

VOL. 3

NO. 41

THIRD SESSION OF THE  
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.  
FRIDAY, MAY 18, 1984

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have what the government considers to be an important and serious statement concerning the present status of the Upper Churchill negotiations with the Province of Quebec.

Determination of the Upper Churchill question by negotiation always has been and remains the preferred means of resolution of that issue by this government, and let there be no doubt about that, Mr. Speaker. Since the mid-1970s Newfoundland has attempted to accomplish a negotiated settlement. All these attempts failed because, while Quebec was willing to discuss other hydrodevelopments in Labrador, it resolutely refused to address itself to the Upper Churchill contract and the inequities flowing from it. Nevertheless Newfoundland continued to indicate its desire to sit down with representatives of Quebec and to seek an amiable resolution. Faced with the apparent firm position of Quebec's refusal to address the Upper Churchill contract, this Province was left with no alternative but to explore other means of mitigating the effect of that contract upon Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. The recall and reversion cases represented our main attempts to achieve this. Regardless of our being forced to the court route, we never abandoned our attempt to get Quebec to discuss a revision of the Upper Churchill contract. Consequently we were very pleased last Summer to note in private communications during various intergovernmental meetings that Quebec

MR. MARSHALL: appeared more amenable to discussing the issues, including Upper Churchill. We tended to attribute this to the uncertainties which Quebec may have then felt regarding the outcomes of the revision case and our opposition before the National Energy Board to their power export. Whatever the reasons, Mr. Speaker, for Quebec's apparant changed attitude, we were encouraged and decided to explore this new atmosphere in order to determine the extent of that change and to assess whether in fact the basis for realistic negotiations might exist.

It was for these purposes that Cabinet authorized me to seek a meeting with the hon. Yves Duhaime, Quebec's Minister of Energy. That meeting was held in Montreal on August 16, 1983. The first objective of that meeting, Mr. Speaker, was to determine if Quebec was really prepared to discuss the Upper Churchill contract where it had not been prepared to do so in the past.

It was made clear to Mr. Duhaime that we were interested in mil rate increases to provide a fairer return to Newfoundland from rentals and royalties, to ensure a fair return to shareholders of CFLCo, and to ensure the long-term fiscal stability of that corporation. We also expressed interest in dicussing access to power from the Churchill River, reduction of the sixty-five year term and other items pertaining to the Upper Churchill.

We secured agreement that Churchill Falls contract elements would be dealt with first and received assurances that Quebec intended to deal with them in a meaningful manner. It was understood we would not be placed in the position of finding ourselves addressing token changes. Regretfully, as can be seen later in this statement, after seven months we found ourselves in fact receiving a Quebec proposal

MR. MARSHALL:                    which any fair and objective appraisal could only describe as amounting to no more than a token gesture.

At the same time that we were receiving these assurances from Quebec, Mr. Speaker, we realized if there was to be a way out of this impasse Quebec would need assurances from us that there would be an appreciation of the contribution Quebec has always maintained it has made to the project. Therefore it was agreed that negotiations would proceed with the aim of striking an agreement that would represent a recognition of the significant contribution and risk which were brought to bear on the Churchill Falls

MR. MARSHALL:

development by Quebec, and, just as importantly, the necessity of a fair return to Newfoundland as owner of the resource. Therefore, any final arrangements would acknowledge the recognition by the parties, both that a legitimate contract existed and that experience during the first decade of that contract dictated a rearrangement of the terms to achieve an equitable distribution of fairness and equity to both contributing parties.

From that statement of intent, Mr. Speaker, I think anyone would conclude that both parties had really come a long way and that indeed we were justified in concluding that an atmosphere had developed which would nurture and foster the chance of positive resolution of this issue. Similarly, from the concessions that we made, which I made candidly, frankly and openly with Mr. Duhaime as to the basis in which we would go on, they were entitled to have assumed that Newfoundland would do exactly the same.

So these were the factors which caused us, on September 7, 1983, to state publicly, and I quote the words that were used in the statement by me: "A basis may indeed exist for conducting talks, and we have therefore decided to follow this route."

Privately, Mr. Speaker, we were very pleased and encouraged. This was the first time Quebec had agreed to address the Upper Churchill contract and we were sure they would do so in a meaningful way - and those were the words that were used throughout this meeting, 'A meaningful addressing of the issues'.

Before then Quebec was not inclined to deal with the agreement directly, that is the Upper Churchill Agreement, but as part of a

MR. MARSHALL: package deal. Operating in that way, at one time when we discussed the development of other rivers with them and came to the Upper Churchill, they refused to talk about it. This was in the days when the hon. the Premier was Minister of Mines and Energy and had discussions in Quebec. Now, however, they agreed to discuss the Upper Churchill first, on its own merits. As a result, we would not be forced into the position of having to entertain trade-offs of benefits from future developments of our resources as a condition of obtaining a measure of justice and equity from our Upper Churchill resource.

After the Upper Churchill issue was resolved, we indicated we would entertain general discussion relating to Gull Island and the joint rivers. However, the aim here would be to arrive at a declaration of co-operation on these future projects. We felt there was no point in dealing

MR. MARSHALL:

with these areas in more than a general manner lest we find ourselves once again in the position of having to trade off future benefit which a packaged deal would entail.

We must maintain the position in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that development of these other resources can never take place on the basis of Quebec being the sole broker of power as has occurred in the Upper Churchill instance.

Mr. Duhaime appeared to fully appreciate the position and indicated negotiations could in fact proceed upon that basis. We were greatly encouraged by this and thought for the first time there might be a means to resolve this issue through our preferred route of amiable, negotiated agreement with Quebec. Considering the previous history of our attempts, some of which I have just recounted, it appeared that our encouragement was justified. Let us now look, Mr. Speaker, at what has transpired to date in these negotiations. This will show how far apart the parties remain after seven months. It should also show how far is Quebec from its agreement to address the Upper Churchill contract in a meaningful manner. Before doing this, however, it might be advisable to review briefly the Churchill Falls agreement so that we might see more clearly the problem with which this Province is confronted.

Let us take a look at the agreement and put it in context, Mr. Speaker. This problem commenced in 1961 when the Newfoundland government leased for ninety-nine years to Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation, then owned by BRINCO, the right to transmit and export all power generated from the Upper Churchill. The price payable to the Province was stated to be a fixed yearly rental of 8 per cent of net profits of CFLCo before taxes, and a fixed

May 18, 1984

Tape No. 1779

SD - 2

MR. MARSHALL: royalty of fifty cents per horse-  
power year generated and sent out of Churchill Falls. There  
were no re-opener clauses. It is



MR. MARSHALL:

important to note that the royalty amounts to \$3 million annually, Mr. Speaker, and the rental varies between \$2 million and \$3 million annually, for a total return to Newfoundland of between \$5 million and \$6 million annually. And I would ask for those figures to be borne in mind, that Newfoundland's total return from the Upper Churchill today is between \$5 million and \$6 million annually.

On May 12, 1969, again referring to the agreement, there was the second agreement. CFLCo entered into a power contract with Hydro-Quebec for the term of sixty-five years commencing on September 1, 1976. That contract gives Hydro-Quebec the right to take virtually all of the output of the Churchill Falls plant which had a rated capacity of 5,225 megawatts. They were to take all that 5,225 megawatts with the exception of 225 megawatts that replaced the output of the plant at Twin Falls, and a further 300 megawatts that CFLCo could recapture as needed, so really all that we had was an additional 300 megawatts of power recaptured from that 5,225.

It is interesting to note that the price payable by Hydro-Quebec commenced at 3 mils per kilowatt hour in 1976 and declined instead of increased over the term to 2 mils per kilowatt hours in the last twenty-five years of that term. So, in other words, the situation is going to get worse, the \$5 million to \$6 million is going to decrease in our situation if the present situation continues.

Let us

look at the benefits to Quebec and Newfoundland as a result of these contracts, Mr. Speaker. The net result is that partly as a result of changed conditions Hydro-Quebec derives

MR. MARSHALL: an enormous, accelerating benefit as a result of its energy purchases of power generated in this Province. On the other hand, the Province's return under the lease remains virtually fixed at between \$5 million and \$6 million, depending upon profits of a corporation whose returns are fixed and declining as a result of being tied to the power contract.

So our annual benefit is \$5 million to \$6 million, but the benefit to Quebec was independently measured by the Economic Council of Canada as being in the order of \$548 million annually in 1979, Making reasonable adjustments for

MR. MARSHALL:

inflation, we would see this figure at approximately \$790 million for 1983 and rising. This contrasts between \$5 million and \$6 million for Newfoundland and declining. So that is the situation with which we are faced in this Province today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at Quebec's offer. What did Quebec offer us with respect to the revenue and the access to power and the terms and CFLCo's stability and other matters? After seven months of frustrating attempts to get Quebec negotiators to put something on the table, on March 23, 1983 we finally received a written proposal from Hydro-Quebec. This offered to index the fixed royalty to inflation before 1976, to maintain the real royalty value of fifty cents per horsepower year. There was to be no change in the rentals payable under the statutory lease. The net impact of this offer would increase Newfoundland's revenue from the CFLCo lease by less than \$2.5 million in 1984. In other words, we were invited to content ourselves with a mere total of \$8 million while Hydro Quebec's benefit was escalating in the vicinity of \$800 million. This obviously ignored the element of windfall profits which had accrued because of world conditions and which Quebec obviously wished to keep for itself. It is difficult to rationalize, Mr. Speaker, this offer with the assurance received from Mr. Duhaime in August of 1983 that Quebec intended to address a meaningful change in the contract. It is difficult to even style this offer as a token gesture. Now let us look at access to power. On the matter of access to power, Quebec concluded experience had shown

MR. MARSHALL: the power and energy capabilities of the plant to be greater than that shown in the power contract. In other words, they concluded with experience that there was more there than the 5,225 megawatts and because of this, only because of the increase, it was prepared to consider granting us additional access to power. This amounted to a mere 500 megawatts at a 68 per cent load factor, or 380 megawatts at a 90 per cent load factor level. Access to the full block of power requested had to be used in Newfoundland and could

MR. MARSHALL: not be resold to Quebec or other provinces. In view of the fact that Quebec knew when we launched the recall case in 1976 that we were then seeking 800 megawatts of power additional to the 300 reserved under the contract, and in view of the fact that Quebec must have known this offer would not enable us to realistically plan an interconnect with the Island of Newfoundland, it is difficult to see how this could be termed meaningful.

Now, we look at the term. No proposal, Mr. Speaker, was received with respect to the term. Initially the contract's term was forty years. In 1969, at Quebec's insistence, the term was extended for a further twenty-five years before the final contract was signed. Since the additional twenty-five years was not part of the original deal, and because we felt inadequate consideration was given for the extension, we sought a reduction in the sixty-five year term. We understood that Quebec was prepared to address this and we were given this indication by Mr. Duhaime at the meeting, yet in the negotiations it turned a blind eye to this concern. There was no proposal with respect to terms.

Let us look at it now from the generalities proposed on CFLCo's stability. We were in this particular case perhaps not so far apart, but, as you will see later on in the statement, this is not as significant as it might otherwise be.

