and it is a very good report; there are some things that are not in there that we would like to see in there but in essence the bottom line is it is a good report;

MR. J. MORGAN: we have some concern with some aspects but in general it is good - and in his report he referred to making public the report at his press conferences saying there would be some calamities - he used the word 'calamities' - in the fishing industry. The Premier has used the term 'fallout' because it came from, I think, one of the federal ministers, a possible fallout in the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada even after the financial restructuring is put in place. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question very sincerely by saying that is of concern to this government,

MR.MORGAN: because fallout or calamity, call it what you wish, means closure of plants and loss of jobs. That is of major concern to us, these calamities or these potential calamities or potential fallout. And that is the reason why the Premier went to Ottawa and wants the assurance that if there are going to be fallouts, if there are going to be calamities, not to let these calamities and fallout just be dropped in the lap of the Newfoundland government and say, 'Here is your problem.' Unemployment in these communities in some cases could mean almost the death of a community. And that is the reason he wanted the assurance. We are still concerned over that, that those negative aspects of any financial restructuring of the large companies.

not be left for one government, but be dealt with in a very co-ordinative way and jointly by both levels of government. And to date that assurance is still there, that any negative fallout or any calamity that is referred by Dr. Kirby will not be left unattended to and forgotten by both governments.

MR.TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary. The hon. member for Fogo.

MR.TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me put the question to the minister another way. Suppose Ottawa in their restructuring-and I know why he is in bed with the federal minister on this one; I know, no problem.- but suppose Ottawa says no to this plant, we are going to close you down and, yes to another plant, we are going to keep you open. Let me ask the minister is he prepared to see Burin, Fermeuse, Ramea or either of these places open and the other one closed? Now just what is he prepared to do? He is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in this Province responsible for the processing

MR. TULK: sector of the industry. What is he prepared to do? How much money is he prepared to put in? Or is he going to just lie and let Kirby and the federal minister decide for him and then a few days afterwards come out with a critical statement? Let me ask him that question-

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

MR. MORGAN: Remember, the hon. gentleman when he asked the first question this afternoon said he was going to put the question in baby talk. Well it is obvious is going to be put in baby talk for him to understand because I went over it earlier. The fact is that this restructuring of those large companies which own those plants in the communities mentioned earlier, that that question, that major problem is now being addressed and we are not going to get involved in disclosing any content or any aspect of these discussions and negotiations, if you want to call it that, between levels of government and the parties concerned. And I am saying again the major concern of this government is that if there is going to be any negative aspects by means of plant closures, that we want an assurance because it is no secret. We are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars, and the federal government is recognizing they have a responsibility to help out the Atlantic region's most important industry, the fishing industry. Surely they have a right to do it. They help out the auto industry, they help out the oil and gas industry, and surely they are going to help out the most important industry we have, and they are going to. We know they are going to. There is a need for injection of hundreds of millions of dollars and when the injection is carried out and the implementation is carried out it is not going to be done unilaterally by

MR. MORGAN: the federal government, it is going to be done in co-ordination with us here. That is when we will have our concerns put forward, that is when we will put our issues forward regarding respective plants. And if there is going to be any plant closed which is going to be detrimental or have any serious social affect on any respective area, we are going to have to work in co-ordination with the federal government to make sure these social problems are overcome.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I believe now that we have clearly established in this House this afternoon that the processing sector of the fishing industry is provincial responsibility. The government, the administration have laid back on their oars, have not lifted a finger to present plans for the restructuring of the processing sector of the fishing industry.

I am going to ask the hon. gentleman now about a visit the Premier made to Mr. De Bane a few weeks ago. The Premier went to Ottawa, met with the Federal Minister of Fisheries -

PREMIER PECKFORD: You are going to ask me?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I can ask the hon. gentleman if he would take his seat.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will take my seat.

MR. NEARY: At that meeting with Mr. De Bane, did the hon. gentleman discuss the possibility of one large fish company operating all the fishery in Newfoundland, two companies operating in Newfoundland, or three companies operating in Newfoundland, or partial or full nationalization of the fishing industry? Now there are four questions in one. Did the hon. gentleman agree or put forward a plan, or agree with a plan or discuss one large company, two companies, three companies, or partial or full nationalization of the fishing industry? Will the hon. gentleman tell the House what he indicated to Mr. De Bane, his feelings, what he wanted done in this regard?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in that meeting that was held I made three points clear. One, we have got to get on with getting this restructuring done and

PREMIER PECKFORD: getting some kind of co-operation between the two levels of government and the other parties to see that it was done as soon as possible. The people were out there waiting in various communities and we needed a comprehensive plan in place and we needed it done quickly. That was number one. I was worried about time and the time was of the essence and let us get on with it. Secondly, I indicated that the Government of Newfoundland opposed nationalization, we opposed one big company. If anybody was thinking about one big company all nationalized, then we were opposed to it. We do not think that is the answer to the fishing industry in Newfoundland, especially the offshore fishery, let alone the inshore fishery. It cannot work in the inshore anyway. As related to the companies that exist there which are mostly offshore, we are opposed to one large company and we are opposed to nationalization. I think that was the way certain people were talking, that one large company would become a nationalized company, a company that the federal government, or whoever, or governments would control or have a significant say over. And the third point that I wanted to make was that if under some restructuring plan which everybody agreed with, all the governments and the industry and everybody else and the banks and it was done, that if there was to be negative fallout, as the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has already mentioned, that any negative fallout to a community or area of the Province would have to be handled by both levels of government because we were not in a position to do it ourselves.

Whilst the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) tries to say, you know, it is like saying that the processing sector is provincial, it is some good to have power over a processing plant if you do not have any fish or trawlers to go into that processing

PREMIER PECKFORD:

plant. Do not be foolish and try to play silly politics, because it is not getting the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) anywhere.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Everybody in the Province knows and understands that 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the fishing jurisdiction lies with the federal government. Quebec has a different system. It is a funny thing about Confederation: Quebec got a favoured treatment status on fisheries. They can licence and can do a whole bunch of things that no other province can do. They got special status in fisheries. It was given to them in 1922 by a Privy Council decision, Privy Council No. 360, amended by Privy Council No. 1890. The Privy Council decision of No. 360 gave them jurisdiction over the fisheries in their area but excluded the Magdalen Islands. The Privy Council No. 1890 gave them the Magdalen Islands as well. So they have it since 1922. We have not been so lucky. They do not treat all parts of the nation the same. They treat Quebec in a favoured way and they do not treat Newfoundland the same way. But that is alright, I mean, we have made that point before.

So in that meeting that was held in Mr. De Bane's office that day, I made three points: One, time was of the essence, let us get on with it; two, that we oppose nationalization of the fishing industry, and, as we understood the rumours and different things that people were saying, that one company would mean nationalization; and three, that if there were to be an agreement between all parties that a certain plan were to go ahead and there was negative fallout from that plan, that both governments would have to address it jointly and respond to it positively for that area or for that community. So that is where it was. Only one more point really: anything else, I said, as a scenario, as alternatives - put these two companies

PREMIER PECKFORD: together, put those three together, put another three together, put those two together - we were prepared to look at and would base our final decision upon the data and upon analysis of the data. And that is where we are right now. We are still getting information, computer runs done on it. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has indicated, but I do not mind indicating to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and to the House and to the Province that yesterday the Minister of Fisheries was in Ottawa, there was a meeting of the federal Cabinet Committee at which all parties in the fishery who were going to be affected by the restructuring plans made their positions known. The Province of P.E.I., the Province of New Brunswick, the Province of Nova Scotia, the banks, all the companies and the union, they are all here tomorrow to do the same process with the Newfoundland Government. We did not make our position known yesterday primarily because we are not in a position to make it known, because we want to know where everybody else stands. We are a government and we are not going to be pre-empted by somebody else. The Leader of the Opposition or the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) have no worries about that. This is a government that prides itself on having its homework done and we are not going to be caught out on this one, we are going to do it right. And the Minister of Fisheries was in Ottawa yesterday on behalf of the government and the people of Newfoundland to say exactly that to the federal Cabinet Committee.

