

VOL. 2

NO. 33

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 4, 1983.

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
Yesterday I informed the House of Assembly that government  
was considering the possibility of scheduling public  
examinations during the two-week period following the  
end of this school year. The school year will end, as  
originally planned, on June 17.

Mr. Speaker, I am now  
pleased to announce that government has decided to conduct  
public examinations from Monday, June 20, to Wednesday,  
June 29, inclusive.

Public examinations are  
now required for only level 3000 senior high school courses.  
Most level 2 or Grade XI students are now taking two level  
3000 courses and, consequently, will have to write two  
public examinations.

Concurrently with the  
level 3000 course public examinations will be public  
examinations for people completing the old Grade XI program,  
commonly referred to as final supplementary examinations.  
Attached is the level 3 and Grade XI public examinations  
schedule.

Mr. Speaker, government's  
decision was made with the benefit of consultation with

MS. VERGE: school board administrators.  
The deferral of public examinations complements school board plans to eliminate or reduce the amount of time spent on internal final examinations in other than level 3000 courses. The combined effect of these initiatives will allow schools to regain up to two weeks of the teaching time lost as a result of labour-management disputes. This will be particularly beneficial for the students in the Avalon North Integrated School district who lost as much as eight weeks school because of strikes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, our spokesman on education will be a little late in arriving but to use a phrase that my hon. colleague used yesterday that the minister still has her hand in the dog's mouth, It is obvious that the minister is trying to redeem herself for her own incompetence, for her own failure to keep the schools opened, Mr. Speaker. Instead of Government making unilateral decisions and getting involved it would be far better left to the educators, the professionals, left up to the professionals not the non-professionals like the minister, who failed to keep the schools opened

MR. NEARY: and as a result we find ourselves in a situation today where you have a chaotic situation in the schools, Mr. Speaker. So we will just have to wait and see, I guess, Mr. Speaker, how it works out.

MR. HODDER: She can throw all that garbage into the wastepaper basket.

MR. NEARY: That is right. She can try all she wants. There is no way that the minister can redeem herself with the professionals. What the minister did is unforgivable; forcing the teachers out of the classrooms and the kids out of school is unforgivable, and the minister can try all she wants to redeem herself, she can make Ministerial Statements every day, but it is not going to work, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have a statement to make on behalf of the Premier. Mr. Speaker, the administration has always had as one of its goals the smooth and efficient operation of this hon. House -

MR. NEARY: Oh! Here it comes.

MR. MARSHALL: - Notwithstanding the hon. gentleman there opposite. Our extensive use of the committee system has done away with the notoriously long and inefficient night sittings, which used to be necessary every year on budget estimates. The introduction of a Fall sitting devoted entirely to legislation has also reduced the large number of bills that in the old days all too often died on the Order Paper. This administration was pleased to bring in an early budget this year and as a result, the majority of the Budget Debate and related proceedings are already behind us.

It is perhaps appropriate at this time that we review the record of the administration in this House, both from a historical perspective and by way of comparison with other Houses in Canada. There is attached

MR. MARSHALL: for hon. members a list of actual sitting days of this hon. House since 1949.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the House sat on average less than fifty days per year during the Smallwood Administration. The average for the Moores' Administration was a little over sixty days per year. The Peckford Administration has not been in power that long, so talk of averages is not really appropriate. After the Premier won the Party leadership in the Spring of '79, he shortly called an election which was held on June 18, that year.

MR. MARSHALL: This administration has no fear of hard work, Mr. Speaker, and instead of waiting for the Summer of 1979 to expire before opening the hon. House, we had it open on July 12, 1979 for a fifty-two day session that did not end until December 14th. It was a record in itself right from the word go. The years 1980 and 1981 - now listen to this, Mr. Speaker - were the only two uninterrupted years under the Peckford administration and the House sat eighty-one and ninety-seven days respectively. In 1982, of course, saw an election in the Spring - a bitter memory for the members there opposite - but we still managed to sit a respectable fifty-five days in spite of this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Now are the hon. gentlemen who are always talking about the way the House is conducting observing?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Every session is a record. It must be educational, Mr. Speaker, to compare the Peckford administration's best year in 1981 with the rest of Canada. Our ninety-seven day sitting was only topped by the Parliament of Canada with 146 days and the legislature of Ontario with 106 days. All other legislatures sat ninety days or less, some as low as forty days in that year. Indeed, if one excludes the House of Commons our ninety-seven day sitting in 1981 compares most favourably with an average of seventy-five days for other legislatures for that year.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: In closing then, Mr. Speaker, we think the record of the administration in this House speaks for itself. Not only have we improved the

MR. MARSHALL: efficiency of this operation, we have also shown the dedication and stamina required to remain open for sufficient lengths of time so as to insure that the people's business is not only introduced into this House, it is done here as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, this statement is made for both the edification and I know the extreme disappointment to the hon. members who during the debate are always saying that we want to close her down. Mr. Speaker, we want to debate the affairs of the people of this Province and introduce legislation and we shall stay open as long as it is necessary at all times to do the people's business.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they are really down to the bottom of the barrel now. Is it any wonder that the hon. gentleman had a silly grin on his face from one ear to the other when he was making that statement. What they are really doing, Mr. Speaker, is making a case to justify closing the House down quickly. Well just for the benefit of hon. members this House has so far met this Session, I believe, thirty-three or thirty-five days. Now, Mr. Speaker, to compare this House to the House back after Confederation is like comparing apples and oranges. Mr. Speaker, in the first place we have fifty-two members and there was only forty-two then. We have ten more now than we had then.

MR. NEARY:

But let us look at the sessional indemnity back in 1949 right up to probably 1966. The sessional indemnity at that time was \$3,333.33, which meant that the average member of this House was a part-time politician. The average salary today just for an ordinary backbencher is around \$33,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true - including expenses, sessional indemnity, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the total in 1966, the total, \$3,333.33 as compared to \$32,000 or \$33,000, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Hon. gentlemen wanted to make politics full-time and now they should be prepared to stay in the House.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the Committee system is concerned, that speaks for itself. We know what the record of the committee system is.

Look, here is what this administration have done: They have restricted the time that we can speak on the estimates, they have refused to allow us to debate amendments to Private Members' resolutions on Wednesdays, they have refused to answer questions and I am just in the process of dealing with that now in answer to a question I got on March 23rd from the Premier. And I draw question number 59 to the attention of the media. Look at the answer, and just take a look at a government that was going to give us information, Mr. Speaker. It is frightening when you read the answer to that question and how they are refusing to answer questions in this House.



MR. TULK: Parliament is no more.

MR. NEARY: That is right. They are trying to do away with parliamentary democracy in this Province, Mr. Speaker. And all the Ministerial Statements in the world that the hon. gentleman can make on behalf of the Premier or anybody else is not going to justify shutting this House down in a week or ten days while we have so many urgent and pressing problems in this Province, a crisis in the fishery, the hospital crisis.

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

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, had I known my simple statement was going to drive the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to such heights, perhaps I may not have made it,

May 4, 1983

Tape No. 1721

MJ - 1

MR. MARSHALL: I made the statement, he is to comment on it. Now he is entering into areas of debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!  
I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition's time has elapsed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that was not a point of order. Mr. Speaker, I am only responding to that so-called Ministerial Statement that was made by the hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Your time is up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
Does the hon. member have a new point of order?

MR. NEARY: I am responding to a point of order, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: I ruled there was no point of order.

MR. NEARY: - is that allowed?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: That was ruled on.

MR. RIDEOUT: He ruled there was no point of order, boy.

MR. SPEAKER: I ruled that there was no point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter

MR. NEARY: is that the Premier -  
MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!  
The hon. member is speaking on  
a point of order?  
MR. NEARY: No, this is in reply to the  
Ministerial Statement.  
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Your time is up.  
MR. SPEAKER: The Chair stated to the hon.  
member that his time had elapsed at the time that the point  
of order was raised.  
MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.  
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat  
Mountains.  
MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question  
for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern  
Development (Mr. Goudie). Some time ago the minister  
advised that the Voisey Bay fish camp would be transferred  
to the Department of Development. Could the minister advise  
the House if that transaction has taken place?  
MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.  
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of  
Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.  
MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, no, that transaction  
or transition has not taken place and will not be taking  
place this year.  
MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.  
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat  
Mountains.  
MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker,  
I know the minister said, I think it was sometime in April,

MR. WARREN: that it would take place on March 31, 1983, Now the minister has changed his decision. Could the minister tell us why he has changed his decision?

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GOUDIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, this particular minister has not changed his decision; it was the decision of government that the camp might be better administered under the Department of Development. However, that has not proven to be the case in our opinion, so my department, the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, will still maintain responsibility for the operation of that facility.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Seeing that this building, according to the minister, cost \$194,000 to construct and the minister has said that it came out of federal/provincial monies--which I think was either 66/33 per cent cost shared or something like that - could the minister tell us if this building is the property of the Government of Newfoundland or the property of the Native people of Labrador?

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I think, I could be corrected, but I think the building, the facility itself is within the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young). I will certainly have to get that clarified. But I think I should also explain to the gentleman for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) that the building itself did not cost \$194,000. It cost \$194,000 to place that particular facility there, which involves two other buildings in addition to the main camp, and involved a rather substantial transportation cost to get construction materials in there, equipment in there and get the manpower in and out of Voisey Bay, which is about a three hour run by speedboat using a 35 horsepower Johnson motor from Nain. You can figure out the mileage from that.

So it was a very expensive proposition to construct that facility and place it there. In terms of who owns it, I could be corrected, as I say, but I think it is within the confines of the Department of Public Works and Services.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the figure I quoted, \$194,000, is exactly the figure that the minister gave me as the answer to what was the cost of construction of the Voisey Bay fish camp. That is what the minister said, so that is the cost.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the minister. Knowing that this building was built out of federal/provincial monies, has the minister

MR. WARREN: considered the proposals - I know it was sometime ago when this government offered the Voisey Bay fish camp for sale but I think the minister has received some proposals. - has the minister considered any of those proposals or has he been in contact with any of the possible buyers of the fish camp?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. Minister for Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I have no proposals to purchase the Voisey Bay fish camp. I do not recall putting it up for sale, although I could certainly double check that. I do not recall any for sale notices going out on that particular facility. But I should explain to the hon. gentleman, who probably or obviously does not remember, the facility was constructed out of funding under the Native People's Agreement several years ago: ten years ago, I think, this year, - and was designed to serve as a training ground for people from the North Coast communities, the communities under the Native People's Agreement, one of which is in my district and the other six communities in the hon. gentleman's district.

There were a number of Native people brought in and given the opportunity to develop an expertise in terms of constructing, operating and maintaining

MR. GOUDIE: a business enterprise of that particular nature. For two or three years there was an interest in it, several people were employed there and in addition to being trained, they were paid for their training. They have since seemed to have lost interest, and that is where the facility sits right now.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the minister did mention that some people were trained. I know it may be a bit difficult, but I wonder could the minister, in the next day or so, give a list of the names of the Native people who have been trained there during the past eight or nine year? At the same time, could the minister tell the hon. House the government's purpose in maintaining and keeping ownership of the Voisey Bay fish camp?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, there were no Native people trained there, unless you want to call my brother a Native person, who was managing the camp and is probably pretty well qualified to operate it. I mean, it has been maintained and operated for the last ten years by him. And I should point out that I did not hire my brother, Mr. Speaker, I am talking ten years ago, so no one can suggest any allegations of conflict of interest there. In any event, Mr. Speaker, during the first two or three years of operation of that camp, there were several people hired and worked in it. I think I can remember the names now but I would rather not mention them here, I will certainly endeavour to get them for the hon. gentleman and indicate which years they were employed there and trained there.

May 4, 1983

Tape No. 1723

SD - 2

MR. NEARY: What are you keeping the camp  
-open for now?

MR. GOUDIE: Why?

MR. NEARY: Yes, why?

MR. GOUDIE: Well, as the hon. gentleman  
pointed out, it cost \$194,000 to build that particular facility  
out of federal/provincial dollars. What would happen to  
that facility, I wonder, if it were not maintained by  
someone?

MR. NEARY: Put it up for sale.

MR. TULK: What is the point of it?

MR. GOUDIE: There was no for sale ad, as  
I understand or remember, but we wanted to find out if anyone  
was interested in that particular facility. There was  
no great interest expressed in it for a couple of reasons.  
One is that it is a very large, expensive facility to  
maintain if someone private were to take it over, because  
there is a fair amount of work that should be done to the  
foundation of the building and to other parts of it.  
And, secondly, not all that many sports fishermen in North  
America seem to have that much interest in speckled trout  
or Arctic char, everyone wants to go for Atlantic salmon,  
and there are no Atlantic salmon, as the hon. gentleman  
knows, in rivers in Labrador North of Davis Inlet, and  
this facility is North of Davis Inlet. So rather than  
leave the facility there to be vandalized, etc.,  
government has decided to hang on to it and use it if  
it is possible to get commercial bookings. There are



MR. GOUDIE: usually two or three commercial parties, if you will, who come into that facility each year.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at what the minister is saying. I will ask him another supplementary question. Could the minister tell the number of visitors who attended the Voisey Bay fish camp last year? Also how much did it cost the government to keep this fish camp in operation last year, and how much does the minister expect it is going to cost this year to keep the building open?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I think the figure for maintaining the operation last year, including the cost of employees, was about \$20,000 and I would expect this year it is going to be somewhere between \$25,000 and \$30,000. Those are just guesses off the top of my head. I can certainly get the information the hon. gentleman is requesting, of course.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the minister is still not responding to the questions in the proper manner. I wonder would the minister tell the House what will be the purpose, other than stopping vandalism from taking place, of keeping that building open this year?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will remember from one of my earlier responses that the facility is being maintained by the provincial government to prevent vandalism and other damages which might occur to that rather expensive facility. And this year it will be operating on a care-taking basis. Now if it is possible to bring in one or two or three parties of

MAY 4, 1983

Tape No. 1724

NM - 2

MR. GOUDIE: sports fishermen, I see nothing wrong with doing that. That way government would get some revenue from it. There are no bookings at this point in time but up until three days ago there

MR. GOUDIE:

were three enquiries. Whether or not these parties will come in and fish there, I do not know, but we want to maintain it in as good a condition as possible with perhaps one of the future objectives being to dispose of the facility, either giving it to the Native groups themselves if they have an interest in operating it, selling it outright, or disposing of it in some other way.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains, a supplementary.