The effect of the present arrangements will result in greater financial strain being placed on CFLCo as the term of the contract proceeds. There is not even enough money reserved under the power contract, Mr. Speaker, to maintain the solvency of CFLCo itself.

MR. MARSHALL: The contract did not even provide enough moneys to the corporation to maintain the long-term fiscal stability of the company and to provide a reasonable return to shareholders. Of course, Quebec has a much more direct interest in this problem. In addressing the financial integrity of CFLCo, Quebec proposed in general terms that revenues be adjusted at five to ten year intervals to maintain the company's financial stability, cover extraordinary capital expenditure and maintain dividend levels.

Now, this is the coup de gr<sup>^</sup>ce, Mr. Speaker, the final one, the invitation to the second Upper Churchill. It was in its proposal for future development of Labrador hydroelectric resources that a real insight was obtained into Quebec's determination to continue to require future development of hydro resources on the same basis as applied to the Upper Churchill development.

MR. MARSHALL: As indicated, the basis of our objection to a package deal was we did not wish future benefits to have to be traded off against readjustment of the Upper Churchill deal. This is why we wished the 1969 contract to be dealt with firstly. However, we were certainly not so dogmatic as to state we were disinterested in Quebec's ideas for development of Gull Island and Muskrat Falls and the five rivers. Indeed we were interested in receiving its views as to how it thought these developments might proceed.

Hydro-Quebec, Mr. Speaker, proposed that Newfoundland grant to Quebec, and I quote from the offer, "an option (right of first refusal) to purchase the energy in excess of the needs of Newfoundland produced by power plants constructed by Newfoundland on the Churchill water-shed." This is not significantly different than the existing arrangements on the Upper Churchill. Quebec apparently wishes the right to be the broker of power exported from Labrador. We are to be continued to be denied the right to transmit and freely sell power generated from the Lower Churchill without first offering it to Quebec. A similar proposal was advanced with respect to the joint rivers, sweetened somewhat, of course, in Quebec's favour to give to Quebec the right to elect to use the headwaters for a period of fifty years.

Now to summarize the position, Mr. Speaker, or Quebec: After seven months of somewhat frustrating negotiations, on March 23 last we finally received a written proposal from Quebec. This would see Newfoundland receive less than \$2.5 million extra in 1984, an indefinite and insufficient access to power of between 500 to 380 additional megawatts which would not permit us to even plan an interconnect, no proposal on term and a suggestion that the Lower Churchill and joint rivers be developed

MR. MARSHALL: upon essentially the same basis as the Upper Churchill. Quebec, Mr. Speaker, may feel this to be a meaningful response to the issues; however, it is very difficult for us to see how anyone could maintain this to be the meaningful response to those issues which was contemplated in my meeting with Mr. Duhaime on August 16, 1983. It was then apparent to us, Mr. Speaker, that the gap between what Quebec would be prepared to offer and what we considered to be reasonable and legitimate was so great



MR. MARSHALL: that it would be difficult to bridge unless some new factor was injected to encourage Quebec to deal with the matter more reasonably. We had hoped this might have been a positive decision on the Water Rights Reversion Act. That was why we indicated we were calling for the Supreme Court decision at the time. To have agreed to a third postponement would have given the erroneous impression that talks were going better than they obviously were. We had already agreed to two postponements of that decision which we had hoped would afford a major step toward achieving justice and equity from these resources.

These postponements, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the ultimate outcome, effectively show our determination to do everything possible to achieve a negotiated settlement. On the other hand, it is noted that Quebec at the same time resolutely refused to defer its application to the National Energy Board for export of power to New York.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to understand the gap to which I refer, it is necessary to know Newfoundland's position. The government has decided in a forthcoming, candid way to tell the people of Newfoundland what it feels its position should be in relation to this contract in order that there can be an appreciation and an assessment as to the reasonableness of our position and, also, so that people can see how great the gulf or the gap is between what we perceive to be a reasonable position for settlement and what we were ultimately offered.

At the outset we must reiterate that this government feels strongly that Quebec should never have been permitted, Mr. Speaker, to exact more than wheeling costs as the price of transmitting power through its territory. This Province should have

MR. MARSHALL: enjoyed the same rights as other provinces to market their resources through other parts of Canada and over provincial borders. We felt equally strongly, and we feel now, that a power contract such as the one executed on May 12, 1969, should never have been allowed to have been based on the premise that Quebec was the sole broker of our power. Neither should the federal government

MR. MARSHALL:

of that day, 1969, have permitted this to occur, Mr. Speaker, nor, clearly, should the provincial government then in power in this Province have accepted such a state of affairs. Nevertheless, considering and weighing all of these things, and it has been subject to debate back and forth across this House and in this Province from time to time, the government has to say that we have to recognize that the power contract does in fact exist. It is a reality. And we approached these negotiations on the basis that we have to deal with the situation as it exists.

That is why we agreed negotiations would proceed on the basis of the contribution and risk undertaken by Quebec preparatory to the contract and the project coming on stream. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, we expected in return recognition that Newfoundland was entitled to a fair return from its resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

If Newfoundland has to accept the reality of that contract, Quebec should accept the other reality of drastically changed circumstances which probably, Mr. Speaker, were best described by Philip Smith and his book on BRINCO where he stated, and I quote Mr. Smith when he said, 'by 1974 the combination of the energy crisis and galloping inflation had changed the world to an extent that could not have been imagined during the Churchill Falls negotiations.'

Now, then, in that context, Mr. Speaker, let us look at Newfoundland's proposal on revenue. Weighing these considerations, we felt, accepting the realities of the contract and the dramatic and unexpected windfall

MR. MARSHALL: profits that a split of 60 per cent and 40 per cent of benefits in favour of the resource owner, that is Newfoundland, would not be an unfair expectation. Notwithstanding this, however, Mr. Speaker, we were prepared to entertain a 50/50 split of benefits. This would amply recognize the contract and give more than a fair return upon it. On the other hand, it did not seem unfair to us to expect approximately \$400 million annually from a contract which now nets approximately \$800 million. As one can see, the gap between \$8 million and \$400 million is light years apart. And I should inject, it is not in the statement, Mr.

MR. MARSHALL:

Speaker, that I note the comment made by Mr. Borbeau of Hydro-Quebec today to the effect that when Premier Peckford and the government of this Province talk about \$800 million being derived from that contract that we are incorrect, that the profits of all of Hydro-Quebec did not equal \$800 million, what he failed to address, Mr. Speaker, is that if the profits of Hydro-Quebec do not equal \$800 million it is because the people of Quebec enjoy the lowest electricity rates in North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: They are paying the lowest electricity rates in North America compliments, to a large extent, of this particular contract.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, you will see the profits of Hydro-Quebec increase enormously over the next few years. You just watch their balance sheets when they get these exports of power that we have been fighting against, exporting to New York and the New England States. So it is not, Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Borbeau refers to, the profits of Hydro-Quebec, it is the benefit that has come from that contract. And that benefit, Mr. Speaker, has been independently assessed by the Economic Council of Canada and amounts today to \$800 million, and that is undeniable. And any other test you use will get you in the vicinity of \$800 million. Compare, for instance, Quebec's average price that it gets from its exports of power and translate that into the whole machine and you will come up with the same. So there is \$800 million worth of benefits, we have proposed a 50/50 split, and what could be more reasonable than that from this Province?

Now on recall, let us deal with recall. With regard to power access, we were prepared to accept

MR. MARSHALL: the right to recall, over a period of time, some 2,400 megawatts. This amounts to approximately one-half of the rated capacity now flowing Westward to Quebec. Furthermore, we were prepared to see this entitlement phased in over a period of time. It was envisaged access would be at prices no less favourable than those paid by Hydro-Quebec. There is a vast difference, Mr. Speaker, between that expectation of ours and the fixed 380 megawatts to 500 megawatts of additional power offered as the only extra entitlement for this Province until the year 2041. On term, we felt, Mr. Speaker, it not unreasonable to expect the term of that contract to be reduced by twenty-five years so that it would expire on September 1, 2016 instead of 2041.

MR. MARSHALL: After all, this was the original term which Quebec was contented with and upon which financing was arranged. The extra twenty-five years, at reduced mil rates, was added when Quebec had to guarantee extra funding for the project in 1969 and gave other assurances. Hydro-Quebec exacted that from this Province in consideration of these extra commitments. We have heard it said they were dumbfounded, actually, Mr. Speaker, that they were absolutely nonplussed and dumbfounded when Newfoundland capitulated to these demands. We cannot verify this to be true; however, it is evident the extra considerations were incommensurate with the benefit received of a twenty-five year extension at reduced mil rates. The forty year term was sufficient, Mr. Speaker, to support the contract at its inception. In view of the unanticipated benefits it should be sufficient for the present contract. The fact that Quebec declined even to address this shows the depth of divergence on this point.

Now, let us look at CFLCo briefly. On the question of CFLCo's financial integrity we felt there should be a rate adjustment to allow a return of 15 per cent to shareholders and to finance extraordinary capital expenditures needed before the end of the forty year term. Here the gap, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, was not as significant. Nevertheless, it must be remembered also there was no real concession in this case since we are addressing provision of financial stability of CFLCo which ought to have been addressed in the first place. They were only agreeing not to permit CFLCo to go bankrupt which is in Quebec's own self interest.

Now the final observation I want to make with respect to our position is with respect to this ludicrous offer to enter into another Upper Churchill situation

May 18, 1984

Tape 1787

NM - 2

MR. MARSHALL:

on the Lower Churchill.

On the question of further hydroelectric development, we saw what can only be styled, Mr. Speaker, as a cynical gesture. To suggest that the Lower Churchill and joint rivers to be developed on essentially the same basis as the Upper Churchill could only be interpreted by us as a message that Quebec is unable to concede there should be any substantive change in our relationships with respect to development of our resources in Labrador. It signals unwillingness to



MR. MARSHALL:

accord us the same rights as Canadian citizens to transmit power and freely market our resources. Faced with this position, Mr. Speaker, how could we feel the issues were being treated in a meaningful way by those on the other side of the table? Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the Newfoundland position. Quebec's position is set out. Let me now make a few comments with respect to the course of the negotiations themselves.

We were disappointed with the pace of negotiations and the difficulty of getting Quebec to place written proposals on the table. On six separate occasions, Mr. Speaker, Quebec cancelled scheduled meetings, once when our negotiating team was within hours of their scheduled airline departure. On September 30 very shortly after formal negotiations commenced, we were right in there and presented our written proposal, which I have outlined the terms of, Quebec procrastinated throughout. To our extreme irritation, on January 12, almost five months after the meeting with the Quebec minister when the basis of negotiations were set and notwithstanding pressures from us to have Quebec present a written proposal, Quebec then insisted on January 12 to focus on a letter of intent. Although we viewed it unnecessary, a letter of intent was in fact signed. It was not until March 23, at Newfoundland's insistence and persistence, that Quebec finally tabled a formal proposal the terms of which are outlined above. From our proposal Quebec could have determined Newfoundland's position. Certainly there can be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, of the basic Newfoundland suggestion of a 50/50 split. This was

MR. MARSHALL: reiterated by the Premier on CTV's Question Period on Sunday last where the Premier indicated this expectation could be implemented on a graduated basis, and it was reiterated again here in Newfoundland by myself on Monday. It is noted Mr. Duhaime is reported to have indicated he did not take our expectation seriously. Indeed, Quebec's attitude to the pace of these negotiations, its reluctance to table any formal proposal and the proposal itself causes to wonder if it took the negotiations seriously in the first place. In fact it now appears to us that Quebec used the process to give the impression that substantive negotiations were ongoing during the period of our intervention to its application to export power. It was only after the National Energy Board ruled, you will note, Mr. Speaker, in its favour that Quebec finally brought forth what can only be regarded as a less than token proposal.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the above constitutes the summation of what has transpired in our negotiations to date with Quebec. We would get about \$8 millions of dollars and Quebec would take about \$800 millions of dollars. That constitutes Quebec's concept of a meaningful proposal. For the next fifty-seven years, Quebec would receive one hundred times as much as Newfoundland from the Upper Churchill. We are to content ourselves with 1 per cent of the benefit which the Economic Council of Canada determined to be flowing from the Upper Churchill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it must surely strain the bounds of credibility to style such an offer as meaningful.