Tomorrow we will be conducting the same process of asking the companies, 'Where do you

March 8, 1983

Tape 112

EC - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: stand on all the stuff that has
gone on and the Price Waterhouse report with all the data?

PREMIER PECKFORD: We will be asking the union, and the companies, we will be asking the banks, we will be asking Price Waterhouse and we will get all of that data. We know where the other three provinces are, we got their positions from them yesterday. Then after we got all of that, and because Price Waterhouse says, A, B, C, D, E, F, and G based upon the data - I mean, a computer is only as good as the information you feed it, so we did not take the scenarios that were spewed out of the computer by somebody else's question and by somebody else's information, we said, 'Hold on now, just one second. This is fine and dandy, but we would like to look at all of this. We have a few experts around too.' And so we said, 'We would like to see this scenario into the computer. We would like to put this into the computer.' And all that information will not be available to us until Thursday or Friday.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am just so happy that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked me this question, because I spend more time, day and night, and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is worn out, Mr. Speaker, on this matter of the fishery, and I am too. The Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), we spend more time on this! We had meetings all Friday evening and Friday night, all through the week-end, on Sunday -

MR. TULK: We asked him a question and he is making a speech.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - the Minister of Development, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) -

MR. NEARY: Time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The President of the Council
(Mr. Marshall).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are worn out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are worn out.

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not
understand the simple rules of this House.

MR. SIMMS: A good answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, he does not
understand the rules of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my point of order
is this, the hon. gentleman, in his answer to my question,
misled the House when he said -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Hold on now! Wait now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
I would ask the hon. Leader
of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to refrain from accusing the hon.
Premier or any other member of misleading the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my understanding
of the Parliamentary rules, Beauchesne and so forth
is that you are permitted to finish your statement before the
Speaker rules. I believe that ordinary simple -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is up to the Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

No, it is not up to the Speaker.

No, that is freedom of speech, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

You are challenging the Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

No, I am not challenging the

Speaker.

But, Mr. Speaker, my point of order has to do with a statement made by the hon. gentleman.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of privilege, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! The hon.

President of the Council on a point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:

Your Honour himself, the position

of Your Honour has just been attacked by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Your Honour had made a ruling with respect to the Leader of the Opposition. There can be no decorum in this House if any member of this House debates Your Honour's ruling and does not accept it. I think it is incumbent upon the Leader of the Opposition to be required immediately to retract his insinuations as to the way in which Your Honour is conducting the proceedings of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To the point of privilege, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall), when he stands on a point of privilege, is himself abusing the privileges of this House. A point of privilege is something that ought rarely to come up in Parliament. Now I have not seen in the last four or five years a matter which affected the privileges of all members, because a point of privilege is one that is 'absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers.' It is something that is enjoyed by individual members because it comes about when the House cannot perform its functions. Section 16, Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, page 11, 'the House cannot perform its functions without the unimpeded use of the services of its Members. It is something that affects all members of the House and when it is used it ought rarely to come before the House of Assembly and when it is used it should not be used for frivolous purposes.'

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, If I were in Your Honour's Chair right now, which I am not, but if I were I would feel highly indignant about what the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) did. The hon. the President of the Council tried to bully the Chair, almost threatened the Chair by raising this so-called point of privilege, which is not a point of privilege. The hon. President of the Council tried to use brute force on the Chair, tried to intimidate the Chair, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is quite capable of doing that, he does it all the time in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was merely raising the matter of answers to questions, and again I have to refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, 'Answers to questions should be as brief as possible'. That was the main point of my raising the point of order and the hon. gentleman came in with this frivolous, nonsensical, silly point of privilege. But, Mr. Speaker, what worried me about it was they have forty-four members on that side of the House, we are only eight over here, and the hon. gentleman is trying to use brute force to intimidate and threaten Your Honour. Now we have heard these rumors and reports prior to the House meeting, Your Honour, that that was the intention of the government, to try to bully the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: And when Your Honour looks out at forty-four members on that side of the House, eight on this side, I do not believe Your Honour is going to be intimidated or influenced in any way, shape or form by the fact that they have a large majority on that side of the House. I am sure Your Honour is going to be fair and impartial and will see that the rules of the House are obeyed and that the decorum of the House is maintained.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if anybody is responsible for lowering the decorum of the House and the courts in this Province, it is the hon. gentleman. And I will be dealing with that matter tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: It is not a case, Mr. Speaker, in this House the fact there are forty-four against eight. It is the case of the Office of the Speaker. If the hon. gentlemen wants to quote rules, let them look at Beauchesne, page 19, paragraph 52, "The Speaker should be protected against reflections on his actions." There are instances that are given there. Again on page 38, Mr. Speaker, paragraph 117 (1) -

MR. NEARY: No wonder you would smile.

MR. MARSHALL: - "The chief characteristics attached to the office of Speaker in the House of Commons are authority and impartiality. As a symbol of the authority of the House, he is accompanied by the Mace," etc. "He calls upon members to speak ... When he rises to preserve order or to give a ruling he must always be heard in silence. No Member may rise when the Speaker is standing. Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You are running the House.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not running the House.
This is the authority of the rules.

MR. NEARY: You are running the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman with his way, you know, gets up and talks about eight in the House and forty-four on this side. But Your Honour holds the Office of Speaker, the rules are set down with respect to the Speaker, and unless the Speaker is protected, because the hon. gentleman continually, and that was just an example, when Your Honour makes a ruling to get up in this House and to question the fact

MR. MARSHALL: that Your Honour made a ruling at a certain time when he was speaking and what have you, is entirely out of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The Speaker is entitled to protection and the Speaker is going to get the protection of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the final speaker on this point of privilege.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: To this point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I noticed, when the House Leader opposite read - they say the devil quotes scriptures to suit himself - but when he read this particular section he certainly did not read it correctly.

Mr. Speaker, first of all there was no reflection against the Speaker, and I submit the transcripts will show that. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, if he had continued to read that particular section he would have seen that even in the House of Commons debates - Beauchesne, Section 52 - even when members of the House of Commons wrote articles which complained about the Speaker's ruling and used that type of decorum in the House of Commons during the pipe line debate it was not considered a breach of privilege. I would consider, Mr. Speaker, that what happened in the pipe line debate in the National Parliament of Canada and the reflections that were made on the Speaker that this would not be considered a breach of privilege or anywhere close to it. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall) should not use questions of privilege just because one serious one may come up sometime and it will be like the boy who called wolf. As Mr. Speaker knows, the question of privilege rarely ever comes up here and I have

MR. HODDER: opposite should be more cautious
in the way he uses parliamentary language.

MR. NEARY: Abusing the rules of the House,
misusing and abusing the rules.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

 There are two points there,
perhaps. If I remember correctly, the hon. the Leader of
the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was making a statement or was
about to ask a question and he used a term which the
Chair felt may have been a little unparliamentary. And the
Chair certainly has the initiative and should indeed take
the initiative to remind any hon. member if he uses a
word or term that is unparliamentary that the Chair does
not necessarily have to wait until the end of the speech
to make a ruling on that.

 I would also like to say that
the point raised by the hon. the President of the Council
(Mr. Marshall) was indeed not a point of privilege and
the Chair is not of the opinion that either side of the
House has attacked the Chair.

MR. NEARY: He should learn the rules.

The hon. member should learn the rules.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

 This issue began when the Chair
rose to suggest to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition
that the remark he made was perhaps an allegation that
the Premier - I think it was the Premier - had misled
the House, and it was the Chair's opinion that this is
not correct and I did ask the hon. the Leader of the
Opposition to withdraw the remark.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not say
'deliberately misled the House', so I withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Public Accounts of the Province for the year ending March, 1982 and at the same time, report of the Auditor General to the House of Assembly for the financial year ending March, 1982, and also departmental observations on the report of the Auditor General for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1982.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1, Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, Address in Reply.

The debate yesterday, I think, was adjourned by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when I closed the debate, this government has done a lot of things in my district, a lot of things against the wishes of the people, I might add.

I am glad that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is in his seat today because he probably has not heard what I said yesterday about his department.