MR. WARREN: The minister said that if visitors come in government can get some revenue. I will ask the minister another question: Was there any revenue generated from the visit of Cabinet ministers to the camp last Summer?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I am only familiar with one Cabinet minister who visited that camp and that was in company with several prominent business people from North America. I do not know if there was any revenue from that or not but I can certainly find out.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Now that the minister has given the answer that the camp is not viable, it is costing the government money, roughly \$20,000 last year and maybe \$30,000 this year - in fact, \$30,000 could have got all of the meat out of the bush inside of Nain - would the minister now consider taking the Voisey Bay fish camp and

MR. WARREN: submitting tenders to see if there is anyone interested in purchasing the camp?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know about the tender process that the hon. gentleman is referring to, but since the facility was built out of funding designed especially for Native peoples in Labrador, and the concept behind the camp -

MR. WARREN: Answer the question.

MR. GOUDIE: If the hon. gentleman will stay quiet for a minute so I can answer, he might get the answer he is looking for. If the concept behind the construction of that camp was to train Native peoples to operate that type of facility then, in my opinion, they should be given first right of refusal on that particular facility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: That is the rationale of this particular government.

On the matter, Mr. Speaker, of the caribou that the hon. gentleman refers to, he obviously denies by not admitting that the offer was made to him directly by staff of my department.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. GOUDIE: I made the offer to the L.I.A. and to other groups in Labrador to take money out of the Native People's Agreement, not only to fly out the machines and the meat which were stranded in the country, but take an additional \$30,000 if they wanted and feed everyone in all of the communities. Their answer was no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Now the minister says that the Native people will be given first refusal. Why was not the Labrador Inuit Association given first refusal when they submitted a proposal to take over the Voisey Bay fish camp in 1977?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I was not minister of this particular department at that particular time so I cannot give the gentleman off my cuff an answer to that particular question. But let me make an offer to the hon. gentleman, who has something stuck down his craw today about that camp and I do not know what it is. But if the LIA or the NMIA, or both, want to submit a proposal, send her in, Sir, I will deal with her right away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: I hope that somebody takes the hon. gentleman up on his offer about the camp in these times of restraint. In fact, I want to ask the Premier about the government's restraint programme. They cannot answer questions on the Order Paper in this House because they cannot research them, they are closing hospital beds, and yet they have a luxurious camp up on the Voisey River in Northern Labrador being financed by the people's money. Now what about the government's restraint programme? Why do they not close it down, give it away, but get rid

MR. NEARY: of it somehow or other?  
There is no revenue from it. The odd Cabinet Minister will drop in once in a while and do a little fishing and then go on his merry way. Is there any justification for the government keeping this camp at all?

MR. HICKEY: That is not what the minister said.

MR. NEARY: That is what the minister said. There is no revenue from that camp, maybe one or two fishing parties, he said, in the run of a year, that is all.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is Question Period. The hon. gentleman, as usual, is making a speech and, as usual, is injecting poisonous remarks. Now, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the Question Period is to ask questions, and the hon. gentleman is on a supplementary question so he requires no preamble.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to direct his question on the restraint programme.

MR. NEARY: What about the government's restraint programme, Mr. Speaker, when we have examples of waste and extravagance like this cabin? Could the hon. gentleman tell us now what he intends to do about this extravagance and waste?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, sure, no problem, Mr. Speaker. It has been discussed many, many times with the minister and we have been in a quandary to know what to

PREMIER PECKFORD: do. One of the alternatives was, as the minister mentioned, to put it up on open tender. Then we thought that perhaps that would not be the best idea because we should give either or both Native associations the opportunity to have the right of first refusal. I think during the last conversation we had that is what we decided we should do with it. Now it is not extravagance and waste in the sense that the Leader of the Opposition wants to make it out so that the press would try to carry it that somehow we extravagantly got camps around. That is not true. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition remembers it was this administration that got rid of all the camps that were used for extravagance and waste.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We were the government before restraint came in that got rid of the Gander cabin and the Adlatok cabin, the ones that were being used, and in which there was a lot of extravagance and waste. I am proud to say we got rid of them. Now we have this one that was built under the

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Native People's agreement, a federal/ provincial agreement and is used very, very irregularly by anybody. We have been trying to see if we could stimulate some commercial development up there and then be able to pass it over to the Native associations so that they could build on what we had already started so you had some kind of a commercial operation up there. It has been very, very difficult going because, as the minister said there is no salmon in that river, I was up there once four or five years ago, I have not been up there since, and there is only Arctic char and trout in that river. It has been difficult to try to attract commercial parties from inside or outside the Province to go to a river where you only have Arctic char and trout. So it has not worked that well. There is not that much being spent on it each year, as the minister said, just a caretaker status, \$20,000 to try to keep it in good shape. But we are quite prepared, and we talked about it in Cabinet a number of times, to perhaps offer it to the two Native associations to use. Now, the other thing is, of course, they might be able to access - you know, what you can do by the back door is alright if you do not do it through the front door - they might get the funding for it through the Native's agreement and keep funding it. So, whilst it might look like government is no longer financing it, the long and the short of it might be that the two Native associations might take it over and then get the funding through the Native's agreement anyway. Then it looks all right yet the money is still coming from the taxpayers of Canada and Newfoundland. Whether that be so or not, that is fine and dandy, but we have not spent any



PREMIER PECKFORD: money on it because of the very reason that the member mentioned, one, restraint but, more importantly, two, that it has not worked out. It was built years ago, I do not know what year it was built, but it must have been built in 1974 or 1975 or somewhere around there.

MR. GOUDIE: 1972.

PREMIER PECKFORD: 1972, was it?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So we are prepared, obviously, to immediately try to do some kind of a deal with the Native peoples. You know, it is no good to let it run down if the Native peoples can use it wisely and perhaps make some money on it and train some of their younger people at it. So it is not extravagance and waste. We have a facility and it is now an asset. Let it not become a liability, it is an asset. It has not been a great liability, but it is more

PREMIER PECKFORD:

of an asset than a liability. How can we use it? Because you are not going to get commercial people to go in there. I mean, we have tried. You are not going to get them, they want to go for the salmon. So you have that building there, now what are you going to do with it and how are you going to make it work? And perhaps we should really try to go the way the minister has indicated and work out a deal with the Native peoples to take it over and use it effectively and efficiently for them. I think that is the way out of the situation, it seems to me.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Premier would undertake to give the House a full and detailed report of this camp from the day it started right up to the present time: Tell us the kind of training that was undertaken in this camp, what kind of training, how many people were trained, the cost of it, the cost of maintenance, and operations of the camp year by year, the revenue received from the camp, and a list of those who visited the camp since it started?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No problem, Mr. Speaker. The long and short of it, I think the minister gave most of information, is that we have been trying to attract commercial people in there and have been unsuccessful. Therefore the amount of money that has been spent there has been just a caretaker thing in trying to work out a way out of it. Personally I think I was in there once, and that was before I was Premier. I went in there one time when I was the Minister

PREMIER PECKFORD: of Municipal Affairs, I was  
in Nain and I dropped in to see this facility was there.

MR. WARREN: That was the last time you were there, was it?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes.

MR. WARREN: That is shameful.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, I know it is terrible.  
I should be up in Nain and Makkovik and Postville.

MR. WARREN: You ought to be up there to see the caribou.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Pardon?

MR. WARREN: You should go up to see the caribou.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh, yes, no doubt. Perhaps the  
hon. member would like to come with me out to Green Bay too  
and we could drop in in back of Millertown to see some of the moose  
and caribou in there too. It might be a good idea.

MR. NEARY: When will we get this report  
in the House?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know if  
I would leave the hon. gentleman behind or not, but I think  
I would. I have a sneaky suspicion the hon. member for  
Torngat Mountains would have a hard job keeping up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Is that a Liberal button? You  
have the Liberal colours. Is that a Liberal button you are  
flying for the weekend?

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, I am sorry to inform the hon.  
Leader of the Opposition that I do not associate myself with  
things that are dying, I associate myself with things that are  
alive and well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: You should come to Gander  
on the weekend.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And on that note, Mr. Speaker,  
we do not want the camp that we are talking about to die either,  
we would like for it to be used by the Native peoples up

PREMIER PECKFORD:

there. It was built, we have inherited it, we are trying to make it work. It does not seem like we can. It is in a caretaker status and we would be pleased as punch to get rid of it. But having the facility there and just see it deteriorate and be nothing does not seem to be the right approach to take. Surely we should try to make something of it and in that vein I think the minister's suggestion seems to be a good one to me.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman thinks anything is dying in this Province, he should come to Gander on the weekend. If he wants to see something that is alive, Mr. Speaker, and on the move in this Province, he should come to Gander. There will be a fair representation from the hon. gentleman's district in Gander and from the member for Baie Verte - White Bay's (Mr. Rideout). But, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell us now when we can expect to get the information that I just requested? Will it take a day, two days, a week? When can we expect to get the information tabled in the House that I just asked the hon. gentleman about in connection with the operation and maintenance of that camp since the time it started?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We will get it as quick as we can, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). We are glad that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is having a meeting in Gander. They must have enlarged the telephone booths in Gander in recent times, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wants to make a flick at my district, the Leader of the Opposition is welcome any day of the week to come down and run against me in Green Bay. We would love to have him down there. He ran away from Bell Island, he is about to run away from LaPoile, fine and dandy! He got elected by a couple of hundred votes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Forty votes. Forty votes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Forty votes, was it? Down to forty, just skimmed in by the skin of his teeth. If another day had gone by in the last election he would not have gotten elected. I am glad he got elected, Mr. Speaker, I am happy he got elected, a colourful character in the political scene in Newfoundland, but if the Leader of the Opposition wants to make little flicks and little darts, as he likes to call it, from time to time, let him dart down to Green Bay and run against me in Green Bay, and we will see if he wants to keep running around the Province, who will get elected, and who will not.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I made the hon. gentleman the other day a challenge. Now if the hon. gentleman is thinking about calling an election -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - and the hon. gentleman wants me to come to Green Bay to run against him, let him go down to the Governor this afternoon, turn in his resignation, and I will go down to Green Bay next week and take the hon. gentleman on, if that is what he wants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: But he does not have the courage, he does not have the intestinal fortitude to do it. If the

MR. NEARY: hon. gentleman is a fighter, let him show if he is a fighter or a coward. Is he a coward? Go down to the Governor this afternoon and we will have it out. And I would be glad to accept the hon. gentleman's invitation, now, this present day, to go down to Green Bay and take the hon. gentleman on. But if he waits two or three years, Mr. Speaker, well, that may be a different story.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has told us he is only going to last two terms because everybody knows the hon. gentleman will not be around in the next election. The hon. gentleman is going to get out or he will be booted out by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Is this a question, Mr. Speaker? Where is the question?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mount Scio may take care of him.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Where is the question?

MR. NEARY: But the hon. gentleman did not answer my question as to when we are going to get this information. Will we get it before the House of Assembly closes?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition, talk about being cowards, he ran away from Bell Island, the hon. member did, he could not stay there because he knew the people got wise to him, and now they are about to get wise to him in LaPoile. Now I will run against the hon. member -

MR. WARREN: Tomorrow?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Not tomorrow, and not the day after tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, I have invited -

MR. WARREN: When? When?

PREMIER PECKFORD: - I have invited the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to come to Green Bay -

MR. NEARY: I will go. I will go.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - in the next election and run against me in Green Bay.

MR. NEARY: Call it today, I will go.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is a prerogative that the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Premier has -

MR. NEARY: I see. So you are not going to call one.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - now I know the Leader of the Opposition would love to have that prerogative, Mr. Speaker, he would love to that prerogative, but I have a sneaky suspicion he is never going to have that prerogative.

MR. NEARY: Go down and call it and we will go.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now I am sorry if the Leader of the Opposition is jealous that he could not win his seat by as much as I won mine. That is too bad. Tough on the Leader of the Opposition. Tough he was not able to win it even though he ran over to LaPoile from Bell Island. That is too bad. But when the election is called, Mr. Speaker, that is the time for the Leader of the Opposition to play politics, when the election is called, and then see where the Leader of the Opposition goes, then let him come to Green Bay and run. As far as the answer to the question the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked, I said we will get it as quickly as possible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: If I was Premier of this Province, leading a party, Mr. Speaker, and my vote went down, I got less votes in my own district, if I was Premier, than I got in the last election, I would be ashamed for the hon. gentleman to get up and talk about that.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat what I said; I will accept the challenge, if the hon. gentleman will go down this afternoon, turn in his badge, and let us go down to Green Bay -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!



MR. NEARY: - and have it out. But he has not got the courage to do it. I challenge him to do it. He has not got the courage to do it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. gentleman a final supplementary. Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman tell the House if government had been considering giving that cabin to the Native people before my hon. colleague brought it up in the House this afternoon?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. For the last year or so, or more than that, it has been discussed in Cabinet on a number of occasions that we should work out a scheme with the Native groups in order to do that. I do not know, in talking about running against me down in Green Bay, whether the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would get the Liberal nomination in Green Bay to start with to run against me. But is the Leader of the Opposition talking about a by-election now or a full-scale general election?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Does the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) want to challenge me in Green Bay tomorrow in the by-election? Is that it, if I can ask a question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!  
The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentlemen can play -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Are you willing to do a by-election  
now?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentlemen can play all  
the games he wants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman got himself  
boxed in now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the hon. gentleman  
come to LaPoile in a by-election right now?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Answer my question.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am asking the hon.  
gentleman a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, the answer from  
the hon. gentleman is obviously, no, he will not come. So I would  
say to the hon. gentleman, he issued the challenge in the  
beginning, now I am going to repeat it. If the hon.  
gentleman has the courage of his convictions, and he is a  
fighter, he says he is a fighter, and he tries to portray  
the image of a fighter, not a coward. Now, Mr. Speaker,  
Is the hon. gentleman a fighter or a coward? Let us have  
a general election right now and I will come down to Green Bay  
and I will run against the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman  
wonders if I can win the nomination.

MR. NEARY: Well, the fortunes of the Liberal Party are so good at the present time there may be a line-up to take the hon. gentleman on in Green Bay.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But, anyway, what was the question I was asking?