Before now, Mr. Speaker, we had refrained from commenting on the negotiations lest such comments adversely affect the prospect of success. We comment now, and I want to make it plain, for several reasons: First and foremost, in the circumstances, the public of Newfoundland have the right to know; secondly, while the Quebec Government has been making general statements relating to the negotiations, it has given the impression in these statements, particularly one made by Mr. Duhaime before the Quebec National Assembly or a committee thereof, of which statement I have a copy, that it made a proposal which is substantially reasonable and acceptable, which obviously is not so, Mr. Speaker; and, thirdly, the other reason is, knowing there is such a gap between the parties in which a meaning result would seem improbable, it is not in the best interests to let the impression lie that a settlement is attainable through negotiations

MR. MARSHALL: without some impetus being injected into the process that might cause Quebec to take a more reasonable approach. We had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that this impetus might have been provided by a favourable reversion decision. Since this is not attainable, it is our opinion action by the federal government affords the only speedy and secure means to provide a way out of this impasse, Mr. Speaker, and we ask this, not as beggars on horseback, but we ask this as a matter of right flowing from our Canadian citizenship.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say, as I indicated at the beginning of this statement - and let this be known - that this government prefers to attain resolution of these and all other issues through negotiation.

MR. MARSHALL: We are prepared to continue negotiations if they can be conducted meaningfully. It is obvious, though, without some change of attitude by Quebec a fair and just settlement is improbable. This being the case, we call upon the federal government to utilize the jurisdiction it sought to assert in the reversion case to assure Newfoundlanders and Labradorians receive a measure of justice and equity as Canadian citizens. The Premier has already written the Prime Minister to this effect. We await his reply with interest.

Settlement can best be attained only if the federal government is prepared to act fairly and impartially in this matter. Injecting itself on the side of Quebec, as it did in the reversion case, is not acting equitably and justly. As long as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are denied a fair share of the \$2 million daily which flows Westward from our own great hydro resource, there is a total failure of Confederation in this Province. The people of our Province are entitled, Mr. Speaker, to receive the same determined efforts from their federal government as they received from their provincial representatives to see this gross inequity rectified.

And that, Mr. Speaker, constitutes the statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

I can only add, Mr. Speaker, to the statement that we have put the facts freely and plainly before the people of Newfoundland, and I hope, the people of Canada, and I hope that the people of Newfoundland, and most importantly the people of Canada, particular those in central Canada where we operate in this Province continually on the anvil that we only have seven seats in the Canadian federation, that I sincerely hope that they will read that statement, they

May 18, 1984

Tape No. 1790

MJ - 2

MR. MARSHALL: will assess it and that they will see that we have been fair and reasonable, we have attempted to be forthcoming and candid, to give plainly to the people of this Province what our position is, what we feel is a reasonable one. We feel it will test the standards of

MR. MARSHALL:

reasonableness, and we invite other Canadians outside this Province, the federal government particularly, and particularly those in Central Canada, to address that statement, to assess its reasonableness and to see that the people of Newfoundland at last attain justice and equity from this Upper Churchill that they are entitled not, as I say, as beggars on horseback to Ottawa, but that we are entitled to as Canadian citizens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

I would just like to

take a moment to welcome some visitors to our galleries. First of all, I would like to welcome twenty-six Grade XI students from Robert's Arm, I would like to welcome five special education students from Cape Broyle with their teacher, Marie Cahill, and I would like to welcome twenty students from the Assumption School at Avalon with their Principal, Sister Genevieve, and teachers Mrs. Juliann Lewis and Mrs. Ellen Doyle. +

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

X MR. NEARY:

Let me say at the outset

that the hon. gentleman who just delivered that sixteen page statement, plus some ad libs in between, did send the statement to our office fifteen minutes before the House met today, but he addressed it to my colleague, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), and so the statement did not reach me before I came to the House of Assembly. My colleague is on his way to Baie Verte, so I did not see the statement until a few seconds before the hon. gentleman stood in his place to read it. I just mention that at the outset because I have no intention of getting into any great detail in connection with the

MR. NEARY: statement because it is  
of such a technical nature.

There are a lot of  
partisan political statements in there, there  
is a lot of game playing and a lot of rhetoric in it,  
and there are a lot of hypocritical remarks in there,  
and there are a lot of statements in there that will  
only add fuel to the controversy; they do not mean any-  
thing but that the hon. gentleman has to get his licks in.

The hon. gentleman, I  
noticed, steered away from laying blame in this  
particular statement, although the hon. gentleman has laid  
blame before, and continues to do so, even though he  
knows the difference, that if you are going to blame another



MR. NEARY:

administration for this agreement, then you also have to blame the Opposition of the day because the Opposition in the House at that particular time did not object, did not raise this matter of the contract between CFLCo and Quebec Hydro. Mr. Speaker, it is the Opposition who are the watchdogs of the House, of the people of this Province. And there are two sitting on that side of the House who were in Opposition at that time, The present Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) were in this House, sat on this side of the House and did not lift a finger. You know, hindsight is a wonderful thing, Mr. Speaker. These two gentlemen sit on that side of the House now -

MR. WARREN:

And they are still here.

MR. NEARY:

- they are still here, and when they were over here they did not raise their voices in objection to this deal. Because the deal was not negotiated by the government, as the hon. gentleman is aware. It was not negotiated by the government. It is an unfair deal. We would like to see it remedied, see it rectified. We still do not know if Quebec is being reasonable or unreasonable, because all the hon. gentleman did a few moments ago was to give us his version of the proposal and his version of the negotiation. And we are well aware of the hon. gentleman's narrow-minded version of everything that goes on in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

Like he did on the offshore.

MR. NEARY:

Like he did on the offshore. We are well aware of the hon. gentleman's buttoned-down, narrow-minded version. At the end there the hon. gentleman said, 'We have outlined the facts to the House and to the Newfoundland people'. Well, Mr. Speaker, in

MR. NEARY: order for us to assess the facts we must have Quebec's proposal.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman prepared to lay that proposal on the table of this House?

MR. WARREN: No. He is too chicken.

MR. NEARY: And if he is, then is he prepared to lay Newfoundland's counterproposal on the table of this House?

Then, Mr. Speaker, once we get the proposal from Quebec laid on the table of the House and the Newfoundland Government's -

MR. MORGAN: He just told you the Province's portion.

MR. WARREN: No, he did not.

MR. NEARY: No, we only heard the hon. gentleman's version and we are not prepared to accept it.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, you cannot accept the hon. gentleman's version of anything that goes on in this Province.

MR. WARREN: That is right. He is trying to blindfold the people.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, it may well be that Quebec is being unreasonable.

MR. WARREN: He is trying to blindfold the people.

MR. NEARY: That could be. And if they are. I would say that is very unfortunate and regrettable indeed because there is not a Canadian or a Newfoundlander or a Labradorian who does not agree that Newfoundland should be getting a fair share from the Upper Churchill Falls contract. But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot do what the hon. gentleman and the administration is doing. If you are going to go down and borrow money from the bank, you cannot insult the bank manager before you go down and then expect him to be reasonable and conduct negotiations with you in good faith. So my first point is to ask the hon. gentleman to put the facts on the table of the House, not have somebody down in the Premier's office write a partisan political statement. Let us do it in a cool, calm, collected way, in a cool atmosphere, put the facts on the table and let us take the Quebec proposal, we in the Opposition, I mean, and the Newfoundland government's counterproposal and we will take it down and we will study it and we will research it and then we will be able to say whether or not we agree with hon. gentlemen there opposite that -

MR. MORGAN: Are you supporting us or not?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting a better deal for Newfoundland -

MR. MORGAN: You would never say it.

MR. NEARY: - on that Upper Churchill Falls contract. It is a one-sided agreement and, Mr. Speaker, we should do everything we can to rectify it.

Now the hon. gentleman did not tell us what happens in the event that negotiations break down with the Province of Quebec. Obviously they have because the hon. gentleman made all kinds of statement about cynical gestures on the part of Quebec. 'Unless we get the benefits of this resource which flows Westward from our own great hydro resource,' he said, 'there is a total

MR. NEARY: failure of Confederation.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the Premier going across Canada asking the people of Canada for sympathy and understanding and support on these matters, and we have hon. gentlemen like the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) making anti-Canadian statements, separatist statements. The hon. Minister of Finance made a statement the other day that Newfoundlanders are becoming strangers in their own home. And the hon. gentleman is talking about the total failure of Confederation.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, why be hypocritical, why not call the Premier home. He is out trying to get support and sympathy and understanding from the Canadian people. And I have no doubt at all, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that in this particular matter you do not have to ask the Canadian people for sympathy and understanding because the sympathy and understanding is already there. There is not a fair-minded Canadian today who does not agree that we should have a better deal on the Upper Churchill.

MR. DINN: Is Trudeau a fair-minded Canadian?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of political game-playing you get from hon. gentlemen. This is a very serious matter, it has to be handled in a genuine statesmanlike way, not playing political games. The hon. gentleman did not tell us what happens in the event that negotiations peter out with Quebec, and obviously they are going to. I would not hold out much hope now that these negotiations are going to succeed.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) came down.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he was speaking, did I? I ask for the same right.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Halifax a couple of weeks ago and I met with my -

MR. MARSHALL: He is labouring.

MR. NEARY: I am not labouring. The hon. gentleman was labouring when he was down at the

MR. NEARY: bottom of the barrell trying to think up some nasty remarks and trying to fool the Newfoundland people again.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Halifax a couple of weeks ago and I met with my colleagues, the Liberal leaders and Leaders of the Opposition in Atlantic Canada. One thing that we talked about was low-cost energy for the Atlantic Provinces. And my colleagues and I agree that we should take a look again at the Anglo-Saxon route. Mr. Speaker, if these negotiations fail with the Province of Quebec, and I believe they will now, I do not think they are going to succeed after the attitude and tone of the hon. gentleman today -

MR. TOBIN: Go away, boy!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman. The Atlantic Provinces need low-cost electricity and if it is technically feasible, if the technology is available to use the Anglo-Saxon route, then I think we should take a good hard look at it. It will also give us access for markets in the New England States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we should be doing. We should be negotiating by all means, that is what we advocate on this side of the House,

MR. NEARY: by negotiations you do not make a statement on CTV, as the hon. gentleman referred to, and say all Newfoundland will accept is a 50/50 split. I doubt very much if they did make that known to the Province of Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said in the beginning I am not going to go into any detail on this statement at the moment, I have to take the statement and have our researchers and our technical people take a look at it. I would like to have Quebec's proposal and the Province's counterproposal so we can see if the hon. gentleman's version of the negotiations and Quebec's position is correct and he is not just merely playing games.