I want to just mention the inshore fishing gear programme for Labrador residents. It says that you must be a full-time fisherman and also it says you must be a resident of Labrador in the region. Now, during the past two years

MR. G. WARREN: the minister's department has authorized payments out of this fund to fishermen operating longliners from the Province, fishing in Labrador. Now, as far as I am concerned, that is a complete abuse of the funds that the Labrador fishermen are entitled to. The minister's department has authorized distribution of those funds to fishermen who own longliners in Conception Bay, in Notre Dame Bay and along the Northern Peninsula. Now, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things that this government has done in my district. Mr. Speaker, that refers to native funding, I might add. I would not doubt at all that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) may follow me, because I have been in the House since 1979 and every time that I take the opportunity to speak, the person who usually follows me is the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. That is usually the only time, other than when he is presenting a bill, that you hear the hon. minister speaking. So, I hope, today, that he will stand up and defend his department's handling of the native fund money because, Mr. Speaker, the minister's department has completely abused the spending of the funds belonging to the native people. The minister's department has been called upon, he has been called upon, Mr. Speaker, but by the Conne River Indian Association, not only by the combined councils of Labrador, representing thirty-three communities, which met in Happy Valley - Goose Bay in the early part of February and passed a unanimous resolution at that time asking for a public inquiry into the spending of the native people's money by his department. And, Mr. Speaker, in fact the minister's officials told the Nain Council, in a meeting that I attended just two weeks ago, that there was \$486,000 of native people's money that was not used during the last fiscal year. When asked what happened

MR. G. WARREN: to it, they could not tell us, Mr. Speaker. And until the minister and his officials -

MR. B. TULK: There is a very good reason for that, is there not?

MR. WARREN: Yes, there is a very good reason.

I would like to say to my hon.

from Fogo that the minister's officials have said that they have taken the money and put it in reserve. Reserve for what? For the next federal/provincial election probably. Mr. Speaker, there has to be an investigation and there is only one way to do it. Mr. Speaker, I sent a telegram to the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) asking him to initiate a Commission of Inquiry and the Minister of Justice sent me back a telegram saying, 'It is a federal/provincial native agreement, so contact the federal department.' Mr. Speaker, monies belonging to the people of this Province that have been administered by this government is a federal responsibility?

MR. HODDER: Right on.

MR. WARREN: I have also, Mr. Speaker, telexed the hon. John Munro. I wish to advise the hon. House now that before too long we will find out what happened to all of the \$39 million that was allotted to the native people of this Province.

MR. S. NEARY: Conne River included.

MR. WARREN: That is included in the \$39 million, yes.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, there are many people in this Province who have not received the money that belongs to them, and they will not receive it, Mr. Speaker, as long as the Department of Rural Development is administering it. There is only one way, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the hon. gentlemen will take my advice and the advice of other people and native groups in this Province, and that is to have direct funding, direct funding from Ottawa and then the native people in this Province will get what justly belongs to them.

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is getting short. However, the Premier and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and a few more of his colleagues were down in Shoe Cove recently on the picket line.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. WARREN: Down in Shoe Cove on the picket line and here were the cameras taking pictures of the Premier and the hon. Minister of Social Services down fighting to save the Shoe Cove station. Where was the Premier when the Markland hospital closed down? Where is the Premier now when the Conception Bay South Intergrated School Board, all their schools are closed? Where is the Premier now? Where is the Minister of Social Services?

MR. TULK: Out there in the corridor.

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is where he is, out in the corridor. That is how much concern he has. That is the concern of the Premier. But when the Minister of Social Services thinks about the Shoe Cove station, and when the Minister of Social Services asks the Premier to come down on the picket line, the Premier should remember that there should be equality in this Province and this government, with forty-four seats, should show equality. There is equality needed, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing that we can look right down through my district and see what this government is doing.

MR. DAWE: When was the last time you were in your district?

MR. WARREN: Tuesday past. Tuesday past.

And I might add too that your department is not plowing the roads up there although you are taking the money away from the people, you are not plowing the roads. Your department is not plowing the roads.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the hon. Minister of Transportation about something else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have order before I continue.

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, let me say something to the Minister of Transportation. I would like the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to hear this. Here is the concern that the Department of Transportation has for Labrador. The federal government built an airstrip in Davis Inlet and where would you think the equipment is stored? The equipment for the airstrip in Davis Inlet is stored in Deer Lake.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. WARREN: It is stored in Deer Lake. That is the Minister of Transportation. By the way, they have had it since last October and they did not send it into Davis Inlet but they kept it in Deer Lake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what the Minister of Transportation is doing. Why does he not stand up now and defend that? What is the equipment doing in Deer Lake, just in a storage room down there? So, Mr. Speaker, you can see what the minister is concerned about. The minister is more concerned, Mr. Speaker, about going on picket lines for the Shoe Cove station.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, we can see that - I read an article a while ago. It was in The Evening Telegram in 1980, and I am going to just read it for the public record, Mr. Speaker. It says, "Missing from our Home" and I am going to read it in its totality. Mr. Speaker, it is only a short ad and it was in The Evening Telegram in 1980. It says, "Residents of Labrador wish to advise that between 1497 and 1980 various items have been removed from our home without our consent. Here is a list of them: Fish, quantities undetermined; seals, quantities undetermined; lumber, quantity undetermined; iron, quantity undetermined; furs, quantity undetermined; electricity, quantity undetermined. Most goods last seen heading for the island."

Yes, Mr. Speaker, since 1497, and even up to today, the Government of this Province is taking everything out of Labrador and putting very little back. And that is what is happening, Mr. Speaker. That is what is happening. The government is taking practically everything out of Labrador and putting very little back.

And it goes further, Mr. Speaker, and says, "Some red hot items may have already been sold through a pawn broker." Yes, Mr. Speaker, the same thing with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), he got up today and he lambasted for about fifteen minutes on nothing. "However, last year some 5 million pounds of cod was taken out of the waters close to Makkovik and processed elsewhere, processed here on the Island and as far away as Spain."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what this government is advocating. Let us take it away from Labrador. Let us take its hydro resources, let us take its natural resources, but we will put very little back there. And with that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this government is a dismal failure to the people

MR. WARREN: and we can see today that if the Premier and the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall) had only read the letter that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wrote before the Ocean Ranger disaster, I am doubtful that the Ocean Ranger disaster would have occurred.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am doubtful, that we would have had that disaster. But it was just because the Premier and the minister were too pig headed, Mr. Speaker, to listen or to read a letter that we had the Ocean Ranger disaster. Mr. Speaker, I would say it probably could have been averted if they had listened.

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): Before recognizing the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), I would like to rule on the point of order made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) yesterday. I was not in the Chair at the time to hear the comments made by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), but I have looked up Hansard and I saw the comment was, "The offshore case that was recently erroneously decided by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland." I also looked up the references that the hon. Leader of the Opposition submitted, and they, in my opinion, referred purely to the conduct and integrity of the judges and not to an opinion of the member on the ruling, so they are not applicable, in my opinion, in this case. There is no point of order, only just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. member for St. John's West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to go half an hour?

MR. BARRETT: No, no intentions of going half an hour, Sir. I do not believe in wasting the time of the House like some people opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations on this very timely Speech from the Throne. I say it is very timely, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is one that has been necessary to set the record straight, to show and to reiterate to the people of this Province the absolute tyranny that is being practiced by the Liberal government in Ottawa against the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRETT: And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but this tyranny is supported by the provincial Liberal sheep that we have in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province entered Confederation as people of an independent country thinking that they were entering into a partnership, a partnership until now. This Throne Speech highlights the difficulties that are being experienced solely because of the federal Liberal position on matters affecting the people of this Province. Let me review some of these items that are outlined in the speech.