MR. WARREN: About the cabins.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes. I asked the hon. gentleman there if they had been thinking about giving this cabin to Native groups. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House what contacts they had made in connection with the disposition of that cabin? Have they contacted any of the Native groups? Have they asked for there opinion? Have they made the offer or, Mr. Speaker, is this just coffee talk around the Cabinet Room or down in the private dining room? Have they contacted any of the Native groups in connection with the disposal of this cabin?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is trying to twist things. We had an election a little while ago and we almost eliminated the Liberal Party, and we do not want to completely extinguish it off the face of Newfoundland all together, but if the Leader of the Opposition wants to come to Green Bay, as he expressed an interest in doing -

MR. NEARY: No, you invited me.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - let us today go down, I will resign my seat as the member for Green Bay, and we will run in the by-election and the Leader of the Opposition can challenge me there as a Liberal candidate. Let us test it now. I mean, the Premier's prerogative should mean something,

May 4, 1983

Tape No. 1731

MJ - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: so let us test-it. If the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) really is serious and tries to put it on me to be a fighter,I challenge the Leader of the Opposition now -

MR. NEARY: We want a general election.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - to come tomorrow in a by-election in Green Bay and let us fight it out,if the Leader of the Opposition really wants to play games.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: No,let us go to LaPoile. If we are going to have by-election,let us go to LaPoile.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let us go to the district that has been Liberal more than any other district in Newfoundland, Green Bay district.

MR. NEARY: We want a general election.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Let us go to the district that has been Liberal more than any other district in the Province of Newfoundland, the district of Green Bay. So, therefore, the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Neary) should not be scared to resign his seat in LaPoile and come to Green Bay as the Liberal candidate, I say, he might not get the Liberal nomination, but I am sure that will be arranged.

MR. NEARY: There would be quite a line-up!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Most things are always arranged by the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure this one can be arranged too. Mr. Jamieson was arranged to come back here as leader in 1979. And they have arranged that the member for LaPoile to stay on for a while until they get a leader who perhaps can get more seats than the Leader of the Opposition can get. That has been arranged. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) will come out of the woodwork now one of these days and run for the leadership and poor old 'Steve' will have to go into retirement after trying to fight the battle forty-four to eight in the House. They are all ready to desert him over there, just about everyone of them.

So let him now, if he really wants to remain Leader of the Liberal Party, let him beat the Premier in the Premier's district and then the member for the Strait of Belle Isle will not be able to beat him in the Liberal Leadership Convention, Mr. Speaker. He will have it sewed up then.

MR. WARREN:

Answer the question now!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we will get the information for the Leader of the Opposition as quickly as possible. We have talked about trying to put together some kind of a proposal to put to the Native groups and we are willing to pursue that as we have talked about it over the last several months.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The time for the Question Period has expired.

MR. NEARY:

Time really flies. That was a pretty heavy Question Period.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, after extensive research, but in the spirit of our highly successful restraint programme which we continuously and diligently apply, I would like to put on the table the answer to Question 22, which was asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on March 15th.

o o o

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I can interrupt the normal course of events of the day, with the concurrence of the members of the Opposition, I was not here when the House opened. I would just like, on behalf of the government, and I am sure I speak for all hon. members - and I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) should have an opportunity to comment on this too - in welcoming the news that His Holiness, the Pope, will visit our Province. The news is in the paper today, but I was informed yesterday by the Archbishop that His Holiness will be visiting Newfoundland from noon September 9th to 9:00 a.m. on September 10th, 1984. I thought that since this information has been made public that it might be fitting for members of the House of Assembly to express our gratitude that His Holiness is coming to our Province. It will be the first visit of a Pope to the Province and I think this is the first place that His Holiness will visit on his trip to Canada. I would just like to, on behalf of the government, and, as I say, I am sure I speak for all hon. members, express our gratitude for that.

MR. TULK: In 1984.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I wish the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) would just at least keep quiet when I

PREMIER PECKFORD: am trying to be serious about something which is extremely serious. I did mention 1984, from noon on September 9th to 9:00 a.m. on September 10th, and that we are very, very happy that His Holiness has seen fit to come to our Province. And I am sure all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians of whatever religious persuasion will welcome him with open arms.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we heard the news today, the same as the hon. gentleman, that His Holiness was going to visit Newfoundland in 1984. We are very, very thrilled about this. We are excited about it. We are completely overwhelmed, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that a world leader of the stature of His Holiness could find the time in his busy itinerary, in his busy schedule, to visit Newfoundland. We are quite excited about it. We welcome the news, Mr. Speaker, from the bottoms of our hearts because, as the hon. the Premier indicated, no doubt if His Holiness follows the tradition and the practice that he has followed in other countries that he has visited he will attract large numbers of people and especially if His Holiness has an outdoor Mass. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, but we can all understand why His Holiness can only visit the city of St. John's and the St. John's area.



MR. NEARY: We are all disappointed that His Holiness could not come to other parts of Newfoundland but we can understand why. But no doubt if he has an outdoor Mass people will flock to St. John's from all over Newfoundland and Labrador. They will come by car, they will come by boat, they will come by air to see and hear His Holiness.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it would be in order or not, I am going to make the suggestion anyway in all sincerity, not wishing to embarrass anybody. I do not know if it can be worked into the agenda or not, but I believe the offer should be made that we convene a special session of the provincial Legislature - if it is possible, and it may not be possible - and invite His Holiness to come to the people's House and address the provincial Legislature. It is merely a suggestion of mine. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour or somebody could pass the message on to the people who are arranging the programme, the agenda for His Holiness. I certainly would like to see it happen. We should make the offer. If it is rejected well, then, nothing ventured, nothing gained, but I believe we should make the suggestion, Mr. Speaker, to invite His Holiness to come in on the floor of the people's House in special session and have a few words if that is possible, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Today being Wednesday, Private Members' Day, we have Motion 11, moved by the hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach).

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to propose  
resolution number 11 on the Order Paper:

WHEREAS Newfoundland has a moral and historic claim to the  
resources on our Continental Shelf; and

WHEREAS it is an undeniable fact that Newfoundland brought  
those resources into Canada upon its entry into  
Confederation; and

WHEREAS we entered into negotiations on the verbal under-  
standing that the Federal Government was willing  
to consider an offshore agreement for Newfoundland  
which would be better than the Nova Scotia  
Agreement; and

WHEREAS the Federal Government has adopted the unacceptable  
position that Newfoundland must accept an agreement  
that is no better than, and in some respects worse  
than, the Nova Scotia Agreement; and

WHEREAS the clear and public position of Newfoundland

MR. PEACH: is that this Province must share in a meaningful way the management responsibility and the revenues associated with offshore resources; and WHEREAS social and economic justice, and the chance for Newfoundland to become an equal Province in Confederation, dictates that the position of the Federal Government is morally wrong and unacceptable to the vast majority of the people of this Province; NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House demands that the Government of Canada enter into an agreement with this Province such that our moral and historic claims with respect to the sharing of offshore management and revenues are recognized.

Mr. Speaker, to take the beginning of that resolution referring to our moral and historic claim to the resources on our continental shelf, I think it is fair to say that it is difficult to question the fact that this historic and moral resource that this Province claims rightfully belongs to us was taken into Confederation in 1949 when we joined Canada. I say, Mr. Speaker, really what is wrong with such a moral and historic claim? The fact is there that we did take this resource with us in 1949, Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians own the resource that was part of this Province and went with us into Confederation? Is this resource, Mr. Speaker, not a part of the heritage of our Province? It is part of the resource that we have on our continental shelf and nobody denies the fact that that is a part of this Province. And is the claim that this Province makes that it has a historic and a moral right to that resource

MR. PEACH: any different than what other provinces claim is rightfully theirs of their land resource? Mr. Speaker, I as one member of this government, cannot see any difference in our claim to the resources that lie off our shores and other provinces' claims that the resources which are on the land belong to them I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we could even go back to the actual discovery of this Province by

MR. PEACH: John Cabot if we wanted to and say, Mr. Speaker, that our resource on the Grand Banks, which is part of the continental shelf, is actually what our very discovery itself was, I suppose, based on, and work over the years in our Province has been part of our offshore resource. Our moral claim and, I suppose, more importantly our historic claim to that resource which lies off our Shores, and I make reference to the fact that prior to 1930 the same narrow, leagalistic issue of ownership of resources below the land of Western Canada was settled and that, Mr. Speaker, needed no court case to settle it, no court case to resolve it, the then existing law clearly indicated that the Federal Government owned these resources, yet, at that time, Mr. Speaker, common sense, as should be the case now, dictated that the people above the land - for example, the people of Alberta and the people of Saskatchewan, and of Manitoba - should own the resources below their land. That seemed to be a very basic and common-sense approach at that time. So it was at that time that the law was changed and that the Federal Government of the day recognized that it would be just and quite an appropriate way to cede over to the Westerners the resource that was below their land. That is why today and for the last several years, we can see the wealth and the benefits that the Province of Alberta receives from its vast oil reserves that they have. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, should Newfoundland and Labrador settle for anything less than those provinces had to settle for? The resource which was below their land is no different than the resource which we feel rightfully belongs to us today, which is just off our Shores on our Continental

MR. PEACH: shelf. Why should not the resources that are off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland be owned by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?

Mr. Speaker, we brought those resources into Confederation with us and all of the legal decisions that anyone can come up with in the world, I guess, will not make the Grand Banks of Newfoundland the Grand Banks of Ottawa. Common sense really, Mr. Speaker, should demand that we own these

MR. PEACH:

resources. Fairness and equity in relation to the historical Canadian precedent dictates that it should be recognized by our federal government, that we do rightfully, legally and morally own the resources that lie off our shores. Any sense of, I am sure, fair play would not deny a Province such as ours the right to these resources and we, Mr. Speaker, are simply saying that we should be looked upon as the other provinces of Canada have been and we should be able to enjoy the resources, the very rich oil resources that lie off our shores.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that there should be in our minds no mistaking this, and in order to reach our goal and our claim of ownership of our offshore we as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, whether we sit on this side of the House or whether we sit in Opposition, we should show and it is the only way, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to attain our goals by showing a strong determination. And when we are prepared to insist as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians upon this basic human right, I am sure we all realize that we will have no hope of ever receiving the resources that rightfully belong to us. On the offshore, I suppose, if we follow along the line of thought of hon. members opposite and the thought of our federal government we could, I am sure, see a recurrence of the nightmare we had with the Upper Churchill. And I am sure Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, as was echoed loud and clear on April 6th of last year, have no intention of going that route and we want to reap the full benefits that are rightfully, morally and historically ours. In relation

MR. PEACH: to our claim as such, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to a few remarks that were made on October 6 of last year by our Premier, when in a reasonably detailed statement on the offshore resources, he said, 'We believe the offshore resources belong to Newfoundland for historic, moral, legal and traditional constitutional reasons. When Newfoundland joined Canada in 1949 it did so as a separate dominion within the Commonwealth, and it brought into Canada all its resources human and natural, renewable and nonrenewable, on land and under water,' and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, nobody argues that point. I am sure when hon. members opposite see fit to get up and make some comments on this resolution that they will have to agree that at the time Newfoundland joined Canada, in 1949, it did bring these resources in with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH: Therefore, before 1949 neither the federal government nor anyone else, except Newfoundland, had any claim to any of the resources on land or under water, and if we had not joined Confederation the offshore resources would definitely be ours today. In other words, if Newfoundland had not joined Confederation in 1949 these resources would be clearly ours. They would be just as clearly ours as the Avalon Peninsula is part of Newfoundland today, they would be just as clearly ours as the Great Northern Peninsula is part of Newfoundland today, they would be just as clearly ours as is the part of our Province called Labrador, which belongs to Newfoundland today.

MR. SIMMS: And Cabonear.

MR. PEACH: I could refer to Carbonear as another part of our Province which would fit into the same category.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an undeniable



MR. PEACH: fact of history and no matter what one puts forth as argument, it cannot be changed. So, Mr. Speaker, in reference to that same statement, when we joined Confederation in 1949 we passed over certain things to our federal government. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is a point, or several points really, that we should look at very seriously. We passed these over to our federal government at the time and I am sure

MR. PEACH: we looked at it in the light that it would benefit us as well as benefitting the rest of our great country. We passed over National Defence. We passed over money and banking. We passed over international trade. However, Mr. Speaker, what we did not pass over we kept. We did not pass over at that time education or health, we kept them, we did not pass over the forests of our Province, we kept them, we did not pass over our mineral resources on land or under water, we kept them. So there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we kept our offshore resources. Therefore, I would ask the question, Mr. Speaker, why then do we have such a dispute? If we brought our offshore into Canada and we did not pass it over to the federal government at the time, then why does this fact alone not settle such a dispute?

Also, Mr. Speaker, to make further reference to that same statement, it seems a rather strange situation that we find ourselves in. On the one hand you have Ontario, Quebec, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta given ownership and total control of their vast natural resources to which they have no ownership claim at all, Mr. Speaker, and on the other hand, Newfoundland has had to go to court to prove that they have the same rights to resources that other provinces of Canada can just simply claim as theirs.

How come, Mr. Speaker, the five provinces that I just mentioned can have their resources even

MR. PEACH:                    though they did not bring them into Confederation at the time, yet Newfoundland cannot have their resources which they did bring into Confederation? This, Mr. Speaker, is rather strange indeed.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness I should refer to the main elements of proposals that our federal government put forth in September 1982 which clearly indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, that their claim to the ownership and the way in which they want our offshore resources managed is far from fair to this Province. One of the proposals was that Federal Acts and Regulations would apply to offshore Newfoundland just as it does to the Arctic and to the Northwest Territories. The federal government would fully manage and administer the offshore. The federal government would make all of the final decisions. This, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all realize, is in no way fair to our Province and fair to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

To get into the next part of the motion, concerning the verbal agreement in which we were to understand that we would be better off than Nova Scotia yet in some respects we find that we would be worse off, this Mr. Speaker, is, I am sure, unacceptable and should be an unacceptable agreement to not only members on this side of the House but to the hon. members opposite. We all should be fighting with one aim, to get what we can for this Province. And to say that Nova Scotia has settled their offshore differences and signed an agreement, that is all very well to say, or to get up in this hon. House and read from some of the media, Yet really what does Nova Scotia have? They do not have our resource. As far as I understand, we will burn off more gas than Nova Scotia can produce.