MR. TOBIN: Do you support our stand?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we do not know that.

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

MR. NEARY: We will be dealing with the hon. gentleman's wind and fury in the next statement, the gigantic bluff of the hon. gentleman will be dealt with next.

But, Mr. Speaker, I appeal to hon. gentlemen there opposite again to lay the facts on the table of the House. We are pleased to have this little bit of information but we do not know whether most of it is correct or not. Mr. Speaker, we have learned to become very suspicious of anything that hon. gentlemen say. Now we are also aware that Quebec may be unreasonable, we are not ruling that possibility out either, but give us the facts and then we will make up our own minds and decide and determine the direction that we think the administration should be taking. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Anglo-Saxon route should be given a very high priority and the hon. gentleman did not address himself to that question

MR. NEARY: at all. I am sure that our sister Atlantic Provinces would welcome a thorough study of the Anglo-Saxon route because they need the electricity in Atlantic Canada and it would give us access to new markets in the three Maritime Provinces and in the New England States. We discussed that a couple of weeks ago and I believe the premiers of Atlantic Canada should now get together again and take a look at this option to see if it is feasible, if the technology has now been developed to use the Anglo-Saxon route so we can develop the Lower Churchill and these five rivers without being beholden to Quebec or anybody else, Mr. Speaker. So, if and when we get the



MR. NEARY:

facts we will take a look at them. I hope the House is open long enough so that we can state our interpretation and our version of the proposal and the counterproposal. And if the House is not open, we may have to call a news conference in order to do it, Mr. Speaker. X

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

X MR. MORGAN:

I want to give a statement this morning on the salmon situation and inshore fishery.

As most Newfoundlanders are aware, of course, the federal government has brought in a plan, a measure with respect to the commercial salmon fishery which will indeed have a serious negative impact on the income of our full-time fishermen around the Province. The most serious of these, of course, is a three week delay in the opening of the season. Today, being May 18, is the normal date on which the fishermen would be placing their nets in the water and commencing the salmon fishery. Because of the new regulations with regard to the season, the date has now been set back to June 11, and fishermen have to await that date. By that time most of the salmon will have passed our waters and there will actually be no salmon fishery this year.

In many areas all of the salmon will have passed by the waters of Newfoundland and there will be no salmon to catch. This will mean that the commercial inshore fishermen will have their incomes reduced as much as 80 per cent. We have done an assessment on this and in some areas of the Province the fishermen's total income from the fishing industry will be reduced by 80 per cent this year as a result of these

MR. MORGAN: measures. In fact, because of the imposition of this later date there will, in essence, be no salmon fishery whatsoever.

Now, this new policy and management plan favour heavily the interests of the sports salmon fishery in New Brunswick and elsewhere throughout Atlantic Canada. It was adopted over adamant objections of this government and the Fishermen's Union. Unfortunately, the aspirations of Newfoundlanders to earn a living did not have as much impact on the federal government as the aspirations of the sports and recreation salmon fishing interests in the Atlantic region.

Since the federal government announced this plan, Mr. Speaker, I have communicated on a number of occasions to the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) not only the provincial government's objections to the plan, but also the objections and the frustrations of the fishermen. In view of the fact that the fishermen were recently out back in the amount of salmon gear they could use; for example, just last year they could fish with 300 fathoms of gear, this year it is down to 100 fathoms of gear, there have already been

MR. MORGAN: severe cutbacks in the catching and harvesting efforts in the salmon fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, although I fully understand the frustrations of the fishermen on this issue, as I said yesterday and said earlier in the House of Assembly, we cannot as a government condone fishermen defying the law, breaking the law and defying the regulations, but we fully understand the frustrations they are encountering this day and in fact in recent weeks. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, as well, that just a few weeks ago, the Fishermen's Union and myself reached an agreement. We held meetings, Father Desmond McGrath, Earle McCurdy and fishermen with them and myself sat down and reached an agreement and we worked out a joint proposal between the Newfoundland Government and the union. And we then put forward that proposal in a joint way to the federal government through the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane). Unfortunately, to date, there has been no positive response from the federal minister to that joint proposal put forward by the union and the Newfoundland Government.

Earlier this week, the Fishermen's Union met in Ottawa with Mr. De Bane. As a result of that meeting, Mr. De Bane did send down his Deputy Minister, Mr. Art May, and his Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Scott Parsons. They came to Newfoundland and held meetings with the Fishermen's Union and held meetings with my Deputy Minister and officials from my department. They went back to Ottawa yesterday morning to report back to the federal minister with the strong suggestion from these officials that a

MR. MORGAN: meeting take place as quickly as possible between the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa (Mr. De Bane) and myself and, if at all possible, at the same time, to be joined at that meeting by the Fishermen's Union. I am hoping this meeting will take place this weekend. I am presently awaiting confirmation from Mr. De Bane's office that he will indeed meet with us this weekend. I am going to Twillingate tonight. Tomorrow I can go on from there to Ottawa over the weekend and meet with Mr. De Bane, or he will come here or elsewhere in Atlantic Canada, and I am hoping that he will agree to have the Fishermen's Union at that meeting.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is still no word from Ottawa on that meeting. In the meantime, the days pass, the fishermen are losing income, so we have to pursue every possible angle on what to do as a Province, if we can do anything at all here to help with the problems of the inshore fishermen. So we pursued the possibility of being able to issue licences.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Labrador may make his little political comments across the House, but his fishermen in Labrador are calling me practically every day on this issue so, Mr. Speaker, it is important to the fishermen. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to deliver this statement without being interrupted by stupid comments from the Opposition.

The fact is that we did investigate. We were determined, if we

MR. MORGAN:

could do it, to issue licenses to our fishermen in this Province to resolve the real problem of fishermen losing 80 per cent of their income from the inshore fishery in many areas of our Province. So we pursued it vigorously and, after pursuing it and getting all information on the issue and investigating all potential options, I requested legal advice on the possibility of the Newfoundland government being able to issue its own salmon licenses to our fishermen in an effort to resolve this problem. And I have now received legal opinion and have been advised by the provincial Department of Justice on this matter, advised in writing on the issue. The opinion is that, first of all, the decision of the Newfoundland Court of Appeal on the offshore reference case granted to Newfoundland the jurisdiction over the seabed and subsoil in the territorial sea to the extension of three miles offshore and consequently this ruling is presently the law. That was a ruling of the court and that ruling is presently law, based on the decision of the court, that we do have jurisdiction over that three mile territorial zone. So on the basis of that decision, the legal advice I have received is that indeed it is arguable that this Province would be able to issue licenses to fishermen who are engaged in a fixed gear fishery. And because the salmon fishery is indeed a fixed gear fishery this would include the right to license salmon fishermen. In other words, the legal opinion says indeed it is quite arguable that we would have the right right now to issue licenses based on the Newfoundland Court of Appeal decision

MR.MORGAN: giving us the jurisdiction three miles from the coastline to the territorial sea.

Now, however, as I mentioned yesterday to the media, there are legal complications. We may have the right to issue licenses but the further legal opinion I have received from the Department of Justice is that with respect to the salmon fishery or fixed gear licensing, with regard to the regulations governing the licenses under the licensing, the right to control seasons for management and conservation purposes - and that is a very key statement- the right to control seasons for management and -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, can the members of the Opposition restrain themselves over there? It is an important item to the Labrador fishermen and to the fishermen out around the Trinity Bay area and these areas.

So, Mr. Speaker, the right to control the seasons for management and conservation purposes is exclusively under federal authority. And, I say again, we have the authority to issue licenses, something thought we could until right now we did have the right to do. We have the opinion now and legally it says we have the right to issue licenses to fishermen but that is not the issue. The

MR. MORGAN:

issue today, and the problem we are encountering on this issue of the salmon fishery is indeed the seasons. So we could issue licences to the fishermen. We are not questioning who is holding licences today; the dispute is not about who holds a licence or does not hold a licence, the dispute concerns the matter in which the seasons have been set forth and the delay in the opening of the salmon season. So in this case, Mr. Speaker, issuing licences tomorrow or today or next week would not resolve the problem of the salmon fishermen because, as I said earlier, the legal opinion says that the seasons are controlled exclusively by Ottawa, so we would not be able to overcome their problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I say that in the meantime we are watching very closely Bill No. 48 in the Quebec National Assembly, because that bill is now in the final stage of approval and they are using the same laws that we looked at and got our legal opinion on in the last few days. They feel as a government they have a right to issue fishing licences the same as we do now here, and they are proceeding to issue these licences under the legislation now before the National Assembly, issue licences within a three mile limit. And we will be watching very closely the developments as it pertains to that licence and what the federal government will do, whether they will challenge that legislation to the Supreme Court of Canada or not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing my statement may I say the only means of resolving these kinds of thorny issues affecting the incomes of our commercial fishermen is through dialogue and discussion. That is the only issue. But, unfortunately, the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) is being inflexibility on this issue. He is not listening to the fishermen.

MR. MORGAN: He is not listening to the Fishermen's Union. He is not listening to the Newfoundland government.

MR. WARREN: Fair enough.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman from Labrador would go down and deal with his problems on the Labrador Coast and the fishermen down there, he would be far better off than making these stupid little comments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that this is a very important issue. There are fishermen today, who, as of right now, have a blackmail-like tactic hanging over their heads and that is the fact that they have been told you either sell your licence between now and June 10 - that is the deadline, you may come in and sell your licence to us, the federal government, or you accept these measures we put forward and lose most of your income from the salmon fishery. That, Mr. Speaker, is almost like a blackmail tactic and it is placing the fishermen in a very unfortunate position. The federal government has set a deadline of June 10 for fishermen to accept its proposal of compensation and buy back their licence for \$2,000 a licence for a full-time fisherman or, if not, carry on and accept the measures now put forward.

So I am hoping that dialogue will be the means of resolving it, that common sense will prevail and that Mr. De Bane will get back to next hour or so.



MR. MORGAN: me within the next hour or so and say, yes, we will meet somewhere in Atlantic Canada. I will go anywhere this weekend to meet with him, bring along the Fishermen's Union, bring along a number of salmon fishermen, and let us sit down and discuss it in a reasonable way, let us make changes. As a result of that meeting I am hoping there will be one thing further, that he would open the season immediately for full-time commercial fishermen and the part-timers out completely. There is no need for them to be involved in the salmon fishery. That will be for conservation purposes and open the salmon fishery immediately and give the fishermen of our Province their right to earn a living from that species of fish in our waters.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. X

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

X MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the background of how this delay in the opening of the commercial salmon fishery developed. The hon. gentleman was in Japan with the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane).

MR. CALLAN:

In a ricksha.