At our doorstep lay the greatest offshore petroleum resources yet discovered in North America. In addition, we have the immense water power resource of Labrador. Unfortunately, in both instances Newfoundland has been forced to resort to the judicial process to achieve a fair and equitable treatment in relation to these great resources. It is unfortunate if not tragic that this Province has been

MR. BARRETT: Four years later, four years, Mr. Speaker, this question is still unanswered. Just look at the waffling that exists on behalf of the members opposite. Just look at the short-sighted views expressed by certain members of the Media and certain uneducated and uninformed views that are expressed by certain people in the business community locally and not only that but within our own Municipal government. I do not think that we are quite ready yet in the minds of some to break the bonds, the chains, the umbilical cord of Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, this government has tried valiantly to reach a fair and equitable and reasonable settlement on the offshore issues. The Opposition members opposite are still not aware or refuse to accept the fact that the Federal Government and not the Provincial Government was the first to refer the offshore matter to the Courts. The Federal Government referred to the Supreme Court of Canada, last Spring, the matter of the offshore jurisdiction and this Government was forced to try and have this case heard in its own Provincial jurisdiction before that case was heard in the Federal Court. As a matter of fact, it was the Supreme Court of Canada that adjourned and delayed the hearings until now only just recently, from last Fall, so that this could be heard in the Provincial courts. It is unfortunate that this reference was not decided as the people on this side of the House would have liked to have seen it decided. I do not think that view is shared by the members opposite; I think they are happy, they are delighted, they are elated with the fact that this indication of transfer of ownership has gone to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that we should be commending the minister responsible for

MR. BARRETT: energy (Mr. Marshall) in this Province in his untiring efforts to bring about a political settlement in this issue.

This gentleman has met for many days and months. And I think, to give the devil his due, Mr. Chretien met in a matter of good faith on this matter. However, there is no question in my mind that Mr. Chretien did not have the backing of Trudeau and his henchman, Lalonde. I believe that this is the reason why Mr. Chretien was not able to agree to put in writing what was agreed verbally by these two honourable ministers of the Crown. It was solely that he was not given the authority to do that, because he did not have the support of the two key players in the federal government in Ottawa, Trudeau and Lalonde. There is no question at all that he was undermined and that he as an individual certainly attempted to deal in good faith with this Province.

MR. NEARY: Only a dirty-minded individual would think that.

MR. BARRETT: Well, boy, it would take you to sort that one out, would it not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You would want to be pretty low to even think that.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, in the last three years the federal government contribution in the field of regional development will drop over \$70 million a year, to this year's total commitment of approximately \$35 million,

MR. BARRETT: yet this Province has made detailed proposals to the federal government totalling approximately \$550 million, less than 10 per cent of the identifiable regional programmes necessary for this entire Province.

Secondary highways upgrading, industrial and commercial upgrading, Corner Brook harbour development, mineral development, and so on, they are all enunciated in this Speech from the Throne.

The federal government's acceptance of this Province's position that long-term resource development projects are the cornerstone of job creation programmes is fundamental to job creation. Why should funds be used for short-term projects when this Province has been able to identify long-term resource related projects in the forestry, mining, fishery, agriculture, and transportation sectors? It is only because the federal government has no interest whatsoever in trying to respond to these needs in this Province.

This government has been unceasing in its efforts to persuade the federal authorities to provide Canadian defence facilities in this area. We remain the Province which gets the lowest percentage of the defence dollar per capita. And our friend from Labrador, what have they done in Labrador? In order to get defence dollars in Labrador we got to bring in the West German Air Force.

MR. TULK: It is only minor.

MR. BARRETT: The federal government brings in the West German Air Force to try to spend a few bucks to improve the quality of life in Labrador.

MR. NEARY: We should kick them out and retaliate against the seal ban in West Germany. We should kick the West Germans out of Labrador.

MR. BAIRD: Talk to your friends in Ottawa. They bring them in we, do not.

MR. BARRETT: It has nothing to do with us, the Province. We have been trying to get a federal force there.

MR. NEARY: Well, why do you not suggest it?

MR. BARRETT: Why do you not suggest it? You have your member for down there.

MR. NEARY: The West Germans should be kicked out of Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. BARRETT: Just recently the federal government announced the closure of the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station. Another gem! The governments of the other Eastern provinces, and the scientific community, have all supported this government on this issue. And was it not delightful to hear the presentation of the Premier today on this subject? It is unfortunate that the members opposite were not able to do the homework that he has. He know exactly what he was talking about, and he shot them down again in fine style. Not even this most basic issue, the Shoe Cove Satellite Tracking Station, not even this most basic of all issues had the members opposite been able to agree on. They still cannot break the political ties that they have with their Trudeau buddies in Ottawa. Even on a matter as basic as this, they still got to hang in there, hang tough with Ottawa. Terrific stuff.

The five year agreement between the provinces and the federal government provided a level of funding to provinces for health care and post-secondary education. It was a significant sum and greatly assisted this Province. There is no question. However, this government like all the other governments of the various provinces, were dismayed that during negotiations for a new five year agreement the federal government revealed that the provinces could expect less of an increase in the federal contribution than we had been led to expect. This government calculates a loss of revenue from this

MR. BARRETT: new five year plan of \$125 million compared with the formula of the previous plan. It has been said many times in the

MR. H. BARRETT:

past that no society can grow and flourish through transfer payments. At best transfer payments provide minimum standards and tragically, over time, produce an apathetic, uncreative, docile society. How better could you describe the Opposition here? Apathetic, uncreative and docile, a society that the Liberal Party of this Province obviously advocates. Our Province must adopt policies which will allow this Province to break out of this transfer payment dependency as it presently exists. We as a province would have no problem in getting financial assistance from Ottawa. All we have to do is opt for the local Liberal Opposition position on the offshore issue: we let Ottawa, we let Trudeau write the ticket. Give it all to them, let them have it, let them write it and we will get all the transfer payments that we need, no problem. We will have it forever, but so will we be a second rate society because of it. Unfortunately, they cannot even get together on that side. Here we have the existing Liberals over there all supporting the Ottawa position on this and what do we have? we have the most recent past Liberal Leader of the Party - no, second past - twice removed, is he? - Mr. William Rowe comes out publicly stating his disapproval of that position and totally supporting 100 per cent the position of this Provincial Government as it relates to the offshore.

MR. WALSH: It took him a long time but he finally saw the light.

MR. BARRETT: He wants to get as far away from that clan opposite as possible, there is no question about that.

Mr. Speaker, we should all now realize that the present administration in Ottawa has no intention of negotiating anything with this Province. Trudeau

MR. H. BARRETT: intends to change the whole fabric of Confederation and is using this Province as his personal whipping boy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MR. BARRETT: He thought he had selected his weakest partner in Confederation to achieve this, a province with the most fragile of all economies and with the highest unemployment rate. If any province could be beaten to its knees, Trudeau thought that we were it. But how wrong that fellow is. He will never make it down here, because we are not going to give in like that. The people of St. John's West supports this government's position that it will continue to pursue its reasonable position on offshore negotiations, that this Province will continue to pursue its Constitutional position on the fisheries and that this Province will continue to use all measures to see that the Upper Churchill deal is changed. Mr. Speaker, I would like to challenge the members opposite to also apply themselves to these principles. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all, in the few remarks I am going to make, congratulate the mover and the seconder of the gracious Speech from the Throne, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). I know that in order to say something in this House the member for Burin - Placentia West must have undergone a tremendous amount of soul searching in view of the problems, the frustrations and so on that he must be experiencing with the fisheries, and I say that in all sincerity.

MR. TULK: In my few remarks, Mr. Speaker, this evening, I want to make a few things absolutely and crystal clear.

First of all, the Throne Speech that we have in front of us gives absolutely and teetotally no new direction to this Province. I can remember sitting here the other evening with the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) when it was being read, and saying to him, 'Have you heard this before?' And he said, 'Yes, for the last ten or twelve years.' Mr. Speaker, I have only been in this House four years and I have heard the same litany of complaints and the same garbage and hogwash that I heard again the other day.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a Province that is literally bankrupt but yet this Throne Speech gives no new direction for this Province to take. It rehashes the same old lament; the same old problems, the same old laments are coming up. I think somebody said that there were twenty-seven incidents where the federal government was again criticized and, Mr. Speaker, if the federal government needs to be criticized, sobeit, but you cannot build the Province by criticizing somebody else all the time.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. TULK: Now, I would ask the Yahoo from Stephenville to be quiet because I will address his concerns before I am finished, I am sure. I listened yesterday evening to his garbage and I hope he tries to listen to my common sense this evening. I would just ask him to be very, very quiet over there, be quiet and he might learn something.