MR. PEACH: So, Mr. Speaker, to deal with all of the great hullabaloo about the fact that Nova Scotia signed an agreement with our federal government, what do they have? I understand that Nova Scotia has its agreement signed. How many oil rigs will be working off the Nova Scotia coast this Summer with their agreement salted away, with their 'me too' clause in, I guess, 'If Newfoundland gets something better, we want it too.'

Nova Scotia will have four oil rigs working off its coast this Summer. Newfoundland does not have an agreement. We will have ten oil rigs working off our coast this Summer. So I say, Mr. Speaker, it is very good to say Nova Scotia has its agreement salted away. I am sure that the people of this Province would much rather that we wait and get a far better agreement than the one that Nova Scotia supposedly has worked out.

Mr. Speaker, the other part of this resolution, the clear and public position on a meaningful sharing of management responsibilities and revenues, this is the part of it that seems to strike nearest to home because it is the part that we are all concerned with, the sharing of revenues.

Mr. Speaker, if I may take a minute to refer to a letter dated January, 1983, which was sent to the Minister of Energy, the hon. Jean Chretien, I will make a short reference to it, in which specifically we asked for written understanding on the following points: "that the joint management board will be an equal one in all of its sense, with its own administrative staff employed by the board and under its full and exclusive direction and control; that there will be an objective means of determination of national energy self-sufficiency

MR. PEACH: and security of supply provided in the agreement by a mutually agreed independent body which renders final and binding decisions; that there be a fair and equitable sharing of Crown rights;"

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH: "that there be a cost shared industrial and financial incentives programme to begin immediately upon signing of the agreement."

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that nobody in this hon. House can deny that these are just, reasonable, sound and, I might add, responsible things to ask for in negotiation with our federal government.

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

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. PEACH: By leave?

MR. WARREN: I will yield.

MR. PEACH: I thank the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. PEACH: I will take one minute to clue up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: No, not a second!

MR. PEACH: I will say, Mr. Speaker, that these proposals, we feel, are just and reasonable for our Province. I will continue next day. Thank you.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: I would like to respond to this resolution, Mr. Speaker. It is fine and dandy to see a new member of this hon. House bring in such a resolution, however, if we read this resolution in its totality it leans on political lines, Mr. Speaker. We want to see an agreement between the federal and the provincial governments so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move an amendment to the motion, seconded by my hon. colleague from Bellevue (Mr. Callan), that we delete all the words after the first Whereas and replace it by adding, "BE IT RESOLVED that this House demands that both the provincial and federal governments negotiate an agreement such that our moral and historic claims with respect to the sharing of offshore management and revenue are recognized."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A good amendment.

MR. WARREN: If it is in order, Mr. Speaker, I will continue.

MR. TOBIN: Is the amendment in order?

MR. CALLAN: We will ask you, you should know.

MR. SIMMS: You might want a recess.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty straightforward amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am going to call a recess for a few minutes to go in and study this.

RECESS

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

I rule that the amendment is  
in order.

The hon. the member for Torngat  
Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Now, we have a resolution on the  
floor of this House that I hope members on the opposite  
side, as well as the members on this side, will once and  
for all support. In our amended resolution we ask that an  
agreement be reached between the federal and the provincial  
governments to develop our offshore oil resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

DR. COLLINS: Would you read your resolution  
again just to see -

MR. WARREN: No, the Clerk has a copy of it.

MR. HODDER: We will send one over to him.

MR. WARREN: Okay, I will read the amendment.

MR. WARREN: The amendment is, 'BE IT RESOLVED that this House demands that both the provincial and federal governments negotiate an agreement such that our moral and historic claims with respect to the sharing of offshore management and revenues are recognized'.

MR. SIMMS: That is what it says in the resolution.

MR. WARREN: No, Sir in the resolution it says, I will repeat, 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House demands that the Government of Canada enter into an agreement with this Province such that our moral and historic claims with respect to the sharing of offshore management and revenues are recognized'. So therefore what the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) is saying is that the Province wants to negotiate but Ottawa does not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I thought it would be good for the record - I think it is in order and will table it after - to read a response that Mr. Chretien sent to the hon. Leo Barry, MHA, Mount Scio, House of Assembly. I have a copy of this letter and I think it would be proper to read the response and see who is at fault. We have heard the Premier's version, the President of the Council's (Mr. Marshall) version, now let us see what Mr. Chretien's version is, and who is at fault. The hon. Jean Chretien wrote back and he said -

MR. TOBIN: Are you reading it in French?

MR. WARREN: - there were four questions -

MR. HODDER: We listened to your speaker in silence now why does not the peanut gallery over there keep their comments to themselves.

MR. TOBIN: You are over there by the door because your leader will not let you come in, as he would not let you come into the House last week because (inaudible).



MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, will you ask the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) to be quiet. Because he got so embarrassed yesterday in front of our federal colleague -

MR. NEARY: Now you know why I did not want to give him leave. My hon. friend knows now.

MR. WARREN: There is an example, Mr. Speaker. However, Mr. Speaker, here is what the hon. Mr. Chretien said, 'As you know, I spent many weeks negotiating with Mr. Marshall. Despite the fact that I met the principle objections of Premier Peckford to the federal offer of September 2nd, 1982, the Newfoundland Government broke off negotiations. Despite the fact that for a week after the breaking off of negotiations I offered to meet Mr. Marshall any place, any time, to try to get a deal and the provincial government refused to see me.' Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the federal government's fault?

MR. WARREN: Here are some of the suggestions that the hon. Jean Chretien threw out to the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). He said, 'As a member of the House of Assembly you might want to ask Mr. Marshall or Mr. Peckford, number one, Why they would not respond at the negotiating table to the detailed, written position presented by my negotiator'. Now, I do not know if the hon. member for Mount Scio has asked those two gentlemen, but we would expect to have a good answer from them.

Now the second one; 'Why Mr. Marshall'-I am quoting from the paper, Mr. Speaker, so I have to use the name as he said it - 'Why Mr. Marshall would not meet with me to try to reconcile the few points of difference between the position of his negotiators and the position of my negotiator?' That was a very straightforward question for the hon. member to ask, and as of yet neither one of those two questions have been answered for the people.

Now, the third question; 'You might want to ask Mr. Marshall why his chief negotiator only attended the first part of the first meeting on revenue sharing?' There is another important thing that the public does not know. 'Why did the chief negotiator for the Province only attend the first part of the meeting on revenue sharing?'

DR. COLLINS: What is the importance of it?

MR. WARREN: What is the importance of it? It is of very much importance. We have an offshore agreement not an agreement. We have an offshore agreement waiting to be signed. The federal government is waiting to sit down with this Province, however this Province -

DR. COLLINS: What kind of (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: Because these are the questions that have not been answered, so I am hoping that this letter

MR. WARREN: will give hon. members an opportunity to answer those four specific questions.

And the final question -

DR. COLLINS: Who is the chief negotiator?

MR. WARREN: Who is the chief negotiator?

I do not know. You should answer that one.

And finally, 'You may want to ask Mr. Peckford why he would not give a full mandate to Mr. Marshall, and why he sat pulling the strings in a hotel room in Montreal, a few blocks from where the negotiations were taking place?'

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the whole trouble, the only reason we do not have an offshore agreement today, Mr. Speaker, because the Premier - and not very often I say this, Mr. Speaker, but I

MR. WARREN: believe the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council, here was his one chance in Newfoundland's history where Newfoundlanders would have forgiven his anti-Confederate tactics, all Newfoundlanders would have forgiven all he said in the past. Because he said nasty things about the past administration, he said nasty things about the former, former administration, so here was a chance for the hon. President of the Council to be forgiven by all Newfoundlanders, because here he was up there and almost had a deal signed. In fact, I remember on national television, seeing both gentlemen, the hon. the President of the Council and the hon. Jean Chretien, both of them walking out through the hallways with the cameras flashing at them and, I suppose, the biggest smile I have ever seen on the gentleman's face since I have known him, and the reason for the smile on his face was because both he and Mr. Chretien were excited because the deal was almost ready to sign. Now, what happened? This is what happened, the Premier -

MR. WOODROW: How do you know what happened? You were not there.

MR. WARREN: The hon. member from Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) knows what happened. He knows because the Premier was just across the street pulling strings and he was saying, 'Now, Mr. Marshall, be careful. Do not sign. Do not sign.' And as far as I am concerned, the President of the Council has done what practically 80 per cent of Newfoundlanders were expecting all along. The Premier of this Province is a dictator, 'What I say goes', and that is what happened. That is the whole answer. The Premier was not satisfied and therefore, 'Do not sign anything.' So the Premier said, 'Okay, look, I am the dictator, I will tell you when to sign that agreement.' And that is why the agreement has not been signed today, and

MR. WARREN: that is why, Mr. Speaker, we have three oil rigs now not close to the wellheads, miles and miles off from the wellheads, because both governments have the oil companies out there and they do not know what is best to do. They will not come into the Newfoundland Ports because Ottawa is saying, 'Do not you dare,' they will not go to any other port

MR. WARREN:

because the Newfoundland government is saying, 'Do not you dare'. So what did the oil companies do? The oil companies pulled up the middle and went outside the jurisdiction of Canadian waters altogether. I believe that is where they are. So here we have three oil rigs out there ready to go back drilling but cannot because there are no regulations in place. That is the simple reason. The reason they cannot go back is because neither the federal government nor the Province have any regulations and if they go back and an accident takes place they may be in hot water over it or something. So this is one of the reasons why the oil companies are not drilling today. And why we have no agreement is because this government sees fit to say, let us wait it out, and let the young people go to Alberta. You know, this government was talking about saving money, Mr. Speaker. In fact, just look at what was revealed today about the Voisey Bay fish camp. There is what money was saved. About \$500,000 wasted when this is where we should be saving our money. Here is where we should be making money, on the offshore, here is where money should be flowing in by now and this government is wasting it. This government said they never had any money to airlift caribou meat and skidoos out of the country in Nain while at the same time they spend about \$500,000 on a fish camp, that has not been used by anyone other than cabinet ministers and VIPs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what is happening.

So with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the amendment. The amendment is a good amendment and I am sure that my hon. colleague from Carbonear who is an up-and-coming, good politician, and I think he does see

MR. WARREN:

the light,

is going to come back and vote for the amendment because this amendment is in order. And we on this side do want both the federal and the provincial governments to get together. In fact, I highly recommend that the President of the Council once again be the chief negotiator, or be the negotiator for this Province. But at the same time, I would like to caution him, do not pay too much attention to the Premier, he will lead you astray. I am sure he will be led astray. If the Premier continues to take the me - too attitude, look, what I say goes, then we will never have an offshore agreement. The only way we can have an offshore

MR. WARREN:

agreement is by locking the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Energy, Mr. Chretien, in a hotel room: make sure they have lots of food and lots to drink and throw away the key until they come to an agreement.

MR. HODDER:

Perhaps we should not give them a telephone and no food or drinks until they come to a settlement.

MR. WARREN:

No, no telephones. Maybe they should do what the Micmac Indians did, go on a hunger strike. They convinced this government and they had to give in.

MR. HODDER:

I say give them no food or drink.

MR. WARREN:

So maybe give them no food or drink and let them go on a hunger strike. Let both the President of the Council and Mr. Chretien go into a room and stay in that room, be locked in, no telephones, no connection with the outside world at all, no television to look at, nothing at all, and let them stay in there until an agreement is reached. And I will bet you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the President of the Council will emerge from that room with an agreement.

MR. MARSHALL:

Would you keep Mark Lalonde in another room?

MR. WARREN:

Yes. All we need to do is keep Mr. Chretien and the hon. President of the Council in one room, no one else connected at all, everyone else stay away and I will bet you any money that the President of the Council would emerge from that room with a piece of paper in his hand and saying, 'Newfoundlanders, I have an agreement'. He will get that agreement.



MR. WARREN: Not only my instructions, but the instructions of 95 per cent of Newfoundlanders are go and get that deal but please do not listen to the Premier. That is another message that is coming loud and clear from the people, please, do not follow what the Premier is saying. The Premier has destroyed Newfoundland so far and he is still destroying Newfoundland so please, do not follow the Premier any longer.

MR. NEARY: And Cabot.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Martin again. It was the Premier with his binoculars, and Mr. Martin, I think, was holding up the binoculars for the Premier, that was what was happening, and this was when the shots were called.

Mr. Speaker, again I go back to the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). I am sure

MR. WARREN: the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) could have already had a deal settled but the Premier would not allow him and at least the member for Mount Scio had the intestinal fortitude to say, "Okay, Mr. Premier, if I am no good in your Cabinet I am getting out." At least he had the intestinal fortitude to do that. But the President of the council (Mr. Marshall), the same person who nominated the Premier for leadership, the same person, said, "I will stand by you, Mr. Premier, whatever you say I will do. If the ship is going to sink I will go down with her, too." That is the attitude of the Premier. The Premier is the captain of the ship, and Mr. Speaker, the ship is sinking. And the President of the Council is willing to go down with her.

MR. NEARY: But not the member for Mount Scio.

MR. WARREN: The member for Mount Scio, he sent out an SOS, but, meanwhile, the Premier would not believe it.

MR. NEARY: Now he looks for a federal seat.

MR. WARREN: And the Premier today was challenged to call an election. And what did the Premier do? What did the Premier do, the fighting Newfoundlander? The fighting Newfoundlander, what did he do? "No," he said, "I will call a by-election today in my district." That is what he said, "I will call a by-election." By why did he not call a federal election? Why not put the forty-four seats or the fifty-two seats -

MR. TOBIN: How could he call a federal election?

MR. WARREN: - I would say the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) would not see daylight if - in fact, he would not save his nomination fee with the ignorance he has shown in this House, since he became a part of this House, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to support the amendment to this resolution. The amendment is in order and I believe that if this House, next Wednesday, in a unanimous vote said that we want both the

MR. WARREN: provincial and the federal governments to join hands, to join forces, and to get back to the bargaining tables and not move until a settlement is reached, then, we would say, 100 per cent of the Newfoundlanders would see a happy day. There would not be any more days of mourning. We would not need any more days of mourning.