MR. NEARY:

I do not know if they were in a ricksha, being hauled around in a ricksha or not, but they were in Japan, they were travelling together and the minister agreed in the beginning, so he told us, and it is in Hansard -

MR. WARREN:

It is right here.

MR. NEARY:

- we have it here in Hansard that the hon. gentleman agreed to a 10 per cent cut in the commercial salmon fishery this year. The hon. gentleman agreed to that. And that would mean a two week delay in

MR. NEARY: the opening of the salmon fishery.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Fisheries,  
on a point of order.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. gentleman if he is going to refer to what I said in Hansard to refer to it accurately. I said I agreed to a 10 per cent reduction on the salmon fishing effort. I never said I agreed to a two week delay. I agreed with a 10 per cent reduction in fishing efforts and we told him how we would like to see it done: Take out the 840 part-time licences in the salmon fishery in our Province. Take the part-timers out. Some politicians today have not got the courage to say get rid of part-time fishermen in our fishing industry, they do not have the courage to say take out the part-time. So, Mr. Speaker, the first part of the statement is accurate, I did say I agreed to a 10 per cent reduction in the salmon fishery for conservation purposes, but I never did say I agreed to a two week delay in the opening of the season. ✕

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, what is alleged to have been said, certainly from the Chair's viewpoint must be deemed a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have Hansard here, April 9, 1984, quoting directly what the hon. gentleman had said. 'We were of the understanding he was going

MR. NEARY:

to delay the opening in Newfoundland by no more than two weeks and then they announced three weeks.' Mr. Speaker, that is what the hon. gentleman is implying that he agreed to a two week delay. Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the delay in the opening of the commercial salmon fishery is devastating to the incomes of inshore fishermen in this Province, especially on the Southwest Coast, all over Newfoundland, but especially on the Southwest Coast, in my own district of LaPoile. So I am very sympathetic towards this matter and I believe that I was the first one to Telex the minister protesting and objecting to the delay that the hon. gentleman had agreed to. I was against any delay in the beginning at all, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MORGAN:

Table the Telex.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, I have the Telexes in the House, I have them here in my file and I will table them. It was a month before the minister raised the matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, this matter has been badly bungled by the hon. gentleman and it underscores the very specific nature, the trademark if you like, of this administration there opposite, Mr. Speaker, bluster and wind and inaction.

MR. MORGAN:

What are you blaming us for?

It is a Liberal party policy.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the only thing that was accomplished by the hon. gentleman's statements of the last few days is that the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, raised fishermen's expectations as high as they could go and then dashed them today, brutally and cruelly, dashed them to the ground, That is what the hon. gentleman did today, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman was bluffing all along, Mr. Speaker. Now he is saying the reason we cannot issue licences is we cannot

MR. NEARY: control the season.

MR. MORGAN: We can issue licences I said. We can.

MR. NEARY: No, but he does not want to do it now because he cannot control the seasons. Perhaps when His Holiness arrives in Newfoundland he should talk to him about controlling the seasons. All it is, Mr. Speaker, all it was all along was a gigantic bluff, bluster, wind and no action which is the trademark of this administration. Mr. Speaker, here we are today, it is the opening of the salmon season, and the hon. gentleman is now calling for dialogue and discussion and negotiation after the fact. The hon. gentleman now has got a foxhole dug deep enough for himself that he will never get out of again, Mr. Speaker. What the hon. gentleman should do after this blunder, along with all the other ones that he has had, he should, Mr. Speaker, go out and resign for failing to help the fishermen of this Province and go and peddle his record, Voices in the Wind. He might be better at that than he is as a Minister of Fisheries. X

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

X MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we all heard the good news last night and this morning from Western Canada, where the Premier, who is on an ill-fated speaking tour

MR. NEARY: across Canada, Mr. Speaker, made a most intelligent statement, by the way, one that I agree with him 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with gentlemen they are so testy over there this morning? The Premier suggested, Mr. Speaker, that if he does not get an agreement before the end of the current year on the offshore, if he cannot settle the offshore dispute that he may very well resign. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a brilliant idea, one which I support 100 per cent and I would like to ask the hon. Government House Leader if he has asked the Premier to submit that proposal to the administration in writing?

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

X MR. MARSHALL: Now, how silly can you get! That is the extent of his type of question. The hon. gentleman sits in this House as Leader of the Opposition, He hears an important statement on the negotiations, he hears an equally important statement affecting the fishermen of this Province, and he gets up and he asks a question like that. I can tell the hon. gentleman that as far as the Premier of this Province is concerned, as far as this Province is concerned, it would be a very sorry day indeed if the Premier, out of frustration in attempting to get rights for young people and the people of this Newfoundland in Confederation, ever decided that the game was over, that there was no way in which we could achieve it and had to give it up, Then, Mr. Speaker, what would happen is the hon. gentlemen there opposite would get in power and they could run this Province as they would like to, as a municipality of Ottawa, administering things from Ottawa. I would imagine that the Premier probably was expressing a little bit of frustration, Mr. Speaker, yesterday when he talked about that, because when I was speaking with him yesterday he was telling me

May 18, 1984

Tape 1802

NM - 2

MR. MARSHALL: on the one hand he was receiving a great reaction from all parts of Canada, he has spoken to groups of Canadians from all areas of life, he has talked on the open-line programmes, to service clubs, to business groups and he is receiving, throughout Canada, an

MR. MARSHALL: extremely positive reaction. They were saying on the open line in Vancouver the other day, 'More power to you. Keep going. You have a just cause. Newfoundland has a right in Confederation, you assert it, etc.' So I would assume - I do not know whether he was or not - the Premier was a little bit discouraged yesterday when he hears on the one hand he is getting that reaction up in Vancouver and, on the other hand, the Board of Trade is down giving standing ovations to the gentleman who, in Timmins, Ontario, a few days before said he was going to take the rights to the offshore away from Newfoundland.

Make no wonder that certain people in Central and Upper Canada think they can stamp on us. People who indicate that they want to be stamped on get trampled upon. Make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that certain individuals, not all, but certain individuals in Newfoundland perpetrate the 'Newfie joke' as those gentlemen down there did. Make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that some think we are simpletons. I make no wonder, Mr. Speaker! And, as I say, the hon. the Premier was probably exuding the same degree of disgust and frustration that all of this administration feels, that now, when we are trying to make an inroad in the rest of Canada, there are certain groups here who, for their own political or selfish economic advantage, are prepared to get at the underbelly of the young people in this Province.

So I can say to the hon. gentleman, I saw a report on what the Premier stated, I would assume that was the reason why he said it, but I can tell the hon. gentleman this for sure, it will be a sorry day in Newfoundland if the only person who has led

MR. MARSHALL: this Province decides that the time has come not when we are going to become a have province and we have an equal chance in Confederation, but he decides that it is impossible to attain it because of the way in which we are operating in it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason why he would come to that conclusion would be because in our midst, with the Mayor of the City of St. John's, the former head of the Board of Trade, the hon.gentlemen there opposite, the greedy little grubby - not all of them - manufacturers agents in St. John's, some of them wanting to get contracts, and through them, Mr. Speaker, outside people get the impression that the Province of Newfoundland is made up of Uncle Toms and see in Confederation and only in Confederation that all we have the right to do within our union is to get welfare payments for the rest of our time, to be like Uncle Toms.

So, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is if because of the attacks at the underbelly of this Province by the hon. gentlemen there opposite



MR. MARSHALL:

and their disgusting ilk that this occurs, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a sad day for Newfoundland. However, I have to advise to the complete discouragement of the hon. gentleman, who will probably dissolve into the tears that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) accused the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) of dissolving into, that the Premier has absolutely no intention of resigning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL:

He intends to continue to fight for the rights of the people of Newfoundland, and everybody on this side of the House and the great majority of Newfoundlanders are foursquare behind him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell)

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, there was a time in this Province when the right to work was a right, the right, to own your own home was a right, but since the Tories took over especially the present administration, these are more privileges than they are rights. Now, Mr. Speaker, the psychology of Newfoundland is you are lucky to have a job. And hon. gentlemen over there making announcements, passing out goodies as if they were coming out of their own pockets. Everything they do is political. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman -

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

We have heard the type of the hon. gentleman's speech, Mr. Speaker, but he is supposed to ask questions. I am afraid if the hon.

MR. MARSHALL: gentleman gets to make a speech what we are going to do is end up thinking that Mr. Levesque is going to think that he should come down and address the Board of Trade to see if he can get a standing ovation as well.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the hon. gentleman when he was giving me an answer made some pretty provocative statements. The hon. gentleman was not responding to my question. The hon. gentleman made a political response to my question and he attacked everybody in sight in keeping with the trademark, the tradition, of the administration there opposite. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. gentleman wandered so far afield, that I should be allowed a short preamble to my supplementary questions to the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was indeed proceeding to make a speech that perhaps could be considered as his preamble to his question. Now he can ask his question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Newfoundland economy has been ruined and wrecked we have havoc in the fishery, the pulp and paper industry,

MR. NEARY: the mining industry and so forth, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if the Premier indicated to him - the hon. gentleman said a few moments ago that they talked on the phone - did the Premier indicate that it was out of frustration that he was considering resigning? Or was it because, as the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) said the other day in the House, his personal popularity in the latest polls has gone down drastically, and that the open line programmes in Newfoundland are devastating and he is depressed and upset not frustrated, depressed and upset over his own personal image, and that is why he is considering resigning? When the hon. gentleman is answering the question, would he also indicate to me, because of this good news that is coming from Western Canada, if he could persuade the Premier not to wait until Christmas, because he has done enough damage now to the Province, and we have got to try and salvage, Mr. Speaker, what we have left -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Who is we?

MR. NEARY: - so would the hon. gentleman indicate if he could persuade the Premier to turn in his badge to get out now, to get somebody else take over or to have a provincial general election and clear the air once and for all?

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

MR. SIMMS: You want an expensive, unnecessary election.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, can you believe it! You ask the question, Does it live? We know it crawls. But Mr. Speaker, honest to heavens -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I mean, you come into this Question Period expecting a question on an important statement that have been made.

MR. NEARY: That is a pretty important statement, he is going to resign.