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech, I think, criticized the federal

MR. TULK: government twenty-seven times and I think there was something like five or six references to the Province of Quebec, but there were no new directions given in that Throne Speech. And that is one thing that I want to make absolutely clear. In a Province that has seen under the Tory regime a decrease in the earned per capita income of Newfoundlanders as against all Canadians since this government came to power, since this administration came to power, in a Province that has seen that we are still hearing the same old nonsense against Canada and against Quebec - no new direction.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing I want to make clear. I want to make one other thing absolutely clear. I am not going to try to portray the other side of this House, try to paint them in any way as non-Newfoundlanders, I am not going to do that. I am not going to try to call them traitors as we have been called on this side. I am not going to say that they do not care for Newfoundland, that they have no feelings for Newfoundland. I am not going to say that at all, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to go on as did the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) this afternoon when he found me smiling across this House when he was reading something and tried to tell me that I would find the offshore situation, danger in the offshore in this Province, a laughing matter. I am not going to go on like that. I would remind the President of the Council that I live on the ocean of this Province. My parents have lived on the ocean of this Province and I know it perhaps better than he does. So

MR. TULK: I am not going to do that kind of thing, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to do that kind of thing.

MR. BAIRD: I think you were found under a rock.

MR. TULK: At least I got out from under it. You are still there. It is on top of your shoulders.

Mr. Speaker, like every person in this House I will say that the opposite side of this House are good Newfoundlanders. Now, Mr. Speaker, I make that statement knowing full well, as I have said, that we have the highest provincial debt of any Province in Canada, per capita. In spite of the size of the public debt that this Tory Administration, since 1972 - since 1972 they have increased the size of the public debt in this Province from \$800 million, less than \$1 billion, \$800 million, to something like \$3.5 billion, \$3,200,000,000. I say that, Mr. Speaker, but I still refuse to say that they are not good Newfoundlanders. I do not believe they know how. I think that is their problem. They just do not know how.

We have a credit rating, Mr. Speaker, a credit rating that is the worst of any of the ten provinces in Canada, and I want to, Mr. Speaker, read part of a telephone conversation that was held with Moody's the other day. One of the questions was, "What is Newfoundland's credit rating?" The question was put to Moody's. "Newfoundland's present credit rating is Baa 1 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is what?

MR. TULK: Baa 1, which is the lowest rating of any of the Canadian provinces. And the Premier, I believe, the other evening did not brag but came close to it, about the fact that it has not worsened. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the lowest of the ten Canadian provinces and you can ask yourself -

MR. NEARY: Look at what Moody's said.

MR. TULK: That is what I am reading. I am reading from Moody's here. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, can it go much lower?

The next question that was put to Moody's was, "How does that stand for North America? Not Canada, but North America?" Generally speaking, it is at the lower -

MR. STAGG: What about the offshore, boy?

MR. TULK: I will get to the offshore for you. "Generally speaking it is at the lower end of the scale," was the answer.

The next question, "What is the investment climate for Newfoundland now?" "Poor," came back the answer. The next question that was put to Moody's was, "Your company has issued a report saying that Newfoundland's level of debt is 60 per cent of the gross domestic product. Can you explain that? Well, really, of all the resources that are available to repay the debt, I think that is the simplest way of thinking of it. And, again, the 60 per cent level is quite high, although we do not have any hard and thick rules. Generally speaking, when we see a level above 20 per cent it kind of causes a red light to go on and we ask some questions."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a public debt, and we have a credit rating that is three times worse than what is acceptable.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And you are up every day asking us to spend more money on a whole bunch of stuff.

MR. TULK: Be quiet now. Be quiet now. That is good stuff, boy. That is good stuff. That is development. I will get to that for you. Just sit down in your seat now and relax. Do not wave your arms or anything like that. Just sit down and relax. I will get to it for you.

March 8, 1983

Tape No. 125

NM - 3

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am not going to say to the Premier that he is not a good Newfoundlander, not at all. I am not going to call him a traitor. I think he is a good Newfoundlander, I think he is a good fellow, but

MR. TULK: I do not believe he knows what he is doing with this Province.

Mr. Speaker, this government has made a mess of our resource based industries. Why does not the Premier just sit back and listen and be quite? Keep your cool, you will be okay. Why does he not sit down and listen? Why does he not hear that we have one resource based industry in this Province, the fishery, that is virtually shut down.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And we want more say over it.

MR. TULK: He wants more say! His minister sits there, and he sits there and says we really have no plans for the processing sector, which he does control. We have no plans for that. We are just waiting for everybody else to come out and say here is what we think should be done then he says we can criticize them. That is his answer.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We have no fish.

MR. NEARY: Oh, we have no fish.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the federal government is going to determine (inaudible).

MR. TULK: That is his answer, Mr. Speaker. The South Coast fishery is shut down -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) about the fishing licences.

PREMIER PECKFORD: It would be no good if they had ten kinds of licences unless they have fish.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, could you ask the Premier to restrain himself?

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask members on both sides of the House to restrain themselves, please.

MR. TULK: The South Coast fishery, as I was saying, is shut down and the Premier sits there - something that he has control of - and says no, we have no control of it. Mr. Speaker, he has. He sits there and says we have no plans. But we know what they are doing. At the present time they are trying to play ball with

MR. TULK: the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane), the Kirby Task Force people, the fishermen's union and everybody else so that when their propositions are put forward the Premier and his minister can take the usual tack, that is their political ploy, take the usual tack of going off and criticizing everything that somebody else has said. That is the way they operate. You can write the scenario. That is the scenario.

Mr. Speaker, the seal fishery in this Province is stopped, virtually stopped. The Premier of this Province has never put forward a proposal that would say how we can solve the seal fishery problem. If he is going to get on camera or on television he is there, but if it is some serious work to say how we can process seal pelts and seal meat in this Province he does not have a word in his jaw. Mr. Speaker, this government presides over a fishery where fishermen's real income from 1977 to 1983 has gone down. Their real income virtually has gone down. . And the government has no plan for development.

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) Quebec now. How come?

MR. TULK: He is on his second favourite topic now, Mr. Speaker, Quebec. He is off the federal government now, he is on to Quebec. Another excuse for him. All he can do, Mr. Speaker, the only thing he can do -

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am a Newfoundlander first, Mr. Speaker, not a Quebeceer.

MR. TULK: There you go, non-Newfoundlanders now. "I am the only Newfoundlander. It is all tied up in me, me 'Brian'."

PREMIER PECKFORD: (Inaudible) minister in Quebec, I never

MR. TULK: How can I get down and roll with that? How can I get down in the gutter? I believe he is a good Newfoundlander. I could not get down in the gutter with him. He just does not know what he is doing.

MR. NEARY: He hates the Liberals, he hates (inaudible). Do not get down in the gutter with him and roll around.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They will take the word of the Quebec government before they will take the word of the Newfoundland government.

MR. NEARY: I could not get it from you. I had to go to the Government of Quebec to get it.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, could you restrain the Premier.

MR. NEARY: You should have tabled it in the House.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Quebec has learned a good lesson from you now.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Do we have to ask him to leave the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I need your protection from the onslaught here.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

Hon. members, on both sides of the House, should respect the hon. member's right to be heard without interruption.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, in an industry which employs 23.9 per cent of the employed labour force in this Province, some 30,000 people, the Premier has no plan for its development.

We find our fishermen being ripped off in the purchase of boats and gear. The Fishermen's Union has been after the minister for years to do something about it. A constituent of mine, the other day, sitting in the office - one little example, it may seem very insignificant to the Premier or to his government, but a constituent of mine, sitting in the office the other day, told me where he had to pay double the price for a pump in a certain station, a bilge pump. Those kinds of things are going on every day, and Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his government do nothing about it. We have seen since he took Office an increase in the interest charged on fisheries loans in this Province by the Fisheries Loan Board, an increase from 3.5 per cent to 12 per cent.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You have to pay your way a little bit, you know.