MR. SIMMS: No, we would have to call a general strike.

MR. WARREN: Yes, I would say a general strike or a general election, either one of them, a general strike or a general election.

MR. SIMMS: And you talk about irresponsibility.

MR. WARREN: Irresponsible government, yes. This government is really irresponsible, when they could see 129 caribou left in the country inside of Nain, and leave the native people to starve, and at the same time spend about \$10,000 on a fish camp only for government people. That is what you would call a responsible government. That is what you call a responsible government.

MR. HODDER: \$500,000.

MR. WARREN: No, only two years this is, overall about \$1,000,000, \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 spent on a fish camp that has not been used except by

MR. WARREN:

government members and VIPs and here we have, at the same time, a responsible government, Mr. Speaker, a government that is really responsible, leaves the meat in the country.

I think, Mr. Speaker, a bouquet should go to the German air force and a bouquet should go to Sealand Helicopters and a bouquet should go to Universal and to Petro-Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Those four companies joined together, Mr. Speaker, and saved the day for the native people in Labrador while this government turned their backs on them. This government have turned their backs on every Newfoundlander in every corner of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, until they get their act together, join forces and come out in support of having the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and Mr. Chretien go back to the negotiating table and let them stay there until an agreement is signed, only then will all of us be happy and then we will have our day in the sun.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

I would like to make some reference to the motion that was put forward by my colleague from Carbonear (Mr. Peach). I think it was an excellent motion. I find it unfortunate, the way that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) - and I would suggest it was on the recommendation of his Leader - treated him in

MR. TOBIN: this House this afternoon when he wanted to grant leave to my colleague from Carbonear (Mr. Peach). The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was about to do it but his leader told him to sit down, that he was not in charge.

I would suggest that this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is just put in to try to cloud the issue, to make it more political than it has ever been and to give the indication that the Newfoundland Government is as much at fault as is the federal government who refused to sign an agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not true.

MR. TOBIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that first of all we have to address it and understand why there is not an agreement reached in this Province today, why negotiations broke off, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that an agreement was reached between the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and the federal minister, Mr. Chretien.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Right on!

MR. TOBIN: There is no question about that.

MR. HODDER: (Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN: There certainly was an agreement reached. That might irk the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) who does not want an agreement, Mr. Speaker - that is evident from his silence on the issue - as well as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). And I guess he just got his message from the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can look at the development of offshore oil and gas, and we must realize that it has to be done in a very modest, and a very controlled manner, not the way the federal government is proposing to do it, because we have to address the social aspect of this as well. Mr. Speaker, we all know that with development there are social problems.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - the Leader of the Opposition should hang his head in shame, should apologize to the people of Newfoundland, when we talk about the social impacts of offshore oil and gas - the Leader of the Opposition stood in this House yesterday and said, 'We are not going down to the Harbour Light and bring back the derelicts'. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition should be made apologize to the people of this Province for these statements. I can assure him that the people who are at the Harbour Light and the people who have been there are there for treatment, not to be insulted, Mr. Speaker, by such a person as the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that he should hang his head in shame and apologize to the families who have people belonging to them down at the Harbour Light.

Mr. Speaker, Webster describes 'derelict' as a destitute person without a home or a regular job and rejected by society. Now, there are a lot of people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and I can say this from my days as a social worker, I can probably, Mr. Speaker, understand moreso than anybody else in this hon. House why the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker,

in case the hon. gentleman does not understand or is unwilling or unable to understand perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the Chair might have to remind the hon. gentleman that it is an amendment to a Private Member's resolution on offshore resources that we are discussing. I know the hon. gentleman in his simplicity and in his ignorance may not understand that, Mr. Speaker, because obviously, from the track record of the hon. gentleman, he does not understand the rules of this hon. House. He continuously thinks he is downtown somewhere in a dart league or some similar organization. But, Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House have to be observed. This is Private Members' Day, we are debating a Private Member's resolution on the offshore. I think Your Honour was following very closely what the poor old helpless member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was trying to say, struggling along, Mr. Speaker, they have their heavyweights up today. Just imagine, the member for Burin-Placentia West debating a resolution on offshore.

MR. NEARY: Just imagine. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker! How bankrupt of members are they over there? Can they not get up somebody with a bit of intelligence to debate this resolution so we can have a good debate? So, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the hon. gentleman is irrelevant and completely out of order and that he should be brought back on track, Your Honour.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

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

MR. SIMMS: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) being a veteran in this House, of course, and having perhaps been ruled out of order more times than anybody else in its history, should certainly be aware that irrelevancy is a very difficult thing for Your Honour to define. Certainly I am sure the comments of my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) were as relevant as those made by the member for Torngat Mountains, you will recall, Your Honour, who talked about moose and caribou and a camp up in Labrador and the like. I think the comments that my colleague from Burin - Placentia West was making certainly were relevant in that he was talking about some of the social implications, as they relate to offshore oil and offshore development. So, I suggest to Your Honour that this is not a point of order that has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition, the best it could be called, Your Honour, is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order the point of relevancy is well taken, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.



MR. TOBIN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I was certainly doing as my colleague just indicated, referring to the social impact that can happen as a result of the offshore oil and gas and no doubt, Mr. Speaker, in some aspects will occur. Obviously, I hit a nerve with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the only way that he could get from the House is squirm from the House, Mr. Speaker. After insulting the people of this Province, the families who have relatives of the Harbour Light - after insulting these people he should apologize - after insulting these people he crawled from the House. He should be ashamed of himself. I spent, Mr. Speaker, ten or eleven years in the social services field in this Province, working as a social worker, and I can assure the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) that people who get treatment at the Harbour Light are not destitute persons without a regular job and rejected by society, as Webster described it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said that?

MR. TOBIN: He declared yesterday, and Hansard clearly indicates, 'We are not going down to the Harbour Light and bring in the derelicts.' How did Webster describe derelict? 'A destitute person without a home or a regular job and rejected by society.'

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

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I do not see where there is any relevancy in what the member is saying. We are speaking on a resolution on the offshore and the member is lowering the decorum of the House and he is not being relevant, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is speaking of the social impact of the offshore on the Province of Newfoundland. I thought the hon. gentleman was getting into a very refreshing and positive tack in his argument and I suggest the hon. gentleman hear him out and at the end of the time I think he would be constrained to agree with us.

MR. DINN: You might learn a few pointers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, I rule that rule of relevancy is very hard to define.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: And I would bring the hon. member's attention to the resolution and ask him to relate his speech to the offshore and to the impact of it.

The hon. member for Burin -  
Placentia West.

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

I will continue to deal with the resolution and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, refer to the social impact that the offshore oil and gas is going to have on this Province. Obviously the hon. gentlemen opposite do not understand that with development of such such magnitude there is, Mr. Speaker, obviously going to be a social impact that is going to have some bearing on the Province as we know it today. I happened to serve, Mr. Speaker, for a few years on the Social Service Committee of the offshore oil and gas, before I entered politics, and I have some insight into what is going on as it relates to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that hit a nerve with him but I certainly hope that the Leader of the Opposition will apologize to the people who have had people in this situation and not insult them anymore. And I find it intolerable that the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) personally, who I refer to as a man of dignity, would permit himself to become an ally of the Leader of the Opposition in insulting people such as that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can go into the offshore, we can look at it in a lot of regards. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the man responsible for negotiating - let us get it straight - the man responsible for negotiating a settlement, an

MR. TOBIN: agreement, which was reached in this Province - why was the agreement not signed, Mr. Speaker? We all have, I guess, our own feelings on why it was not signed. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that the lack of action or inaction on behalf of the hon. gentlemen opposite by becoming allies of Mr. Chretien in these negotiations certainly contributed in some way, Mr. Speaker, to the lack of an agreement. So when the agreement was reached the civil servants were brought in to sign up the agreement, and what had been agreed verbally between Mr. Chretien and Mr. Marshall was not about to be written. Mr. Chretien would not permit it to be written. So, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Marshall came back and he writes him a letter asking for his understanding, not his hard, fast position or anything else, 'What is your understanding on the seventeen points that we have reached?' What is your understanding? Where is the response? We have not received it yet, it has not come to this government. But no, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have not put pressure on Mr. Chretien or the federal government and asked them to respond to the letter, or asked them to show some common decency and courtesy to the people of Newfoundland. No, indeed they have not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that agreement was reached I would say that this government,

MR. TOBIN: and make no mistake about it, this government want a negotiated settlement. However, before this can be realized surely it is not unreasonable to ask Mr. Chretien to put in writing his understanding of the basic questions and issues involved. Is that unreasonable, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SIMMS: What is wrong with that?

MR. TOBIN: No, indeed it is not. And if he does comply with that, Mr. Speaker, I would say that there would be an agreement acceptable to all Newfoundlanders and all Canadians. We have known what has taken place, we have known what took place this past Winter in the offshore oil and gas. We know quite well the conditions that existed on the Grand Banks in the area of Hibernia, the ice conditions. This government, Mr. Speaker, issued a stop drilling order to the oil rigs, the oil companies. The oil companies concurred with that decision but then came Uncle Ottawa and said, do not listen to the people of Newfoundland. If there is going to be a tragedy let us have a tragedy. That is basically what they said in their response. Why were the rigs not taken to Mortier Bay when this government issued instructions that they be taken there, when Mobil Oil concurred that they be taken there? Why were they not taken there, Mr. Speaker, and many people on the South Coast of this Province rehired in the shipyard to do the type of work that they are well noted in the international field of shipbuilding for doing? What happened instead? The Liberal party in this Province led by the leader, came in this House all smiles, rejoicing in the fact, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundlanders were unemployed, that Uncle Ottawa was not prepared to let them take their places where

MR. TOBIN: they should be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) a few weeks ago say in this hon. House what a great Canadian Mr. Chretien was. Yes, indeed he is a great Canadian. We said and I said earlier, that an agreement was reached -

MR. SIMMS: He speaks out of both sides his mouth, too.

MR. TOBIN: There is no doubt about that. Well he would not be a Liberal if he did not. - that an agreement was reached, Mr. Speaker, between the government of Newfoundland and Ottawa and was not signed.

MR. TOBIN: He would not permit the oil rigs to come into Placentia Bay and get hundreds of people back on the employment roll again. That is what the Liberal Opposition refers to as a great Canadian. The Federal Energy Minister (Mr. Chretien), Mr. Speaker, will not, the federal government will not, permit Newfoundlanders to be treated as equals in this country we call Canada. He will not permit us to be equal with the Canadians of Alberta, the Canadians of Saskatchewan, the Canadians of British Columbia, the Canadians of Manitoba. No, Mr. Speaker, the philosophy of the Federal Government of Canada is to keep Newfoundlanders down. That is the philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

Now, let us not kid ourselves.

The facts are clear that if today there existed in Ottawa a Federal Conservative Government, if, Mr. Speaker, there existed in Ottawa today a Federal NDP Government, we would have our say in the offshore. We, Mr. Speaker, would have our say in the offshore. The facts are clear, it is the Liberal Party of Canada, no other party, Mr. Speaker, not the Conservative Party, not the NDP Party, it is the Liberal Party of Canada, Mr. Speaker, aided and abetted by the fickle five in Ottawa representing Newfoundland, aided and abetted by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who has not got the courtesy to sit in this House, Mr. Speaker, and listen to what I have to say, because he knows full well that he is, that that man is, Mr. Speaker, as are all the members opposite, partly responsible that there is not an agreement in this Province today. It is not the Newfoundland Government, it is the encouragement, Mr. Speaker, that Ottawa has been receiving from the Liberal Party of Newfoundland. It is that type of encouragement that has kept these people going. That is why there is not an offshore agreement, Mr. Speaker, because the

MR. TOBIN: Liberal Party of Canada -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, let us face the facts. The facts are clear and the gentlemen opposite realize that, that the Conservative Government, the Conservative Party of Canada, and its leader, and all of the leadership candidates as I understand it, are willing to give Newfoundland its day in the sun, are willing to let Newfoundland participate, to control their offshore resources, Mr. Speaker. They are willing to do that. But no, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party of Canada, is not willing to do it.

MR. CALLAN: Is your time up yet?

MR. TOBIN: No, Mr. Speaker. My time is not up. I have five minutes to go. I am sure that the hon. gentlemen opposite wish my time was up.

Mr. Speaker, I can stand here in this House, as can forty-four members on this side, and say to the people of Newfoundland



MR. TOBIN: that the Conservative Party of Canada is willing to give to Newfoundland its say in the offshore oil and gas. Can the members opposite, Mr. Speaker, stand in this House today and say that the Liberal Party of Canada is willing to give to Newfoundlanders the same type of treatment that they have given to Alberta, that they have given to British Columbia?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward) A point of order. The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, there are not 14 members in the House.

MR. TOBIN: I have embarrassed you again.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Call in the members.

QUORUM CALL

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is a quorum present.

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

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

It is quite obvious, it is quite obvious that today I am hitting the nerves. That is four times, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that they have called a point of order to try and stifle me. They shall not succeed. Mr. Speaker, I have stated that I can stand in this hon. House, as can any of my colleagues on this side, and state quite categorically that the Federal Progressive Conservative Party will give to Newfoundlanders its control of the offshore oil and gas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. gentleman opposite, whoever takes the floor next, to stand

MR. TOBIN: in this House and say the same thing for the Liberal Party. Can the Liberal Party of Canada, will the Liberal Party of Canada, maybe I should say, will they give us the same rights, the same type of treatment that the Progressive Conservative Party, that the NDP Party of Canada is prepared to give us? No, Mr. Speaker, they will not and they cannot, because they know full well in Ottawa that if they want to shaft Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, no matter what they want to do with Newfoundlanders they have the full consent and the full support of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and that, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: - that is indeed sad. That is indeed sad, that there are people in this Province who are prepared to stand by, Mr. Speaker, those three great destroyers in Ottawa, namely - Lalonde, Trudeau and Chretien -

MR. SIMMS: A good point.

MR. TOBIN: - that there are people in this Province who are prepared to stand by these gentlemen and let them rot Newfoundlanders into the ground. Yes, Mr. Speaker, they have demonstrated that, it is unfortunate, it is sad, it is disappointing, but Mr. Speaker, when will they ever learn? When will they ever learn that we have as much right to be Canadians, with as much right as any other person in Canada? When will they recognize that, Mr. Speaker? When will they recognize that loyalty to their Federal Liberals, that loyalty to their Federal Party should never, Mr. Speaker, loyalty

MR. TOBIN:

to that federal Party should never exist, should never be put first and Newfoundlanders crushed to the ground.