MR. MARSHALL: I can tell the hon. gentleman that the hon. Premier has absolutely no intention of resigning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: He is going to continue a valiant fight on behalf of the people of this Province and he is going to continue to enjoy the same popularity that he has in the past which you can see exhibited over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, as to his question with respect to the Premier's popularity, let me just say what a great scam that is. There is a great contest among the hon. gentlemen there opposite, the rats leaving the burning ship trying to get into the Senate. The hon. gentleman now, I am sad to say, is losing out. He referred to the Senate the other day as the house of retirement, the old folks home, so he knows he is not going to get there. So what happened was his opponent for the job, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), got up and talked about the poll and said that the Premier's popularity is declining. Lo and behold, what else is he putting in? You will not believe this, and he must have swallowed hard considering the leadership conventions of the past, but he said, do you realize that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would beat the Premier in an election called tomorrow? So that is the scam, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: The grubby little people there opposite are trying to get into the Senate. What the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) is trying to do is to tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that he has a chance as leader, stay there, so that he will not crawl and creep to Ottawa asking for a position in the Senate himself. He will be content where he is, in Opposition. In the meantime, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, whom we never see in the House at all, you know, ambles up to Ottawa and goes into Sleepy Hollow to which place he so richly belongs. Now is the hon. gentleman going to get sensible and ask some reasonable questions? You know, I try to be a nice fellow here in the House. I do not like answering questions in this way to the hon. gentleman, but, Mr. Speaker, he provokes me. As I said when I started, Mr. Speaker, he can rise too. Look, he can stand, he bestrides this Province, and they all do on the other side, like creatures, Mr. Speaker, creepy, crawly creatures, on their knees to Ottawa, on their knees to Quebec, They even defend Quebec's offer of \$2.5 million. I have no doubt that Premier Levesque will be asked down to the Liberal Provincial leadership convention, and he will get a standing ovation as a result of his magnanimity to the Province of Newfoundland, which was exhibited today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. gentleman indicate to the House from his discussions with the Premier by long distance telephone following the Edmonton game last evening, or this morning, if the Premier indicated that he was

May 18, 1984

Tape No. 1806

NM - 2

MR. NEARY: seriously thinking of resigning. This is a pretty serious matter; the most important item in the last twenty-four hours in the news is the resignation of the Premier, that is a pretty, pretty significant item. If the Premier is thinking about resigning, he must be awfully frustrated and depressed because he cannot get any of his economic policies to work, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: But did he indicate that it is because of his sense of tragic doom that he is thinking about resigning? The people of Newfoundland and Labrador can no longer believe his lies or his chest thumping -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - that, Mr. Speaker, they consider the Premier's action just silly and childish and kindergarten tactics. Did he indicate that is why he is thinking about leaving politics and doing something else that he is more qualified to do?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to respond to the hon. gentleman but, with respect to his reference to the Premier and his lies, all I can say is that he is a living example of when rats get cornered they go for the jugular.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), perhaps I can put a question to the Government House Leader, the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall).

On April 9, just over a month ago, the Minister of Development told the Government Services Committee that Alcan Aluminum officials were showing renewed interest in development of an aluminum smelter in the Province. Of course, ARCO Aluminum Limited, which previously expressed an interest, was taken over by Alcan. And the minister, before the Committee on the estimates of his department, Mr. Speaker, said the proposed aluminum smelter for the Province has

MR. CALLAN: greater possibilities now than when a feasibility study was undertaken over a year ago. And he said this is because of factors such as increased aluminum prices. And the Development Minister (Mr. Windsor) said the prospects are brighter now than they were a year ago.



MR. CALLAN: Could the Minister of Energy  
(Mr. Marshall) tell us what is the status of an aluminum  
smelter for this Province? What are the prospects now? X

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

X MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to  
have received a sensible question from the Opposition and  
I thank the hon. gentleman for voicing it and raising the  
tone of Question Period. He asked really a very timely  
question. There is no doubt about it, the Minister of Development  
(Mr. Windsor) and the government have been pursuing  
very, very actively the establishment of an aluminum smelter.  
We feel that this aluminum smelter would give a great  
initiative and impetus to development within this Province.  
It is true that the prices of aluminum have increased and  
that makes it still more promising and we are still pursuing it  
and we will pursue it actively. But the other element of it is  
it is not just the prices that pertain, it is also the cost  
involved of operating a plant, As the hon. gentleman  
will appreciate the main element in the operation of an aluminum  
plant is electrical power. I mean, electricity is used  
probably in the aluminum industry more than in any other  
industry itself. So in that sense this question is extremely  
timely because, you know, this particular plant - and it relates  
to the statement I made this morning - this particular plant  
in some respects depends upon us being able to obtain  
a reasonable source, in contemporary times,  
of power, to be able to provide any developer who intends to  
come in. This is one of the essential ingredients. A  
timely question it is today because I say to you that if we  
had access to power from the Upper Churchill at the same prices  
as Hydro-Quebec, the hon. gentleman and other members of the  
House will appreciate the fact that we would very likely be able

May 18, 1984

Tape No. 1808

MJ - 2

MR. MARSHALL: to get that aluminum smelter there.  
Now as contrasted with that, here we are exercising everything we could possibly do to see that an aluminum smelter will be established in this Province under the present conditions and the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) is working actively on it as he indicated in the Committee. On the other side of the coin, it is rather a bitter pill to see the same Quebec that offered us \$2.5 million and a mere 380 to 500 megawatts of power, being able to establish an aluminum concern on the North Shore of Quebec within the vicinity of Labrador by

MR. MARSHALL: offering it power which I understand to be in effect a giveaway by present day standards. I think it is somewhere between four to six mils. So that is the situation we are in so it is a very timely question the hon. gentleman asked in the development of Newfoundland as well as we are. And I am sure he will appreciate the reason why this administration, and hopefully all Newfoundlanders feel so very, very strongly that it is absolutely essential that we get a measure of justice and equity from our resources. Now we have this Upper Churchill flowing Westward at \$2 million a day that has the capacity to serve many aluminum smelters, and here we have the supreme unfairness of our power being used to put a smelter in Quebec at a low price.

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: I am sorry to have to draw this to Your Honour's attention, but the rules are being broken, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. gentleman day in and day out in this House, taking the House on his back. He thinks he can do what he likes. The Question Period is only half an hour, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is making a long-winded political statement in reply to a very simple question that was put to the hon. gentleman to which he could give a brief answer.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: I have come to the end of my response. I would fancy the hon. gentleman who asked the very intelligent question, as contrasted to what his leader did during the Question Period, had thought I was going too long, he would have risen on a point of order. He was interested in the response. I am through with my answer and I look forward to other questions from the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order: It is correct that the Question Period is only thirty minutes and the objective, I suppose, is to ask as many questions and receive as many answers as possible. However, sometimes perhaps the nature of the question might determine the extent of the answer. But indeed questions and answers should be as brief as possible.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It was on April 9 this year, of course, that the minister said that plans for the aluminum smelter looked good. Of course, on May 12 the same minister, the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) said that the court decision on the Upper Churchill could have a negative impact on Newfoundland's ability to attract builders for the aluminum smelter. But let me refer to page 150 of this government's Five Year Plan, Managing all our Resources, and, of course, we are into the fourth year now. Page 150 states that the second major energy objective of this government, is to develop all or part of the 2300 megawatt capacity of the Lower Churchill. And it says there one of the things that that was contingent on was it could be aided by the attraction of a heavy

May 18, 1984

Tape No. 1809

ah-3

MR. CALLAN: industrial user of energy  
to Labrador, of course, obviously referring to an  
aluminum smelter. Let me ask the minister then, since it  
appears, and I think the minister admitted it in his  
sixteen page statement this morning, that this Province  
has lost the fight

MR. CALLAN:

on the Upper Churchill, and we going to just sit idly by and wait and wait and procrastinate and wait for years? Let me ask the minister what plans does government have for the Lower Churchill, the 2,300 megawatts there?

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

~~X~~ MR. MARSHALL: The question, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman realizes since he quoted the minister that heavy industrial user of electricity would very much assist the development of the Lower Churchill in this Province, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the capacity of the Lower Churchill is such that even with a large, intensive energy utilizing industry being established there is still going to be a surplus of power. We cannot, in the short term, use all of the power from Gull Island and Muskrat Falls. Therefore you come back to the same problem that in the short period of time we would have to be able to either sell that power to Quebec or wheel it through Quebec. And I say sell it to Quebec not from the point of view of it being its only broker but Quebec being one of the customers. In other words, sell it to the customer from whom we can get the highest amount. So it is a Pandora's box we are in, that in order to develop that Lower Churchill certainly a heavy user of electricity would be a great aid. But there is going to be a surplus and we come back to the same problem that we got our answer on today. I hope not a final answer, I hope there is going to be impetus put in by the federal government or other concerns and we will get our way out of that Pandora's box.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Belleyue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in responding to the sixteen page Ministerial Statement earlier this morning -

MR. DINN: He made a complete fool of himself.

MR. CALLAN: Well, that is a matter of opinion. - talked about the Anglo-Saxon route. And, of course, the minister, who was in the Moores' government, the Moores' Cabinet, at the time knows about the \$100 million that has been spend on both sides of the Straits, you know, with the hope of transmitting power down through Newfoundland and the Anglo-Saxon route.

Let me ask the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) what is the status of that? Is this administration actively pursuing potential customers in the Eastern United States, in Atlantic Canada? What are the possibilities of the Anglo-Saxon route and, of course, the aluminum smelter at the same time? +

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the Anglo-Saxon route is something that is being considered at all times and assessed. The hon. gentleman will remember - maybe he would not, but the two former Smallwood ministers on the other side of the House will remember - that there was initially a study into

MR. MARSHALL: initially a study into the Anglo-Saxon route by Preece, Cardeau and Ryder, and it indicated, Mr. Speaker, that it was uneconomic at the time. Or maybe it was, I do not know, maybe they just found it more convenient to give it away as they did by passing it over the border. But in any event it looked like it was uneconomic.

Over the period of years now technology has increased and it is becoming more technologically feasible but it is still very questionable whether it is economically feasible. That is the situation.

Now, the hon. gentleman is asking questions himself. He should not rely on the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) as his basis because he is asking good questions himself. I mean, he has to remember that alternative is suggested by the Leader of the Opposition and he knows the answer, the Leader of the Opposition did anyway, and it was untimely to bring it up this morning. But the fact of the matter is another solution the Leader of the Opposition had for a transmission line was to put people one side of the Strait digging a hole underneath with shovels, and on the other side.

MR. DINN: And if they missed you would have two tunnels.

MR. MARSHALL: And if they missed you would have two tunnels, so you would have two for the price of one. I would suggest that what the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) should do, he is asking very credible questions, is please do not refer for his authority to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. X



MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I wonder if the hon. gentleman could tell us if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is coming back into the House?

MR. WARREN: He is out in the common room.

MR. NEARY: He is out in the common room. Because it looks to me like the fishermen and the plant workers in this Province are in for some pretty rough and rocky times in the weeks and days and months ahead. Yesterday negotiations were broken off with the Fishermen's Union between the independent processors. Mr. Speaker, we are told that the independent processors will not be purchasing fish under eighteen inches this year. Now, that is devastating to the income of fishermen. That will cost the inshore fishermen. In addition to all the other losses that they are having, on the caplin and the squid and the herring, because of lack of supply and lack of markets, and because of the escalation of the cost of operating gear and operating their boats and the cost of fuel and so forth, this is going to be devastating.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) obviously does not think it is important enough to stay in his seat. Oh, he is coming in now. Since the minister is supposed to be looking after these matters, will the hon. gentleman tell us what can be done, if anything can be done, to offset this recent setback by the independent processors who are going to refuse to buy fish under eighteen inches in length? This will mean a loss of 25 per cent of their income in addition to what they are now losing because there is no market for squid, caplin and herring, while the cost of operating their gear and equipment and boats is escalating, skyrocketing. Is there anything the hon. gentleman can do, or is he just going to continue to grandstand like he always does? ~~X~~

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

~~X~~ MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, he was asking the question in a sincere way but then he ends up in that stupid political manner again. The fact is there are so many problems today in the fishing industry as I have said for the last two or three years, that we must have more co-operation among all parties, so let the Opposition be more co-operative on the fishing industry because it is so important to so many Newfoundlanders.