MR. TULK: The fishermen have to pay their way. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the words of the Premier are clearly printed, 'the fishermen have to pay their way'.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The fishermen have to help pay their way.

MR. TULK: The fishermen have to help pay their way. Now, I hope that is what he is saying. He is implying

MR. TULK: unless they pay less or not.

I hope that in Hansard, Mr. Speaker. I want, again, to repeat to the Premier, repeat to this government, that in no way should they be called traitors, non-Newfoundlanders, but they should be told with all kindness that they just do not know how to run this Province.

MR. BAIRD: There is a good Newfoundlander and a poor Newfoundlander, you are neither.

MR. TULK: I am not going to roll in the mud with that. Not at all. Not going to get down with him. Not at all. I am going to be very kind to him and say he is as good a Newfoundlander as you can find in Humber West. He is no better but he is as good as you can find there.

Mr. Speaker, let us look -

MS. VERGE: There are lots of good people in Humber West.

MR. TULK: Are you there?

AN. HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. TULK: That is what I said, he is as good as anybody else there but no better.

MS. VERGE: Is that a compliment?

MR. TULK: That is a compliment, sure it is! He is a good Newfoundlander. He does not know much, but he is a good Newfoundlander.

Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the forestry. In 1979 - 1980, forestry in this Province employed 5,435 people.

MR. CARTER: Who said?

MR. SIMMS: Joey! That is what Joey said.

MR. TULK: - contributed 4 to 6 per cent to the Provincial Gross Domestic Product. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we witnessing in Corner Brook? The close-down and the elimination of some 700 to 800 jobs. And it virtually affects

MR. TULK: every district in Central and Western Newfoundland, and Northern Newfoundland. Every district is affected.

 Mr. Speaker, the Premier supplied us with no answers on that one. He has supplied us with no plans for that, nothing at all.

 Mr. Speaker, there is virtually, as a matter of fact, the Premier, I believe, sat on the information and did nothing.

 Mr. Speaker, let us turn to something else, reforestation. I know that the Premier is very fond of fish and trees and so he should be. As a matter of fact -

MR. HODDER: He makes out he is.

MR. PREMIER: Yes, I have loaded more logs on more flatcars than Jim Hodder is ever going to see.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, that is for sure.

MR. TULK: Is the Premier trying to tell us he is in tremendous physical shape? We know that. He is in tremendous physical shape but I will hold odds with you.

MR. BAIRD: He proved it.

MR. TULK: Pardon?

MR. BAIRD: He will take you on a jog and proves it.

MR. TULK: That is good physical shape, no problem.

Mr. Speaker, of the productive forest land in this Province Bowaters controls approximately 40 per cent, Abitibi Price approximately 25 per cent, Crown Lands approximately 35 per cent. Crown Lands is the lowest -

MR. BAIRD: He likes jigging cod.

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Jigging cod, nothing to it. You only need five or six for a meal.

MR. BAIRD: You want more than that.

MR. TULK: That is all. He knows how to jig cod. He is a good Newfoundlander. There is nobody arguing that. He knows how to jig cod. He knows how to load wood. Nobody argues that. There is nobody arguing that. He just does not know how to run the Province.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a Province where 40 per cent to 70 per cent of the lumber in the Province is imported. What has the Premier done about that?

MR. BAIRD: That is because the trees are not big enough.

MR. TULK: The trees are not big enough. The Premier should fertilize them with some of the stuff he throws out of his mouth. Mr. Speaker, 30 per cent to 40 per cent of our forests are budworm infested. Last year we had this Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) over here, this good looking Minister of Forest Resources

MR. TULK: and Lands, not a hair out of place, come into this House and announce that he had licked the problem. He had licked the problem, Mr. Speaker. The problem had been licked.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You should talk about the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) like that not the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power).

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

This is ridiculous.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I implore the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) to please start referring to the Minister of Education like that, not the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands because he is not like that.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I do not have that eye for the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier wants a comedy hour we will have one. He is comic enough now to the people of this Province. He does not have to practice that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A body blow, another body blow.

MR. TULK: You are good at throwing them boy. We had this minister come into the House last year and say, 'Look, I have licked the problem. You do not have any worries about it. The spruce budworm count is down.' And this Fall he had to come in and make - I do not know what this is, I think it is a four or five page confession,

MR. TULK: that 'Really, he said, 'I did not have that much to do with it. It was the weather really that had a lot to do with it, not me.' Those are his accomplishments, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, he keeps going around talking about his reforestation and the silvaculture programme. Now we hear Bowaters saying to him, 'Charlie, boy, we might not do that. If we do not want to do it we will not either.'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to accuse the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) as being a non-Newfoundlander in no way. I am not going to say he is politically motivated in his answers in this House. I am not going to say he is a traitor. I am not going to say anything like that. I am just going to tell the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands as I told the Premier that I do not believe he knows what he is doing. I do not believe they are in control. They are not in control, Mr. Speaker.

Let us look at the mining industry in the Province. In 1979-1980 the mining industry in this Province employed 6,550 people. Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that that is

MR. TULK: in a state of decline. We know that there are a number of layoffs or threatened layoffs. It is unbelievable what is happening to that. We got no action. The member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) two or three years ago, four years ago when he was on this side of the House proposed a resolution, a Private Members resolution to this House in which he asked for a committee - a good idea, a good Liberal resolution - in which he asked for a committee, that a select committee be appointed to investigate, consider and report upon the feasibility and the desirability of the several proposals to develop the water power resources of this Province albeit to sit in and out of session. That was Mr. Rideout. He wanted to set up a resource committee in this Province -

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

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): A point of order. The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not think I ever proposed a resolution to set up a committee to look into the water power resources of the Province. I am sure the hon. gentleman was talking about the non-renewable resources of the Province.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, this happens to be a copy of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order?

MR. TULK: It is not to a point of order. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order. The hon. member just took the opportunity to clarify statements attributed to him.

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: The member for Baie Verte-White Bay came into this House and wanted a resource committee on

MR. TULK: non-renewable resources. He got it. He was supposed to go around this Province and I believe try to establish some sort of fund. That was a good idea. What has happened to that? That was a Liberal resolution. The member subsequently crossed the House. And we voted for it and it was a unanimous decision of this House that that committee be set up. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened to his committee? It died with the last election. It is gone and forgotten.

MR. RIDEOUT: You will die with the next election.

MR. TULK: Now I had that threatened to me the last time.

MR. RIDEOUT: You just missed it, buddy.

MR. TULK: I am still here, well and healthy.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I repeat that I am not going to make any accusations of non-Newfoundlanders, traitors politically motivated, over on that side. No, no! They are too pure and clean for that. They just do not know what they are doing.

MR. SIMMS: That is a nonpartisan comment, right?

MR. POWER: You will lose sense of debate.

MR. TULK: No, you sent your Premier (Mr. Peckford) over to Fogo Island and they gave him such a shock that he would not return afterwards. Do you want to know what that was about?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: No, he could not make it. He said, 'No, I cannot go to Musgrave Harbour because if I do you will have something else waiting for me. For sure and certain I

MR. TULK: will get some more bad publicity
down in Musgrave Harbour.'

PREMIER PECKFORD: Never had any good weather.

MR. TULK: The last day, Mr. Speaker, I
flew from Fogo Island to Wesleyville, a great day.

MR. POWER: You and your buddies were
saved by the weather.

MR. TULK: There you go.

MR. BAIRD: To whom do you owe the favours
for flying you down around your area that time?

MR. TULK: That is none of your business.

MR. NEARY: Not the government aircraft.

MR. TULK: Not the government aircraft.

MR. BAIRD: The Liberal Party's aircraft,
was it?

MR. TULK: Well, I would say the Liberal
Party had control of that aircraft, yes. Mr. Speaker, I
only have -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, can you keep that crowd quiet.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. TULK: I would like to say a few more sensible things for those people there.

MR. BAIRD: But you are not saying anything to start with.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Look at Humber West down there, Mr. Speaker, look at Humber West down there.