Now, Mr. Speaker, will the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) or will the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) stand in this House and tell us where the Party stands? Because, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, Newfoundlanders must have a say in the offshore oil and gas development. We saw last Winter in this Province nothing but utter contempt, Mr. Speaker, for the people of Newfoundland, for the people of the Burin Peninsula, when the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) would not permit the oil rigs to come into Mortier Bay where people could once again be employed on repairs, would not permit the oil rigs to come into Mortier Bay, Mr. Speaker, and the Opposition walked into this House gloating in the fact, Mr. Speaker, that hundreds of Newfoundlanders were unemployed, gloated in the fact that they could not get employment again, gloated in the fact that Mortier Bay was being rejected by Mr. Chretien. What did Mr. Chretien say? What did he say, the man responsible, knew all the ice conditions, what did he say? He said, 'I am sorry, gentlemen, I do not know what the big fuss is about. The whole South Coast is completely covered with ice.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the man who made the decision on the lives of Newfoundlanders, that is the man who made the decision in this Province, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the member for Port au Port should really disassociate himself from his leader. We know, I know, Mr. Speaker, full well that the Leader of the Liberal Party in this Province is a contemptuous man with no regard for Newfoundlanders. The statements that he made in this hon. House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, proves beyond a shadow of

MR. TOBIN: a doubt the contempt that he  
has for Newfoundlanders.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Looking at the resolution

I am a little bit surprised that here it is May and  
we are standing up and still debating this when we had  
an election on this main issue that re-elected the Peckford  
administration and the offshore settlement would be  
finished. That is over a year ago, Mr. Speaker, and you  
would not know but it was still back in 1979, we  
are debating the same thing.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, how many times since 1979 has this administration changed its position, from total ownership to total control, and now to the position that the Liberal Party has always held, that there must be a negotiated settlement for the betterment of this part of Canada and for Canada as a whole.

MR. BAIRD: If Garfield had not (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, when members on the government side are speaking I do not interrupt them. I ask for the protection of the Chair and members on the other side to extend to me the same courtesy I show them.

MR. BAIRD : Asking the Premier if he would resign, what about that?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: Instead of interrupting me, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) should keep the points he wants to make until he gets up and takes part in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland has always stated that Newfoundland owns the resource and we should have maximum benefits of jobs, control and spinoffs from it. We have always said that. For whatever reason, the Premier, in a fit of stubbornness and on impulse, ended up submitting the issue to the Supreme Court. The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) tells us it was an irrational act and it should never have been put there, but it was put there. We could have withdrawn the case if we had wanted to, but the Premier kept it in the courts. His thinking, of course, was the same as that of the member for the West Coast who ended up saying, 'Stand up and be counted.' It was the Premier's belief that the three justices of the Appeal Court of this Province were going to stand up and be counted as Newfoundlanders, not as intellectuals,

MR. HISCOCK: and not as jurists, and that they would shirk responsibility and their oaths of office. But instead of going on an emotional binge with all this nonsense of standing up and being counted and saying, "I am a Newfoundlander" and pounding their chests, those jurists followed the rule of law, Mr. Speaker, and ruled in favour of the Nation.

The government has many times demanded to know what everybody's position is on this issue. I will state mine now once and for all - and you could not say this about a year ago without being called a traitor, and I will probably be called a traitor now by the government side - but I am not a Newfoundlander, I am a Canadian, and a proud Canadian at that, and I believe the Nation of Canada owns the offshore. I believe that the Nation of Canada, the second largest nation in the world and one of the richest, has the greatest potential of any nation in the world, but here we are, ten small provinces, fragmented and tearing at each other's throats.

MR. HISCOCK: We have the same thing going on in our own Province. The Premier is pitting bay against bay, inlet against inlet, town against town, cove against cove. The people of Cat Arm are saying that people from other parts should not be allowed to work on the hydro project there, people in St. John's are saying people from outside, the bays, cannot come in and work on the jobs here. And this is going on all throughout the Province, Mr. Speaker, because of greed and the lack of jobs. And that is basically what is happening in this country and the world as a whole. We are becoming so inward and looking at our navels that we are beginning to fail to realize that we are part of a greater whole. If we are going to contribute, if we are going to pull ourselves out of this economic mess and recession that we are in, we have to take a broader outlook, not the small, provincial outlook, Mr. Speaker, that we have in this Province and this country. But as a Canadian, I believe that because the resource is in this part of Canada, this part of Canada owns it. And not only owns it, but this part of Canada should have maximum say and control, the spinoffs and everything else, but not just because I am a Newfoundlander, just because I am in this Province, but because I am a Canadian. I want to see Alberta develop as rich as it possibly can and downtown Hamilton, Chicoutimi in Quebec, Bathurst in New Brunswick, and Cape Breton, I want to see those areas of Canada grow rich. I am not jealous of any area of Canada. And I say to the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) that this government has always continued to say that we are second-class to other areas of Canada.

MR. HISCOCK: I do not know how many other people in this Province feel that they are second-class to other people in Canada, but I for one feel that I am not second-class to anybody in this country. I am not the best, I am not any better or I am not any worse, but I also feel that we have a right to contribute to the greater good of our nation and to the world as a whole. I feel that this administration is very small and petty in its outlook. This administration is so small and petty in its outlook, it reminds me of the fable about the fox with a piece of meat in its mouth going over a bridge, and, looking downward, the reflection in the water magnified the image of the meat and the greedy fox, wanting what it thought was a bigger meal, let the meat drop from its mouth and lost everything. This government has done the same thing. Because of its pure greed we could end up losing everything. We could have had a better deal from the Conservative government when they were in power for nine months. No agreement was signed.



MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Clark gave a letter to the Premier of the day granting ownership and control, but in nine months nothing was done.

Now there is a leadership race for the national Conservative Party. Who, as Conservatives in this House, in this Province, are standing by the former Prime Minister? Who are on side with him? People in this House got up and said he was the only friend in Canada that Newfoundland and Labrador had. Who is supporting him now? Only the member, Mr. Jim McGrath, has the intestinal fortitude to stand by him.

And I will go as far as to say this, Mr. Speaker: It is okay for us to stand up for our native son, and I wish Mr. Crosbie well, I hope he wins, because I would like to see Mr. Crosbie as Prime Minister of Canada with Mr. Peckford as Premier of Newfoundland to see how they would settle the Northern cod, whether it would be Newfoundland stock or Canadian stock. I would also like to see them settle the economic problems here. If having the two of them means going on to greater things for Canada and Newfoundland, I would like for them to have the opportunity. But it may not happen, yet we put all our eggs in one basket. And I believe, and I predict here that the next Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party will be Mr. Joe Clark again, but only Mr. Jim McGrath has stood by him. And I tell you, I am not so sure that, after this leadership convention is over, Newfoundland and Labrador will have a friend in Mr. Clark.

With regard to the offshore, Mr. Speaker, I have always felt, as I said, that it belongs to the nation. I have always felt that the nation has the right to build up each area of the country and if we continue - -

MR. HISCOCK: to chip away at each area of the country and be mistrustful and greedy, then the end result, Mr. Speaker, is that we are never going to reach our potential, we will always be borrowing \$31 billion, we will have two or three million people unemployed, and what can one say about it?

MR. BUTT: Would you really like the Grand Banks to be called the Grand Banks of Ottawa?

MR. HISCOCK: The member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) asks if the Grand Banks of Newfoundland will be called the Grand Banks of Ottawa. All the oil drilling that took place and is taking place in Alberta has been done through tax credits at the expense of Canadian taxpayers - the people of Labrador, the people of Pouch Cove and all other areas of Canada, the taxpayers - who made it possible for companies to drill in the Beaufort Sea and in Alberta and off the Grand Banks and off the coast of Labrador.

The Newfoundland Government has not given any tax incentives whatsoever to these large international companies to go out and drill. If anything, they have made it very, very difficult. International oil

MR. HISCOCK: companies do not like dealing with this government here, and they particularly do not like dealing with Newfoundland businessmen. They feel Newfoundland businessmen are too greedy and their prices are marked up too much. The oil companies feel they are not getting a fair shake and that everybody here wants to become a millionaire or billionaire overnight. I caution the business community that if this practice continues of trying to reap too much too soon instead of looking at the long term, then a lot of these companies are going to find alternatives in other provinces.

So with regard to our own Province here, I hope that we will have development in such a way that we will not have to worry about closing down hospitals in North West River or closing down eye care units. One member who has been in the Cabinet and in the House of Assembly for quite a long time, I believe seventeen or eighteen years, is the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey).

MR. HICKEY: It is God's country.

MR. HISCOCK: God's country, I would totally agree. I would go as far as to say that Canada is God's country.

But with regard to realizing our potential God needs a little helping hand, a little bit of direction. But I would say that when the widows and the unwed mothers and the young men whose unemployment insurance has run out go to the Minister of Social Services, the answer that it is God's country is not good enough. His department and social workers are now saying, 'Go West' to the young able-bodied men whose unemployment insurance has run out, and who cannot find work and want social assistance to tide them over for a couple of months until they can get some work, they are not given any help whatsoever, they are not even given a one-way ticket. This was the government, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HISCOCK: that when it came in 1979 said it would create 40,000 jobs in a few years. Now they are telling our young, unwed mothers, some of who are going to school, trying to put their lives back in order and build a future, 'Move in with your parents,' rather than supply them with their own living accommodations. Over in Corner Brook they formed a group of ten to lobby the minister and the end result was that seven or eight of them ended up getting their own apartments. I would like to know if that is also being extended to other people.

MR. HICKEY: (Inaudible) for me?

MR. HISCOCK: It was on CBC, if one were listening, a couple of nights ago. I will get that for you.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) ended up saying that when we entered Confederation certain departments of what had been the Newfoundland public service became federal responsibilities - Defence, Communications, etc. - and others became provincial responsibilities - Health, Education, Forestry.

Health: Fifty cents of every Health dollar is paid by people from Alberta, Quebec, British Columbia, Ontario, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, fifty per cent of the cost of all hospital services are financed by other Canadians because that is the concept of Canada. And with regard to post-secondary education, Mr. Speaker, for example, the offshore training programme, all this has to take place under the federal Department of Manpower. The Newfoundland Constabulary, for example, the training programme there, is financed by Manpower. And I could go on and on and on, Mr. Speaker. With regard to education, that is purely a provincial responsibility. And, of course, we know, and Corner Brook knows better than anybody else, that forestry is a provincial responsibility. But what about the \$50 million that was signed to improve and upgrade the forest industry and also \$100 million available to the Corner Brook mill to modernize if they want it? It is there, willing and waiting.

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the idea that certain responsibilities are provincial and others purely federal, I am glad we live in a country where other Canadians turn around and say, "It does not matter where you come from if you want help. It does not matter what social or economic strata you come from if you want to go on to university."

MR. HISCOCK:

I am also proud that we have a country that puts emphasis on its natural resources. But we have here, Mr. Speaker, a government that is pitting bay against bay, cove against cove, inlet against inlet, and town against town. That is what is going on.

A young university student from Conception Bay South wanted a job for the Summer, but he knew it was useless to try to come to get a job, say, in Holyrood or Gander or Grand Falls or Labrador City or Wabush

MR. HISCOCK: or Baie Verte because of the high unemployment. If you cannot get a job in your own area then it is useless for you to go look in other areas. That is how this government has Balkanized our Province under preferential hiring and that.

MR. BAIRD: Balkanized?

MR. HISCOCK: Balkanized, yes.

I would like to end up by discussing what our government has done in the past couple of years with regard to education. We brought in Grade XII but where are the extra classrooms? Where are the home economic rooms? Where are the computers? Where are the industrial art rooms? Where are the libraries? Where are the science rooms? The schools are going to find out now that they will have to take their libraries and use them as classrooms. They will probably have to take their staff rooms and use them as classrooms. We are finding out also with regard to this that we brought in Grade XII but we have not provided suitable financial support. Instead we are building another Confederation Building. We are building arts and culture centres and we are building prisons, that is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. We should take the money for the new Confederation Building and build a convention centre next to the Newfoundland Hotel, and the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) should be the champion for that. What are we doing to mark the 400th anniversary of Sir Humphrey Gilbert claiming Newfoundland for the British Empire? Sending a bus across the country! It will probably arrive in Montreal on Saturday and attract about twenty-three people, and then on to Ottawa to attract another thirty or forty people. That is the planning, Mr. Speaker, that we are getting. Observation of the 400th anniversary, as far as I am concerned - and some of my colleagues disagree with me on this - should have been one massive publicity campaign

MR. HISCOCK: with the help of the federal government. For example, next year will be the 400th or 500th anniversary of Cartier in Quebec. What did they do there? Private businessmen - not the government, but private businessmen - realized the tourist potential throughout the world of the event. What did they do? They ended up forming a corporation to look after that. And what did we do? We ended up sending a bus across the country, Mr. Speaker, and even that was not planned very well.

Mr. Speaker, what a government! They are closing down hospitals. They promised 40,000 new jobs but there has been no job creation whatsoever. Our young people are told 'Go West,' but they are not even given a one-way ticket.

MR. TOBIN: Would the hon. member accept a one-way ticket?

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the other part, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) referred to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary)



MR. HISCOCK: referring to derelicts and that. What are we doing for the poor? What are we doing in this Province? The end result, Mr. Speaker, is we are putting it on the backs of the aged, of the youth, of the unemployed in this Province. That is what we are doing. We are building a new Confederation Building and Arts and Cultures Centres instead of taking that money and building a convention complex next to the Newfoundland Hotel to accommodate about 5,000 or 6,000 people and then, as Canadians, say to the rest of Canada - the Canadian Legion, the Shriners, the Lion's Club, the Canadian Medical Association and the Canadian whatever - with regard to national organizations, rotate the annual conventions so that once every ten years you come back to St. John's, and that would bring in new dollars, Mr. speaker. But no, we are putting it into a new Confederation Building instead of spending it on a convention centre which would be a boom for the downtown business people who need this project. There was a projection that Hibernia was going to be developed and that was when the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) ended up saying that there would be 40,000 new jobs. There was a belief that we would not only create 40,000 jobs but we would surpass it. And that was the reason why the Confederation Annex was brought into being. But is this government going to show common sense and say, 'No, we will freeze that', and put the money into opening up Ramea or putting it into Grand Bank or Gaultois or Fermeuse? No, they are turning it over and saying, 'Here, Fickle Five, you are the federal MPs looking after that. Let the federal government look after it.'