Now the issue that was raised in the media this morning by Mr. Cashin, and now by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). The so-called independent companies are really all the companies which are not part of FPI, that is what it means. It is not the independent association, as such, of the small producers. It is the independent linking in that one category all those companies who are not part of, not connected with Fishery Products International. Some of these companies have been saying the last few days that they just cannot see how they can buy any

MR. MORGAN: codfish this year below eighteen inches - last year it was below sixteen - because all of that fish has got to go into cod blocks, and right now we have the worst situation we have had in the marketplace in recent history with regard to inventories of cod blocks left unsold. I recall saying as long as a month or two months ago that there would be a serious problem unless someone in Ottawa, through the Fish Prices Support Board, dealt with it. I recall making that statement to the press media, especially in interviews with the electronic media, saying it then. And I called upon the minister and the officials in Ottawa two months ago to deal with the problem I saw looming, the problem of cod block inventories left unsold and prices being depressed for cod blocks.

MR. MORGAN: Now it is proven that I was right when I was saying what was going to happen. Here we are now, at the commencement of the inshore fishing season and the prices are down below a dollar. There were reports to me a few days ago of cod block selling as low as ninety-two cents U.S. per pound, versus \$1.18 per pound this time last year.

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. MORGAN: They were \$1.18 this time last year.

MR. NEARY: How much are they now, \$1.10?

MR. MORGAN: Below that, they sold as low as ninety-two cents a pound.

MR. NEARY: That would be U.S.?

MR. MORGAN: U.S., and you add the exchange on.

In addition, there are about 25 million pounds of cod block in inventory, in storage in the U.S. - not all from Canada, a lot of it is coming in from Denmark and other places, but it is in inventory, not sold - and that is going to have a disastrous effect on markets for the fish products to be produced by these new companies this year around the Province. I guess it is fair to say there is hardly a day that a serious problem in the fishing industry does not come up.

This one is not new. I told the federal minister and the federal government as long as two months ago, at least two months ago, and they are just sitting there and nothing is happening.

Now, as I said a few days ago, I am not afraid to attack Mr. De Bane; the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is because he was told a few days ago, 'You call a minister in the federal Cabinet a liar

MR. MORGAN: once more and you do not get your appointment to the Senate.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: He was told that.

MR. NEARY: By whom?

MR. MORGAN: Because when he phoned Ottawa, he called Mr. De Bane a liar. I am told by good reliable sources in Ottawa that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was told, 'Do not you dare call a minister in Ottawa again a liar!'

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did say that the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) lied. I stick by it. I reiterate what I said. In that particular matter, the hon. gentleman lied in what he said about the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). Nobody to this day, Mr. Speaker, either in official quarters in Newfoundland, in Ottawa, in the United States, Canada or Russia has spoken to me about it. The hon. gentleman is now lying, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if he is doing it deliberately or not.

MR. NEARY: Well, maybe that is unparliamentary,

MR. MORGAN: I am only saying what I hear.

MR. NEARY: What he hears?

Maybe I should withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, because that is unparliamentary. But the hon. gentleman is stating an untruth, it is incorrect, it is false, it is a figment of his imagination, he is suffering from hallucinations, and, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the hon. gentleman not be permitted to continue making untrue, false statements in this hon. House.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order. As to what was said or not said, I can only assume it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The time for the Question Period has now expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

DR. COLLINS: Motion 4.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion 4, the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission. The debate last day was adjourned by the hon. the member for St. John's Centre.

X DR. MCNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, I have got very little to say on this. I accept the report of the Newfoundland Electoral Boundaries Commission in its totality. If I did not accept that I think we would be here indefinitely in a partisan free-for-all. I must, however, say that there does not seem to be any rhyme or reason or indeed logic in some of the recommendations of that Commission and I think that was emphasized yesterday by speakers on both this side of the House and the other. I realize the Commission was tied,

DR. MCNICHOLAS: if you like, to a certain extent in that they had to divide up Newfoundland and Labrador into fifty-two portions, or perhaps it would be better to say into forty-eight portions in Newfoundland because there are not enough people in Newfoundland to come up to the average required. So they were restricted. The only one thing I would suggest in the future is that they not be restricted so much and that they would take into consideration natural boundaries, whether they are rivers or main streets or townships, and not chop up districts in a rather haphazard way as we heard yesterday has happened in Mount Pearl and Conception Bay South.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, about the extension to St. John's Centre. I have realized for some time, as we all have, that the population of downtown St. John's has decreased, so I am very pleased indeed to see that my district has been extended right up to Prince Philip Drive. I am well aware they are mostly my friends there, they are all Tories, but we might be able to flush out the odd Liberal if we beat around the bushes there. But I would like to tell all of my friends there, the few Liberals and the few NDPs and all the Tories, that after the next election I will be very pleased and honoured to represent all of them again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. MCNICHOLAS: I am sorry for one thing, Mr. Speaker; I am very sorry to lose one small part of my district. The original ad that I read in The Daily News way back in October 19, 1983, on the Electoral Boundaries Delimitation Act indicating the proposed boundaries of St. John's Centre, the lower end of St. John's Centre was left as it was in the last election and in the election before, and that included the Basilica and Presentation Convent and Mercy Convent and the surrounding streets there including Mullock Street, and I am very sorry to see this area removed from the district. There were no representations made at the hearings to take that out of my district and I am very sorry that the commissioners, in their wisdom, in their final report did take it out. If I had had any idea that they would have done so I would have had gone to the hearings and made very strong representations. But I accepted the original proposal in their ad. If I had made representations what I would have done, which would be far more logical to my



DR. MCNICHOLAS: mind, is that the district would have continued up Monkstown Road to Circular Road and Empire Avenue, and we would have a straight line rather than just a little pimple sticking out from St. John's Centre into St. John's East.

However, I do accept the Commission's recommendation in that regard. I am very sorry about it because these people there, the nuns and many of the clergymen, they were all friends of mine. The nuns were friends, they were patients, and they taught my children since their infant days and I am very sorry to lose them. I can assure them that even though they will be no longer in my district, I will be more than pleased to look after and represent them in any way I can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one obvious mistake in the Western boundary of my district and I can show it to anybody because I brought along the map here.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: On one part of the Western boundary it says here, 'Thence running along said centre line of Cookstown Road, Newtown Road, and Linscott Street to its intersection with the centre line of Merrymeeting Road.' As far as I can see, Mr. Speaker, that is an impossible situation, or maybe you could call it an impassable situation. Because if you want to go, as far as I can read here on the map, from Cookstown Road to Linscott Street via Newtown road, you have to get a helicopter, get it at the end of Cookstown Road and helicopter into Linscott Street or into Newtown Road, touch down on Newtown Road and then get the helicopter back to Linscott Street.

There is not direct connection between these streets, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that that is a mistake that needs to be rectified, because the direct line from Cookstown Road to Linscott Street is via Pennywell Road and not Newtown Road.

I know that Newtown Road is a border in my district on that Western boundary, but further North. So one thing that concerns me is that it looks as if that section of Pennywell Road will not have representation in this House of Assembly unless there is an amendment brought in to rectify that mistake. I am sorry the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is not here, because I think he would be more than willing to second a motion, Mr. Speaker, that the proposed boundary joining Cookstown Road to Linscott Street be as follows: Cookstown Road, Pennywell Road, Linscott Street.

Now, instead of making that motion I think I will defer it and I will bring it up in Committee stage, and maybe, in the meantime, this matter will be looked into so that the residents on that portion of Pennywell Road will have representation in

DR. MCNICHOLAS: this House of Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I have no intention of delaying the passage of this bill.

MR. CARTER: Shut up and sit down. You are out of order.

MR. NEARY: Go back to the savory patch, boy. It is too wet out today to get on your knees, so instead of getting on your knees in the savory patch, you get on your knees in the caucus and crawl around over there.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to delay the passage of this bill. There are a couple of things I would like to say about it, however, First of all, I want to commend the members of the Boundary Commission under Judge Rupert Bartlett. I think they did a very commendable job under the circumstances. I know each individual personally and I think under the circumstances they did very well, and I will explain what I mean by 'under the circumstances' shortly.

MR. SIMMS: Considering the legislation.

MR. NEARY: Well, considering the terms of reference they were given. They were given terms of reference by the administration there opposite that tied their hands behind their backs.

MR. SIMMS: Not by this administration.

MR. NEARY: By this administration, yes.

MR. SIMMS: The legislation dates back to 1975.

MR. NEARY: Was that a Tory administration or was it a communist administration? That legislation could have been amended.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that as good as the members of the commission were, and I appeared before the commission and I made representation, they were handcuffed, their hands were tied behind their backs. They could not, for instance, consider reducing the number of members of this House, the number of districts in this Province. And that is something, Mr. Speaker, that will be considered by a successive administration. In my opinion there are ten members too many in this House.

MR. SIMMS: That is the same thing 'Garfield' said yesterday.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we discussed it in caucus so why should he not say it? We are of the same mind, our hearts beat as one.

I would suggest that if Frank Moores left a legacy to the Tory Party it was the fact that he created ten districts in Tory St.

John's. One street in St. John's has more power and more authority than the whole of Labrador, the whole of the Great Northern Peninsula, Mr. Speaker.

Now I am not saying that St. John's should be denied anything. It is the seat of government and they are going to get everything they are entitled to anyway. They are going to get their due, they are going to get their rights. The newspapers are here, the public service is here, they are going to get everything they are entitled to and I am not trying to take anything away from them. But, Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to the rest of Newfoundland. You have two Newfoundlands. You have St. John's and you have the other Newfoundland. With such a heavy concentration of members in St. John's and so many of them in the Cabinet,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, five out of the ten members in St. John's and surrounding areas are in the Cabinet, six by the way, if you include the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor).

MR. SIMMS: That is not St. John's.

MR. NEARY: It is St. John's. It is in the metropolitan area— Six out of the ten are in the Cabinet. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, why the decisions made in Cabinet are oriented towards St. John's, why the West Coast cannot get consideration for a convention centre because they wanted to give it to their Tory buddies in St. John's. Mr. Speaker, why is it that the narrow, buttoned-down minds of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and his minion Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), always think about St. John's and never think about the rest of the Province?

DR. COLLINS: A good example was when we brought in the retail sales tax for Labrador West.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we saw what they did with the synchrolift and the effect that is having on Marystown, and how they want to keep the Russian here, to keep Russians inside our 200 mile management zone. They want to establish gas storage tanks in Lewisporte to accommodate the Russians so they can change their crews here. We are trying to get the Russians out and hon. gentlemen are trying to keep them here.

MR. SIMMS: Say that often enough and you will believe it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is true. The hon. gentleman should go and try to do something for the Mary March museum that the people are calling me about down there and the other problems.