Mr. Speaker, let us turn to the issue of offshore oil and gas. Mr. Speaker, that great resource, not a renewable resource, may be lost to this Province forever. Mr. Speaker, I hope that is not true. I sincerely hope that it is not true. Although I do not believe that it will cure all of the basic ills of this Province, it could certainly give us a better economic future. There can be no argument about that. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I want to say now, I want to go on record now and say that I hope the Supreme Court of Canada will give ownership to Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as saying that. At the very least that I hope the Supreme Court of Canada does is that it will push both the federal and provincial governments back to the bargaining table as it did in the constitutional debate. If we lose though, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand in this House and call the Premier of this Province a traitor. I am not going to call him a non-Newfoundlander. I am not going to say he is politically motivated and that he was politically motivated in the direction that he took this Province. Rather I am going to say that he made the worst colossal blunder that ever a Premier of this Province made. How could I say that he was a traitor? How could I say

MR. TULK: that? I can remember sitting in this House in 1979 and hearing the Premier of this Province saying, "I want total control, total ownership. Without ownership I cannot have control". I remember the situation where it went back and forth and was compared to a house. He moved from that position, Mr. Speaker. In August, 1980 the Premier sent out this little paper - I still carry it around in my car because I could not believe what I am reading - the Premier sent out this newspaper saying that he had now moved his position. And as I read it I said, 'Well great 'Brian', great stuff. You have now moved to the position that the Liberal Party of the Province has.' And that position was and is that there had to be a negotiated settlement of the offshore, that there had to be shared jurisdiction and management and that there had to be revenue sharing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going then, as I said, I want to repeat that I am not going to do as the Premier and his colleagues have done. And that is to call this side of the House traitors, non-Newfoundlanders, politically motivated, grasping at political straws. I am not going to do that in spite of the fact that he has now taken our position, in spite of the fact that last Winter in this House we went against the federal government putting the issue into the courts and this government said, "That is not enough, we need your blood on paper. We need you to be blood brothers with us." I am not going to call him any of those things. I am not going to call him a traitor and a non-Newfoundlander either in spite of the fact that he was warned in this House last Winter. And the best example that I can think of was given to him by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) on that famous night of mourning when the member for the Strait of Belle Isle quoted a verse from the Good Book as he called it. And the verse was:

MR. TULK: "As ye sow so shall ye reap".
No, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to call the Premier (Mr. Peckford) a non-Newfoundlander, a traitor. I am not going to say he was politically motivated in spite of the fact that the Premier of this Province was the first person to put that issue in court. I am not going to do it, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to call him any of those things in spite of the fact that he was the person who stood in this House and said that he believed the judges of the Appeals Court of Newfoundland would rule according to patriotism and not according to the law. "They are our judges", he said. No, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to call him any of those things.

I am not going to say that power has gone to his head. I am not going to say that he is a non-Newfoundlander because, as I said, he is a good Newfoundland and I think he means well for this Province. But, as I said, I will say that he has made, if we lose that great resource, I will say to the Premier of this Province, "You have made the most colossal blunder that was ever made in Newfoundland's history".

MR. BAIRD: It is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all.

MR. TULK: That is what you put on the table.

MR. NEARY: Very original.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, how could you accuse this government of being politically motivated. Equality, the Premier's favourite words are, he wants equality for Newfoundland. I believe him. We all want equality for Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have much time left and I suppose I am going to have to get back on this some other time. I suppose there will be

MR. TULK: some other chance for me to get back on this. You never know. But in any case, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I wish the Premier (Mr. Peckford) would take that same idea of equality that he applies to Canada and the rest of the Canadian provinces and Newfoundland and Newfoundland's relationship to Canada and apply it to some districts in this Province. If you have a principle of equality, then if it applies between provinces in a country surely it applies between districts in a Province. Mr. Speaker, this cannot be the same Premier with a principle as worthy as that, this cannot be the same Premier who went out in that Bellevue by-election and sent that infamous letter, that letter, my friend, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) was re-elected, that famous letter that - I do not want to see it, I know what it says - it says, 'Unless you elect a Tory you get nothing'. Where was equality then? Where was that great principle of equality? Where was that great principle of equality then? If you elect an Opposition member you get nothing.

I wish too, Mr. Speaker, he would remember it when I tell him about the freight rates to Fogo Island, when I tell him that the people on Fogo Island today are paying fifteen cents a pound more for a block of butter or a can of milk. Mr. Speaker, I wish the Premier would remember that and agree that the people of Fogo Island have to be treated as equal Canadians and equal Newfoundlanders. I wish he would not write back to me when I tell him that he has downgraded an air service to that island and say, "No, not really". Cutting something down from fourteen trips a week to six trips a week is not downgrading air service. I wish he would tell them that he

MR. TULK: is not making them less than equal. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to believe that the Premier (Mr. Peckford) is politically motivated in anything that he does. After all he is the guy who stands up in this House and says, "Fair is fair".

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, he just does not know what he is doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the member who just spoke was very negative. He reminded me of a slogan which was used in early 1982 before the election - "We want work not war" and that gentleman who made that slogan is not with us anymore.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I would like at the outset to congratulate the Mover and the Seconder of the gracious Speech from the Throne delivered by his Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor. I feel sure that all hon. members agree that both the hon. members for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) did an admirable on opening day.

Mr. Speaker, in the Premier's remarks in the opening day ceremonies, he used the phrase - 'we shall not surrender.' These words rang out around the world in 1940 when the late Sir Winston Churchill brought a message of hope and resolve to those fighting to win the ravages of Nazi Germany. Churchill used them against the enemies of Great Britain and her Allies but our Premier used them to actually describe the present state of relations with the Head of the Canadian family, who seem intent on denying the legitimate rights and aspirations of our people which have not changed after thirty-four years of Confederation. The only hope for our people to realize their aspirations of throwing off the cloak of have not status within Confederation is to pray for a change of government in Ottawa which I have no doubt will follow with the next Federal election. An election which thankfully is within sight.

How long could Canada let Newfoundland survive the Trudeau reign of terror which has robbed this country of its greatness, its hope and its prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech outlined for all to see the despicable way this Province has

MR. WOODROW: been treated during the past
four years, and I will dwell on them during the time at my
disposal. The treatment that we have received from Ottawa
strikes at the very necessities of life that our people
are continually being deprived of. And among those people
are counted the people of the Bay of Islands district who
sent me three time in succession to represent them in this
hon. House of Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. WOODROW:

Thank you. Let me speak firstly, about the failed efforts to achieve an offshore agreement. The Provincial negotiating team under the leadership of the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) have to be congratulated for the many meetings they attended in search of a fair and reasonable settlement which would benefit Newfoundland and Canada. Indeed, I am convinced that the hon. Jean Chretien, the Federal Minister of Energy, was sincere in his approach but simply could not deliver the agreement he and the people of our Province had hoped for. He quite simply had the rug pulled out from underneath him signalling that the Federal grab for our resources had continued.

Mr. Speaker, all indications pointed to the fact that the major issues had been progressing favourably, namely, the issue of management and revenue sharing. Management would follow from a committee of three and three, Provincial and Federal officials with an independent appointed chairperson. Revenue would follow at a 75/25 Provincial/Federal shared arrangement until this Province reached the have status Province and agreement was progressing on the future equalization payment. However, on his way to the well, so aptly described by the Provincial Minister of Energy in his recent speech to the Corner Brook Rotary, someone stopped Mr. Chretien from delivering the goodies from the well.

Mr. Speaker, we do not want nor can we afford a repeat of the Upper Churchill in this Province. Every man, woman and child are the poorer each day that the infamous contract remains intact, while Quebec reaps the fabulous wealth from our resource.

Mr. Speaker, I spent two years

MR. WOODROW: in Laval University with the rebel Premier of Quebec, Rene Levesque, and I do not expect him to show any compassion or good faith towards our Province, or for that matter towards any English speaking Province of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the most appalling fact of all is that in the last three years Newfoundland had submitted ten DREE proposals to the Federal Government, totalling some \$550 million. Yet, in the last three years the Provincial government has seen the Federal contribution in the field, drop from \$70 million a year to this year's total of approximately \$35 million.