And with regard to the offshore, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that is going to be fought in the next election. When the Premier called the election

MR. HISCOCK: a year ago he knew that they would not have an agreement and he knew also that he was going to fight this in the next election. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, we are fighting this on the backs of the poor, that our younger people have lost their dream, that the great white hope, Mr. Peckford, his dream has turned to dust. Now they young people are being told to move in with their parents and to move our West. This is what is done. And as I said, Mr. speaker, I will go as far as to say thank God we have a Liberal government in Ottawa that is a compassionate government, that did not fight this recession on the backs of the poor, did not cut back, as Reaganomics did or the Thatcher government, but kept our social policies in place. Thank God we have that compassionate Liberal government that during the 1970s saw more people employed than any industrial nation in the Western world.

With regard to that, Mr. Speaker, in my closing remarks I will go as far as to say that as a result of that compassionate government we are going to see a fair and generous deal offered to the people of this Province. And it will be offered and put in

MR. HISCOCK: place long before the next federal election and this government will be no part of it because they do not want to be part of it. So, therefore, in concluding, I support that both sides should -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!  
The Hon. member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I am losing my patience at the hon. gentleman courting the truth for the last half hour about the people being told to, 'Go West,' and 'Move in with your parents,' and all of that. I have asked him to produce one case where any of my social workers have told somebody that and he is not going to be able to. Would he turn on another tape because it is getting a bit monotonous here.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the minister seems a little testy there today.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, that is a cop-out all the time, 'I am testy.'

MR. HODDER: In actual fact, I say to the minister, his offices across the Province are inadequately staffed, his social workers are overloaded and do not have the time, they cannot even use mileage any more and can only travel on certain days of the week, while other departments public cars are used for private use in His department is in shambles, so when anybody criticizes the minister he tends to be a little testy. In actual fact, he is presiding over a department which is crucifying the poor of Newfoundland, particularly in a time of economic restraint and hardship as we have right now.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order that was raised by the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Hodder).

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!  
To that point of order, the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: He was not speaking to the point of order I raised, he did not even address it. Now, the hon. gentleman says I am crucifying the poor now. I can only submit, Your Honour, there is no point of order as raised by the hon. gentleman at all. He might deal with the one I raised.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, if I had been allowed to continue I would have been finished now. I will go so far as to say that I will get the information for the minister. With regard to that, I would ask the minister why is he closing the Social Services headquarters on Harvey Road and opening three other offices? The reason we have three offices is to avoid a line up on Harvey Road. He does not want people to know the truth about the terrible shape of the economy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): point of order, I rule there is no point of order and I have to inform the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

The hon. Minister of Culture,  
Recreation and Youth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I was impressed at the beginning of this debate when my friend the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) started the debate at a very high level, and that was continued of course by our colleague and friend from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) who kept to the topic, the resolution as outlined on the Order Paper, but then we heard from the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and just most recently the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and what we heard was nothing but irrelevancy. The member for Eagle River was extremely boring, ah ahead his way through twenty minutes of nothing, absolute trash, garbage, nothing to do with the resolution whatsoever.

MR. CARTER: At least it was better than the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

MR. SIMMS: And then the member for Torngat Mountains, of course, lo and behold, surprise, surprise, moves a totally unnecessary amendment to the resolution, which was addressed by our colleague from Burin-Placentia West, in essence the amendment proposed by the member for Torngat Mountains is totally the same as the resolution, totally unnecessary but the implication in the amendment of course is that the provincial government is as responsible as the federal government in not getting an offshore agreement. Then he went on to say of course that the resolution, the reason he amended it was because the resolution, "leans on political

MR. SIMMS: lines" to quote his words.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is high time for the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and his colleagues across the way, to realize and recognize that this is a political problem. We are being driven into the ground and there are numerous and hundreds of examples by the political party in power in Ottawa. Now hon. members opposite are well aware of it. The member for Torngat Mountains says we are asking for an agreement. Well that, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you is exactly what my colleague, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) had achieved with his discussions with Mr. Chretien, we had an agreement. So we are not looking for an agreement, we had an agreement. All we are asking is that the federal party live up to it and deliver it.

The member said that our resolution is much too political, but yet he went on then for twenty minutes, Mr. Speaker, to put forth once again, as they are well known for doing, the federal government position. He spent ten minutes of his time quoting Mr. Chretien's position. I asked him if he had read the letter that Mr. Marshall had written, he said no, he tore that up.

MR. HISCOCK: Who?

MR. SIMMS: Your friend from Torngat Mountains. He talked about how this thing is too political, this resolution was too political. But he went on to put forth the opinions of the federal government exactly as what he was arguing we were trying to do. So I suppose now that that is not being political, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: It is support for his own party too.

MR. SIMMS: Yes. In any event, what he had to say was really only worth ignoring, nothing else, because it is simply another example of the party opposite extolling the virtues of their friends and colleagues in power in Ottawa, the federal Liberal Party, rather than speaking on behalf of the people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: I want to speak briefly, Mr. Speaker, in this debate and just make a few comments about the impasse associated with the issue as outlined in the resolution. The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), I believe, has very ably presented the resolution and put forth, in expert fashion, I suggest, good arguments associating the detail and history with our case. And, my colleague, as I said, from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was also very eloquent. The hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) even, would have to agree with that.

In doing some research, Mr. Speaker, preparing for commentary on the resolution, it is interesting to note and to read some of the observations from independent observers and writers about what exactly is happening here. As an example, I suggest to my friends opposite that they should have a look at some of the editorials that are being written in Canadian newspapers all across this country. There was one, in particular, in The Globe and Mail recently, which pointed out the fact that because we have not given in, we are being punished by Ottawa. I would like to just quote

MR. SIMMS:                   briefly to give you an idea of what is being said: "The real needs of Canadians seem at times to take a back seat to the political needs of the federal government." They talk about the Province having a major deficit, high unemployment, high sales taxes and everything else and obviously, they point out, because of that, Newfoundland surely needs a great deal of federal help, more than any other province.

                                  They go on to say, "Secondly, Canada has a large surplus of natural gas but still must import oil. Its best hope for the domestic oil it needs lies in the Hibernia field off Newfoundland. So Ottawa pours out its good things upon Nova Scotia but because Premier Brian Peckford of Newfoundland, unlike Nova Scotia, has chosen to fight Ottawa, he is determined to keep at least equal control with Ottawa over the offshore resources while Ottawa is determined to get full control."

                                  "In the meantime," it goes on to say, "Ottawa pats the fawning dog, Nova Scotia and kicks the barking dog, Newfoundland and also, incidentally, kicks Canada,



MR. SIMMS: which needs oil much more than it needs natural gas. Another independent writer, Mr. Speaker, living in Nova Scotia, a Mr. Surette, he wrote an editorial in November of 1982 that Premier Peckford is justified in his resistance over this particular issue. He said and I quote, "Ottawa wants to impose an unfair settlement on Newfoundland and is trying to do it at least partially for rather despicable reasons". And he says, "That reason is because Prime Minister Trudeau does not like Mr. Peckford and he wants to see him squirm even if it means making all of Newfoundland squirm". Well, Mr. Speaker, that sounds to me like a very familiar charge that I have heard many of my own constituents make. And I suggest that the writer is expressing the suspicions and sentiments of many.

I think it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to perhaps run through the resolution to see where the people opposite disagree and why they proposed an amendment to delete all the WHEREASES:

WHEREAS Newfoundland has a moral and historic claim to the resources on our Continental Shelf. Well, Mr. Speaker, who can disagree with that? That is a fact.

AND WHEREAS it is an undeniable fact that Newfoundland brought those resources into Canada upon its entry into Confederation. Well, who can disagree with that? That is a fact.

AND WHEREAS we entered into negotiations on the verbal understanding that the federal government was willing to consider an offshore agreement for Newfoundland which would be better than the Nova Scotia agreement. That too is a fact, Mr. Speaker. Otherwise why did they bother in the first place? They are obligated to give us a deal as well

MR. SIMMS: as they gave to Nova Scotia.

AND WHEREAS the federal government has adopted the unacceptable position that Newfoundland must accept an agreement that is no better than and in some respects worse than the Nova Scotia agreement. Well, Mr. Speaker, these differences were clearly spelled out time and time again publicly by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

AND WHEREAS the clear and public position of Newfoundland is that this Province must share in a meaningful way the management responsibility and the revenues associated with offshore resources. This, I think, can be evidenced by the overwhelming mandate given this government a little over a year ago to negotiate, a mandate to negotiate, not a mandate to capitulate.

AND WHEREAS sound and economic justice and the change for Newfoundland to become an equal province in Canada dictates that the position of the federal government is morally wrong and unacceptable to the vast majority of the people of this Province. Well, there certainly cannot be anybody who would dispute that, Mr. Speaker, if they would look at it objectively and read all the information that has been made available.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House demands that the Government of Canada enter into an agreement with this Province, such that our moral and historic claims with respect to the sharing of offshore management and revenues are recognized. Well, I cannot see for the life of me, Mr. Speaker,

MR. SIMMS: speak against this resolution let alone vote against it. And I suggest to you that the amendment put forth by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is folly, not necessary and just put there to try and throw everybody on this side off track.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SIMMS: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the resolution has clear and factual whereases unlike the last resolution put forth by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) a couple of weeks ago.

I think it is important, first of all, to recognize that the federal government on this issue in particular speaks out of both sides of its mouth. Mr. Chretien told us one thing but when he was asked to put his position in writing he would not or, better still, he could not because his friends Mr. LaLonde and company obviously muzzled him. They felt that he had gone too far. We only need to analyze the facts and the background associated with this issue, Mr. Speaker, because while the federal government have tried to convince us publicly that they favour joint management it is a well known fact that they have always insisted that they have the final say in management. So obviously, the federal government is fearful of us having a real say. In any event, Mr. Speaker, in a very responsible manner and to try to settle their minds on that particular issue the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) during his meetings with Mr. Chretien proposed that they, the federal government, set the pace of development keeping their own self-sufficiency goals in mind and that we, as a Province, be allowed to decide how the development would take place keeping our goals in mind of jobs and business opportunities for our people. And certainly that was a very reasonable

MR. SIMMS: and responsible proposal. How can anyone criticize that position, Mr. Speaker? How can that proposal be unacceptable? Why cannot that proposal be confirmed in writing as it had been verbally?

With respect to our position on revenue it is well known, 75 per cent until the trigger point is reached. Indeed, Mr. Chretien's own public comments gave the impressions to all and sundry that a deal was near. Everyone, I think, can recall his comments at the time. He felt that our proposals formed the basis of a good deal, one that would be good for our Province and therefore good for Canada. So what happened? He started to back off, Mr. Speaker, that is what happened especially when we asked for something in writing. And that is when he refused because his colleagues got word of what he was doing and pressured him to back off. That is why they refused to put their own verbal promises in writing to us. So then it became obvious that we were getting nowhere, Mr. Speaker, in our discussions.

It appears now that it was simply a delaying tactic, that is all it was or else of course, he did not have the authority or the mandate or the power to really negotiate a deal. He was just doing it to save some time until the court decision came down of which they heard a rumour might be going their way. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, why would they not respond to our verbal agreement? I think

MR. SIMMS: my colleague from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) put it best when he said that all we are look for is some assurances and understanding of the verbal agreement that had been reached by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and the federal Minister of Mines and Energy. Not something that is hard and fast necessarily but at least an understanding that the verbal agreement they reached themselves throughout their discussions were accurate ones.

Mr. Speaker, these are the facts and they have been very well put publicly by a number of people. But, of course, with the amendment put forth by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) obviously the Opposition are attempting to try to put us at full blame for this particular matter. They are very anxious to see us agree immediately to an agreement for the short-term benefits, similiar to their now infamous agreement on the Upper Churchill. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to sell out. We want a long-term agreement, Mr. Speaker, that is going to benefit our people for years to come.

Mr. Speaker, both governments I believe have always maintained that an agreement will be necessary irregardless of the legal outcome. There is no question, we brought the offshore into Canada. Nobody can dispute that. We have a moral right to share in the management and certainly in the benefits. Nobody can dispute that. We have to insist, Mr. Speaker, on a good deal for our people because to do less would be acting irresponsibly on behalf of our constituents.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that we did have an agreement in principle but the federal officials then refused to follow Mr.

MR. SIMMS: Chretien's position. That is well known. So under the normal circumstances we did the normal thing. We merely asked Mr. Chretien to put his verbal promises in writing and to clarify our understandings of the discussions that were held. What is wrong with that, Mr. Speaker? Nothing, I suggest. What else could one do under the circumstances?

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that our people and the public of the Province should be fully aware of all aspects of this important issue and what has transpired to date in this particular dispute. The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) recently wrote all the community leaders around the Province, outlining very clearly what had transpired throughout the course of the discussions. And I believe that anybody who takes the time to read this letter will realize just how responsible and reasonable the government has been.

MR. NEARY: What hogwash!

MR. SIMMS: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wanted to hear hogwash he should have been here earlier when his own colleagues were speaking.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we as a Province and as a people must be firm and stand firm in our resolve to get a good deal

MR. SIMMS: for our people. We cannot allow ourselves to be weakened by those few who are simply trying to further their own individual political aims like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in particular. To those who say, 'Let's negotiate', I say, 'What should we negotiate?'. Tell us where we should back off from the position that has been made public, from the position described publicly in writing to Mr. Chretien back in January, which was agreed to, Mr. Speaker, in principle by him. To those who insist that we should sign an agreement now regardless of the facts, I say, should we sign an agreement, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of an agreement no matter what the cost and forget our future? Never, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to you, never.

So our position, Mr. Speaker, is therefore quite clear. The government is ready and willing to negotiate at any time as soon as the federal government puts its earlier verbal positions in writing to us. That is quite reasonable. You cannot have a verbal offshore agreement, Mr. Speaker, it must be in writing. And if the federal government refuses that very reasonable request, Mr. Speaker, then it is obvious to anyone, even the Leader of the Opposition, that they are not serious about this matter, that indeed they are playing political games with us and with the people of this Province.