One of those DREE agreements called for an \$8 million project for Church Cove around the Curling waterfront. Church Cove located partly in Humber West District has the bulk of it situated in the Bay of Islands District. While nothing has been done, thus far, there are some signs of a \$200 thousand dollar study to try to re-elect Brian Tobin.

MR. BAIRD: You would want more than \$200 thousand dollars to re-elect Brian Tobin.

MR. WOODROW: However, the great harbour development could enhance the city of Corner Brook with the spin-off jobs as far away as Lark Harbour on the south shore of Bay of Islands and Cox's Cove on the north shore.

MR. WOODROW: The project would bring badly needed industries as well as a container carrier service and provide an improved access to the local fish plant by providing a new road link to the present arterial road in Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, all the ten proposed DREE agreements are vital to the Province's future prosperity. The Rural Development Agreement strikes at the very heart and soul of Newfoundland and Labrador. As the Speech From the Throne noted Newfoundlanders and Labradorians know that the lifeblood and very essence of the Province is our rural personality. This realization, Mr. Speaker, is the hallmark of this administration and central to our rural personality is the fishery. A vibrant inshore fishery means a vibrant rural Newfoundland. I was therefore especially pleased that the Throne Speech again reiterated this government's commitment to an ongoing technologically advanced inshore fishery. We must continue to impress upon the federal government the need for our Province to have a major say in fishery policy and management to maximize the economic and social benefits for rural Newfoundland whose very lifeblood depends on our fishery resource.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the Bay of Islands district? I am pleased to hear that the provincial government has decided to move the College of Forestry to the West Coast of the Province. Although no site has been officially made known yet, I hope it will be in the Corner Brook area. This will help the economy somewhat in the Corner Brook and the Bay of Islands areas. The federal government has not -

MR. BAIRD: And the Humber Valley.

MR. WOODROW: And the Humber Valley. The federal government has not given a commitment yet but I do hope it will come soon and I am looking forward to a

MR. WOODROW: positive reply from the member for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe. I hope he comes out soon and says we are going to have it there but we are going to co-operate with the Province in putting the forestry in Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, the close down of number seven paper machine at Bowaters is sad news for the economy of the area, as it will put some 400 or 500 people out of work. And as already stated the outlook for paper mills all over the world is not too bright and we do not know what the fate of Bowaters is going to be in the next five to ten years. One bright spot in the district

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, is a proposed secondary processing building in Cox's Cove, costing approximately \$288,640 and employing some twenty to thirty men during the construction and up to approximately forty men on a long term basis. This is financed -

MR. TULK: They are not going to give you the aluminum smelter?

MR. WOODROW: - this will make you stop when I say this - this is financed under the programme known as NEED and I do hope it comes to a successful conclusion and do you know what - it has the backing of one, Graham Flight.

MR. BAIRD: Who is he?

MR. WOODROW: Who is he? What is he doing out in the Bay of Islands district I would like to know. The district, Mr. Speaker, will need -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: I am doing too good now. Take it easy. Give us time. Do not get upset you know. The district will need a lot of money for water and sewer and I am looking at the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) now when I say this. She has been kind and co-operative with me I must say ever since I got to know her. The district will need a lot of money for water and sewer. In fact the only community in the district outside of the Curling area that has complete services including a fire truck is Mount Moriah. The communities of Cox's Cove, McIver's, Gillam's and Meadows almost had their water system completed before the recession set in causing cutbacks in government.

The people of the communities of Summerside - what beautiful names - the communities of Summerside and Irishtown are at my door every day and sending letters and making phone calls for a start on a permanent water supply. The communities on the South shore, from Halfway

MR. WOODROW: Point to Frenchman's Cove need a lot of upgrading on their water supplies. But the communities of York Harbour and Lark Harbour seem to be happy with their own private wells and the like.

MR. BAIRD: We need their trail out to Wood's Island too.

MR. WOODROW: That is coming. The communities of McIver's, Irishtown and Summerside combined on the North shore have fire halls and are looking for fire fighting equipment as quickly as possible.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I know my communities. Nobody can tell me about them. I know the communities in my district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I know what they have and what they want. By the same token, Mr. Speaker, the South shore council from Halfway Point to John's Beach have an old fire truck, 1953 vintage and it is ready for the scrap yard unless someone wants to buy it for an antique. Maybe the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) would buy it for an antique. We will sell it for \$20,000.

MR. TULK: How much?

MR. WOODROW: \$20,000. It is worth it. The community of York Harbour has a fire hall and no fire truck. Lark Harbour is without a fire truck and a fire hall.

MR. NEARY: He knows all about buying trucks and bulldozers. Back in 1970's during the resettlement, the hon. gentleman knows all about it. He is well experienced in that.

MR. WOODROW: Very good. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention the fact that there have been many fires in the communities of the Bay of Islands district and homes were destroyed without insurance. Now this is a point I want to get across. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, for the government of this Province to take a look at compulsory insurance for all homes in the Province because after all in many cases when the house burns down without insurance the government has to restore it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have those hon. gentlemen, as the old Newfoundlanders say, shut their gobs.

MR. BAIRD: Shut their face.

MR. WOODROW: That is a good saying.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, that is important, for all homes to have insurance. It should be compulsory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member is entitled to be heard in silence. He has requested that he be heard in silence and I would ask that the rules of the House be enforced.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask that the member be heard in silence.

MR. WOODROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for coming to my rescue. I would like to repeat that again because I think it is important that every home in the Province have insurance on it because if it has not got insurance it ends up as happened only recently in my district, in fact since Christmas, that this government, the Treasury Board, were good enough to send out - I will not tell the amount - but they were good enough to come to the rescue of a poor unfortunate man with nine children who had his house destroyed by fire with no insurance in the district of the Bay of Islands.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention local roads also. The poor Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), why you know, what is she going to do? There are many local roads that need to be upgraded and paved and if we cannot get the co-operation that we should be getting from the federal government in Ottawa I am afraid that not only the Bay of Islands district but many other districts in the Province will be turned into ghost towns. Now, Mr. Speaker, you can see how we have been hurt. How can the government spend money on secondary roads when it has to spend it on the Trans Canada and the like? So we are really therefore trying to co-operate and we are human beings and we are Canadians and I think that the members of the Opposition should go to their friends in Ottawa and say, "For goodness sake try to co-operate and look after Newfoundlanders".

Mr. Speaker, last but not least - I was wondering if I would speak or not - last but not least is the - I am hoping

MR. WOODROW: that the aluminum smelter will be located in York Harbour in the Bay of Islands district. And I can assure everybody concerned that if it becomes a political battle and it could become one, if they decide, we will soon have the report and perhaps they may decide to build in Newfoundland but if it becomes a political battle I go on the record as saying that I will be fighting for the Bay of Islands -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - as I have always fought for it and will continue to fight and will continue to try to convince Ottawa that we are Canadians. I just saw the administrator of the Western Regional Memorial Hospital coming in up there. He is in, I suppose, trying to get a few dollars to help the Western part of the Province. I hope he succeeds.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure once again in spite of the interruptions and I suppose, you know, you have to take them all, what can you do about it, it has been a pleasure to speak once again -

MR. BAIRD: You were too nice, boy, you were too nice.

MR. WOODROW: Oh, I see. Well they want me to be nice, what can I do about it. They say it is my nature.

MR. TULK: The member for Bay of Islands has ten more minutes. Come on now.

MR. WOODROW: Ten more minutes. No, I think I have all my fighting done now. I shall continue to work with the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the Minister of Health (Mr. House) and all the other ministers to see

MR. WOODROW: that we get our just share of the goodies that are on the way. Mr. Speaker, merci beaucoup. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, since the time is close to six o'clock would the hon. House Leader (Mr. Marshall) across mind if we adjourned the debate until tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. gentleman wanted the minutes read today and all of the rest of it and their lack of co-operation by all means let the hon. gentleman adjourn the debate in the spirit of co-operation.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for Port au Port has adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY: We will not talk about things that we discussed in private.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would keep quiet I will bring in the motion.

I move that 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.