So I conclude, Mr. Speaker. We will let the Leader of the Opposition speak next and see what he has to say, see if he can add anything to it.

MR. CALLAN:

He does not know enough about it.

MR. SIMMS:

You can say that again, he does

MR. SIMMS: not know enough about it.

I want to conclude, Mr.

Speaker, by simply stating that we, as a Province and as a people and as a government, are ready willing and able to negotiate as soon as Mr. Chretien and his federal Liberal Party get serious and stop playing games with the people of this Province and put his verbal promises to us in writing. That is clearly the position of this Province and this government, Mr. Speaker. And the members opposite can try to say whatever they want because obviously the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has spoken for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). He has told us that the Leader of the Opposition will not speak in the debate because he does not know enough about it.

MR. NEARY: Have you (inaudible)?

MR. SIMMS: Yes, I have. The hon.

Leader of the Opposition should be very, very careful. He should be very, very careful because he knows and I know that the members of the tourist industry in the Province are very supportive of the promotion that we are putting forth, very supportive. The hon. Leader of the Opposition knows that. And, Mr. Speaker, for the modest amount of money we have spent on that promotion I think it is going to pay great dividends. In any event, it just goes to show, Mr. Speaker, how they talk out of both sides of their mouths. One day they will criticize us for not doing anything to promote tourism and when you do they will turn around and criticize you for doing it.



MR. SIMMS: Now, if that is not speaking out of both sides of your mouth nothing is. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. MCNICHOLAS): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the member who just sat down, the minister who just sat down, did not even know enough about this topic to use up his twenty minutes. I think he went about ten or perhaps fifteen.

DR. COLLINS: No, he went (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Well, anyway the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) no doubt knows exactly because he is a great man with figures. He saved \$20 million over the last three weeks. And the teachers he knows would still be out of the classrooms if the federal government had decided to give the teachers UIC benefits because practically at every turn what this government is doing is trying to throw people on the roles of the Ottawa UIC or Disability, Canada Pension or Old Age Pension or whatever.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) introduced an amendment to the resolution proposed by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach). And the reason for doing that was obvious, Mr. Speaker, because the member for Carbonear in his resolution - I do not think for a moment that the member for Carbonear wrote, I do not know who wrote it but, I do not think it was written by the member for Carbonear and I was a little bit surprised that it appeared on the Order Paper under his name. You know, I do not think the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), would

MR. CALLAN: mind letting his name go affixed to the resolution. But the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) who was very, very weak in his presentation, in support of the resolution that bore his name, I am sure that he realized as he spoke how silly and foolish his resolution was. You know, how can you expect to win anything on moral and historic rights. I mean, the three Supreme Court judges, Mr. Speaker, have already ruled and, of course, they ruled obviously on the only reasonable and rational way that anybody can make a ruling, along legal arguments.

Now, in 1981 in the Spring by-election in Bellevue which I won by 693 or 694 votes

MR. CALLAN: the Premier was on the airwaves that night or the next morning saying that he and his party had won a moral victory. Well, Mr. Speaker, you know what good did it do the Tory Party and what good did it do the government to win a moral victory? The fact of the matter is that the P.C. candidate was defeated and whether it was moral or immoral or sinful or not had nothing to do with it. It is a silly argument and we have the same word used here in this resolution by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), 'on moral, because we have a moral right to the offshore. What silly nonsense! And we have an historic right, we have an historic and a moral right. Nothing based on fact. Nothing based on legalities. Nothing based on anything that would stand up, you know, in negotiations or in a court case or anywhere else. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, no doubt that when the Supreme Court judges of Canada when they make their ruling, whenever it comes, there is little doubt in the minds of anybody who knows anything about legalities and legal arguments that the decision will concur with the decision handed down by our Supreme Court judges here in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the member who just took his seat referred to headlines or referred to editorials - I am sorry - from mainland papers where some editor of some Tory paper on the mainland was supporting the Premier in his fight against Ottawa. It is quite easy, of course, it is just as easy, a lot easier I would say to pick up newspapers which contain editorials damning and condemning the Premier for his status.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote from this paper here and I have raised this point before and I have also made the statement before that I do not think

MR. CALLAN:                               that the Premier and his Cabinet, the members of his government, I do not believe that they want an agreement at this point in time. That is why we do not have one, because they do not want one and they did not want one when the Tories were in Ottawa. Let us look at it: "Federal Tories upset at Peckford". I am going back, Mr. Speaker, to November of 1980. It says here, by George Bain, "On the cover of the Current Atlantic Insight - and this is a very interesting little item, Mr. Speaker - "there is a picture of Newfoundland Premier Brian Peckford natty in what looks like a blue blazer and a faintly violet coloured turtleneck.

MR. CALLAN: But here is the important part, and we have all seen this Atlantic Insight I am sure: "He is holding out a beaker of oil as if about to offer a toast and drink it which, if they were not exercising restraint on the matter of Brian Peckford these days, some federal Tories would tell him to do it, beaker and all, not just drink the oil but swallow the beaker and all.

Since their disappointment on February 18th. the Tories have managed to avoid backbiting in public and it would be Joe Clark's managerial style to try to keep it that way. But underneath there is a little quiet seething going on about Peckford because he did not help them in that election and, of course, they returned only two Tories in that election. And the same two Tories, Mr. Speaker, were federal Cabinet ministers under Joe Clark. And the article goes on which I will not bother to read it but it goes on to say that it was the federal Tories who substantially helped Peckford to win the June, 1979 election. Obviously! We had John Crosbie as Minister of Finance down here and we had Jim McGrath as Minister of Fisheries down here campaigning- the fish and chips boys - campaigning to help the Premier win that June 18, 1979 election. They gave him moral support which the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) talks about in his resolution and they also gave their material support it says here. He could have no complaint, Premier Peckford could have no complaint that the Province was underrepresented in the Cabinet of Joe Clark, not with one of the two Tory MPs from Newfoundland, the Minister of Finance and the other Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CALLAN: So that is the kind of article, Mr. Speaker, that you can also read and it is a mainland writer which is the kind of writer that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) quoted when he was trying to drum up support for the Premier's stand. Of course, here in this Province also we have articles that were written way back in 1979, in November, about six months after the Premier won his election, talking about the same thing, the fact that the Premier could not get along with anybody.

Mr. Speaker, last night I attended a function in my district, a cadet inspection, but there were a number of school teachers there. There were a number of school teachers who attended this function and they were telling me about the report card, the Premier's report card. The teachers are going to have to wait perhaps another couple of months before they prepare their report cards for their students around the Province but they have a report card already prepared for the Premier.

MR. CALLAN: He failed. The Premier failed in every subject. In every subject the Premier failed. And one of the subjects that he failed in, Mr. Speaker, is the very topic that we are on here now. He failed to negotiate a deal with Ottawa. He failed on more than one occasion. The only member in the P.C. caucus, Mr. Speaker, who won and would probably win more still in the future regarding offshore negotiations was the member who resigned from the Premier's Cabinet, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). He was the only member who won. He was not allowed to negotiate the way he wanted to and rather than negotiate the way the Premier wanted him to he resigned.

MR. NEARY: Packed it in.

MR. CALLAN: He packed it in. And, of course, we had two successive Ministers of Energy federally. We had the present Minister of Finance, Marc Lalonde and we had, of course, Jean Chretien who tried desperately to work out an offshore oil agreement with this Province, not only with the member for Mount Scio, the former Minister of Energy, not only with him, but with the member for - I got his seat mixed up last time, it is not St. John's South, it is St. John's East (Mr. Marshall). Yes, St. John's East. I do not know why we are not allowed to use names here because it is a lot simpler to say Mr. Marshall or whatever.

MR. SIMMS: Parliamentary tradition, boy.

MR. NEARY: That is right. But a lot of parliamentary traditions in this House are going down the drain.

MR. CALLAN: Yes that is right. A lot of parliamentary traditions are being eroded every day.

MR. NEARY: Look at the answer to my question yesterday.

MR. CALLAN: That is right. It was pathetic.

Mr. Speaker, let me quote another article. Let me quote another editorial. And, Mr. Speaker, this editorial was not written last Fall or last week or last month. This will give you an example, Mr. Speaker, of the kind of insight that the people in the district of Bellevue had when they went to the polls last Spring. It will show you that they were not conned, Mr. Speaker. Here is a gentleman from the district of Bellevue and here is what this gentleman says in an editorial: "Crusader Rabbit alias Young Alfie still wafts hither and yon with his boots three feet off the floor. The Peckford crowd reels with as much manic energy as ever but the focus has shifted.



MR. CALLAN: This is back in September of 1981, Mr. Speaker, long before last Spring's general election when the people in Bellevue were not conned.

MR. SIMMS: Who are you quoting?

MR. CALLAN: I will table it.

Mr. Speaker, the minister of course did not say who he was quoting and he did not table it either.

MR. SIMMS: Oh yes I did.

MR. NEARY: No you are not.

MR. SIMMS: Yes I did, yes I said who wrote it.

MR. CALLAN: Nothing miraculous in that.

They have shifted their ground. Here it is, here is what he says about the Premier and his team. "It is a basic political operation. When the goodies present or prophesized are on the go it is the chief business of the government, this government, to make sure it gets all the credit. But when there are showers of nasties the government, this government, ruptures itself to place the blame elsewhere. Until a few months ago everything in the garden was so rosy that Young Alfie would have us believe that his greatest struggle was to keep a damper on the joyous delirium sweeping over Newfoundland. Did not want the economy overheated. Ottawa had been put in its place, the oil companies brought to heel, care banished, prosperity restored and a white she cow in every pot. Aw, shucks, boys, he did not actually do it all with his own hands but golly gee, boys, it was some nice of us true blue ranting and roaring good old Newfoundlanders to think that the Premier had done it all himself.

"Lately of course - this is back in September of 1981 but it is truer today than

MR. CALLAN: ever before - lately, of course, the oil fields that had been practically guaranteed to make us as rich as whatever seem to have stepped back over the 200 mile limit. The oil fields seem to have stepped back over the 200 mile limit. But anyone who was layed off lately or who has never been able to get a job here in this life or whose bills for food and shelter have eaten him out of house and home must not expect anything of Mr. Peckford and his boys."

DR. COLLINS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!  
The hon. Minister of Finance on a point of order.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have been very quiet and we have been very kind to the Opposition but I would like to raise a point of order. This relates to Beauchesne, section 332, Page 117 on the Fifth Edition, and it reads as follows:

"On March 17, 1933, a Member quoting a newspaper in debate was ruled out of order by the Deputy Speaker who said: "The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the House, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order, because Members are here to give their own opinions and not to quote the opinions of others", and it goes on. But anyway, Beauchesne is quite clear on that and the hon. member is clearly out of order.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order,

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the instant expert on the rules did not stand in his place when his own colleague was quoting from a newspaper. Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know my colleague is completely in order. He is not reading the - he is just -

MR. SIMMS: No he is not!

MR. NEARY: No he is not. He is just mentioning the fact that this is what so and so said, I agree with him or I disagree with him. He is expressing his own opinion. Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. This comes out of the hon. gentleman's time and that is precisely what the minister was trying to do. He was trying to use up some time on my hon. colleague who was making some very valid points, Mr. Speaker.

The tradition in this House, as you know, Your Honour, is to allow members to quote from newspapers. That has been allowed. That is the tradition. There are all kinds of precedents for it including a former Speaker who only about a half an hour ago spent twenty minutes quoting from newspapers and reading from magazine articles and quoting from newspaper clippings. And I am sure that that hon. gentleman knows the rules of the House. At least he should.

DR. COLLINS: Well if you have not got enough sense to rise on a point of order, that is not our fault.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order. We know what - I beg your pardon?

DR. COLLINS: I was sure he was finished.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is finished when we hear about people going off unemployment insurance, single, able-bodied people who cannot get welfare and unmarried mothers out in Corner Brook had to gang up

MR. NEARY: on the Minister of Education  
(Ms. Verge) to get the hon. gentleman to move.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Put the pressure on the  
hon. gentleman. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit there is  
no point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure my  
colleague would like to adjourn the debate because it is  
six o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
I will reserve ruling on  
that point of order.

It being six o'clock,  
Wednesday, this House now stands adjourned until tomorrow  
Thursday at three of the clock.

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 4, 1983

Tabled 4 May '83

ORDER OF THE DAY 6/83 - Tuesday, March 15, 1983

QUESTION 22: Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A list of consultants paid for services in the fiscal years 1980-81, 1981-82, 1982-83 and the Departments they were contracted to.

ANSWER: The information provided will concern only those consultants hired by the Department of Finance for work performed in and on behalf of the Department. The Department of Finance does not hire consultants for assignment to other departments. This information would be available from either Treasury Board or from individual departments.

- 1980-81 - Wm. Mercer Ltd. contracted to provide administrative services in connection with Government's Pension Program.
- Peat, Marwick & Mitchell contracted to examine the books and records of Javelin and report to Government in connection with the acquisition by the Province of the Stephenville Linerboard Mill. As a result of the report, Government made a payment to Javelin while refusing to accept certain other expenditures. The final determination of the acquisition price has been referred to arbitration and hearings are still continuing.
  - Dick Consulting Services, Toronto contracted to assist Government in the presentation of evidence on certain matters in dispute and also to appear as witness in connection with the Linerboard Mill at Stephenville.
- 1981-82 - Price Waterhouse & Co. contracted in connection with a study of mining taxation which was being conducted by the Department of Finance and the Department of Mines and Energy.
- Wm. Mercer Ltd. contracted to provide administrative services in connection with Government's Pension Program.

- 
- 1981-82 - Peat, Marwick & Mitchell continuation of services outlined in 1980-81 re: arbitration
  - Dick Consulting Services, continuation of services outlined in 1980-81 re: arbitration
  - John A. Murphy & Associates, Montreal contracted in connection with arbitration of Linerboard.
- 
- 1982-83 - Wm. Mercer Ltd. contracted to provide administrative services in connection with Government's Pension Program.
  - Peat, Marwick & Michell continuation of services outlined in 1980-81 re: arbitration.