DR. COLLINS: Do you not want Russian aircraft using Gander?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, there they are. Everything

MR. NEARY: is little political games with them. They want to make a little announcement about a kilometer of road or the Mary March Museum, so call a press conference, play politics as if they were taking it out of their own pocket, as if they were digging down in their own pockets. That is the trouble with this crowd. They are grandstanding and playing little political games all the time with people. They are making people feel like they are getting this as a privilege when it is their right, Mr. Speaker. I was down last night in St. Lawrence where I spoke to a high school graduation which over 400 people attended and they gave me a standing ovation. And do you know what the people right from Marystown down to Burin and Lawn told me? They told me the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) issued a press release the other day announcing a couple of kilometers of road - as if it was coming out of his own pocket - and the people down there calculated at that rate their road would be finished by the year 2000. We were laughing and joking about it. The people are entitled to that as a right, not as a privilege from a Tory regime or a Tory administration. They think because they can pass out little goodies and little bits and pieces of money here and there that it is going to save their necks. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to save their necks. So what we are saying is that there are ten members too many in this House and we can see the result of it every day. For instance, take the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). What a useless hulk in this hon. House. You have ten useless sticks of furniture over there. They are just like the wooded indians you used to see outside the stores down on Water Street advertising cigars. They have wooden heads, they are wooden indians, useless hulks. They are monkeys on the taxpayers back.

MR. ANDREWS: Will you make some sense for a change!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should talk to the people down in Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. They have been crying out looking for him now for the last year or two, the silent member they are calling him.

Mr. Speaker, there are ten members too many in this House. We could save the taxpayers a million dollars a year by reducing the number of members in this House. Many of the St. John's members are practicing law downtown and their income from the House of Assembly merely pays their income tax.

MR. TOBIN: Wait now. You have more members practicing law downtown than we on this side. There are more members over there practicing law downtown than there are over here.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, apart from the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) there is not one member on this side of the House who represents a St. John's district.

MR. DINN: It would be a sacrilege for St. John's to elect a Liberal.

MR. TOBIN: We have no-one over here practicing.

MR. NEARY: That is what I said, apart from the member for Mount Scio. Up to the time the hon. gentleman shafted the crowd over there because he could not stomach them any longer and then came over here, Mr. Speaker, up to that time no member on this side of the House represented a St. John's riding. When the electoral boundaries recommendations are adopted by this House, my

MR. NEARY: hon. friend will not be representing a St. John's riding, he will be representing a rural riding, Bell Island-Mount Scio. So, Mr. Speaker, that is our first point; too many members, too much authority in St. John's. We can see it in the policies that are evolving every day in the Ministerial Statements that are announced in this House, completely neglecting rural Newfoundland. There are two Newfoundlands, there is one inside the Donovans Overpass and the one outside. And everytime I go to Western Newfoundland, I was out there last week again, everytime I go out there the people feel alienated.

MR. SIMMS: Another standing ovation.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I did, by the way. And that is an absolute fact, I did, at a high school graduation again in Port aux Basques.

Mr. Speaker, they feel alienated on the West Coast, in the Western part of this Province, they feel that all the administration's effort is concentrated in St. John's and on the Avalon Peninsula, and they say you can see that in the construction that is going ahead, pretty well all of it taking place on the East Coast. They feel left out, they have no input, their members are weak, they are like jellyfish, Mr. Speaker, and they are frustrated. The people on the West Coast, the Western part of this Province are angry about the way they are being treated, and you will find the same thing in Central Newfoundland, on the Northeast Coast, White Bay, Mr. Speaker, you will find it in Placentia Bay, any area outside the Donovans Overpass. They have tunnel vision. They cannot see beyond Donovans Overpass. My hon. colleague from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) knows that. And when they do go outside the Overpass, they want the people to kiss the hem of their garment when they flick out a little good, a couple of kilometers of road, or a few dollars for a museum.



MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker,  
I saw something that happened the other day that the hon. gentleman, by the way, is going to be taken to task about, \$100,000 worth of support for the Rising Tide Theatre. Nobody is denying the fact that the Rising Tide Theatre is entitled to \$100,000 worth of support. I am all for it, I know personally the people involved and they are doing a wonderful job for the arts in this Province, But why was the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council by-passed? Why was it not funnelled through them? The hon. gentleman passed out a few goodies to try to bring a little benefit and a little prestige to himself.

MR. SIMMS: The hon. member obviously knows nothing about what he is talking about. It will not cost us \$100,000 and it has nothing to do with the Arts Council.

MR. NEARY: \$100,000 worth of support. It does have something to do with the Arts Council. The hon. gentleman ignored the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council, and they resent it. They were not consulted. They resent it very much. The hon. gentleman was trying to no doubt to work up a little support for the leadership down the road somewhere when the Premier resigns as he told us from Edmonton that he is going to do.

It is a very dangerous practice the hon. gentleman is becoming embroiled in, passing out little goodies and deciding who will be assisted. Why not let the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council do it as they were set up to do.

DR. COLLINS: They have an office in St. John's.

MR. NEARY: Well, we set them up and now you are going to shoot them down, to ignore them.

DR. COLLINS: So you feel that grant should have gone to the office in St. John's?

MR. NEARY: Well, that is where it is going the Rising Tide Theatre.

DR. COLLINS: No, Rising Tide is province-wide now.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is not province-wide or it would have gone through the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council. They are province-wide. The hon. gentleman made a mistake by ignoring them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we understand that the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), and the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) are uptight over the recommendations of the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

MR. NEARY: They are scared, and rightly so. They are scared that they are losing some of their power base and rightly so,

but that is no reason to delay the passage of this bill. I know hon. gentlemen there opposite would like for us to move a six month hoist to delay the passing of this bill for six months. That has been suggested outside the House in the corridors. But, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to accept the recommendations. Last time the report that was brought in was jerrymandered by a Tory administration. The late Judge Higgins made recommendations and they were jerrymandered out of existence. You could not recognize the report, the recommendations when they were brought into the House. And now the Bartlett Commission have tried to rectify some of the damage that was done at that time. But, Mr. Speaker, the trouble is that under the terms of reference they were not allowed to change the number of districts, they had to just move boundaries and change populations here and there. And that is why the hon. gentleman has that pimple that he was talking about earlier this morning. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough and the day will come when it will be looked at, the number of seats, the number of members in this House. If we are going to talk about restraint, well, then let us be men enough to face up to it.

MR. WARREN: There may be an amendment.

MR. NEARY: My hon. colleague probably has an amendment ready to reduce the number of seats in this House by ten. Now, Mr. Speaker, that would be

MR. NEARY: very worthwhile, would save the taxpayers \$1 million, keep the hospital beds open, put students to work, help out the Mary March Museum, look after the sick and the disabled, the crippled and the poor and the Native people.

MR. CALLAN: It would put a couple of miles of pavement down in Southwest Arm.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not think \$1 million would do that.

MR. CALLAN: Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: It would. But anyway if we are going to show the people of this Province that we mean what we say, cut the number of seats in St. John's in half, because that is the legacy that Mr. Moores left the Tory party in this Province. He put ten seats in Tory St. John's. He figured that when they start out in an election they would start out with a handicap, they would have the edge, the dice would be loaded, the cards stacked. Mr. Speaker, that will only work for a certain length of time and then they will get the dart and the jolt. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything else I can say about it.

DR. COLLINS: Could you deal with the motion now?

MR. NEARY: I am dealing with the motion, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is anything else I can say about it except that we are very concerned about this alienation that is developing. One time it was felt only in Labrador, where the people felt



MR. NEARY:

bit, but I can tell hon. gentlemen that there is another revolution taking place in this Province, in Central and Western Newfoundland and on the North Shore of Conception Bay, the Southern Shore and on the Northeast Coast, on the Great Northern Peninsula and throughout Labrador: Get rid of this urban government! They can only think in terms of things that will help the city and not the rural parts of this Province. That is why the fishery is in such an incredible mess as it is in today, as is the forest industry, the pulp and paper industry, the mining industry, no rural development agreement. Hon. gentlemen can only think about their own little political hides and downtown St. John's, and the decisions are made by, as I like to refer to them, the Tory cocktail set in St. John's East. That is where all the decisions are made.

MR. DINN: Most of them applaud Chretien.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is what they do, and rightly so. I happened to be there,

MR. TULK: Have you supported Chretien publicly?

MR. NEARY: No, but I like the man very much. I think he is a great Liberal and a great Canadian. I also like Mr. Turner, and I am having, Mr. Speaker, restless nights, sleepless nights agonizing over which one I am going to support finally.

DR. COLLINS: There is not much you can do about it.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. DINN: He did not look too good on T.V. the other night when he was asked about Lalonde's telephone call.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and he told the truth about it.

DR. COLLINS: It is like being on a sinking ship. Is it better to stay on the sinking ship or jump overboard?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Anyway, when future boundaries commissions are established, let us hope that the legislation will be changed, that the boundaries commission will be given wide-ranging terms of reference so that they, not the party in power, can decide whether or not we have too many members, how the districts in Newfoundland and Labrador should be carved up. Just look at it, Mr. Speaker.

That great territory of Labrador has four districts, four members and then, if you take in the two on the Great Northern Peninsula, there are six members, taking in Bay of Islands there are seven, and coming down to Exploits there are eight. You can start at Exploits and go right up the Great Northern Peninsula, and that whole of Labrador and they do not have as many members as the city of St. John's. Now, that is something worth thinking about, Mr. Speaker, because it is awfully frustrating for the people out there to imagine that they are getting a fair deal from this administration. A great feeling of alienation is developing.

MR. DINN: That is your kind of philosophy.

MR. NEARY: Every time I go to Corner Brook I hear it, every time I go to my own district I hear it.

MR. DINN: You hear it twice a year?

MR. NEARY: Twice a year, how are you!  
Twenty-two times last year I went to Port aux Basques.

MR. WARREN: I am the only one keeping Naskaupi in the news. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) is useless.

May 18, 1984

Tape 1821

EC - 3

MR. NEARY:                    That is right. And, by the way, my colleague here probably is doing more to promote Labrador than any other member of this House. He keeps Labrador in the news.



MR. NEARY: He is a good member. I wish I had a dozen more like him, Mr. Speaker. He is a wonderful member. He will be elected as long as he wants in the district of Torngat Mountains.

MR. SIMMS: Do you think he will run for leadership?

MR. NEARY: I hope he does run for the leadership.

Mr. Speaker, as I said from the beginning, I am not going to belabour the point. I think I have made it sufficiently well. I want to again commend the members of the commission. They are all friends of mine. I do not know if they are all Liberals or not, but they are fine people.

MR. WARREN: One thing about you is you have Tory friends, but they have no Liberal friends.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, we do have a few Tory friends. Last night I went to the staff room in the school in St. Lawrence -

MR. WARREN: How many people were down there last night?

MR. NEARY: Over 400.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - before we went to the banquet and there were eighteen teachers there. Mr. Speaker, I wish I had a transcript of the conversation, I only wish I had a transcript. No wonder the hon. gentleman is out in Western Canada. I have to say this, when Mr. Trudeau got in trouble on the Canadian scene domestically and they could not get his image up, they could not get the polls up on the national scene, the image makers, the experts moved him into the international field and turned him into a peacemaker to see if that could get the polls up and his image up -

MR. WARREN: It worked! It worked!

MR. NEARY: - it did not work - and the

MR. NEARY: administration here are trying the same thing. The Premier cannot get the polls up, cannot get his image up, cannot get the morale of the party up on the provincial scene, so he moves into the national scene. Now he is depressed and frustrated! Nobody is paying any attention to him so he is sulking and pouting. Now he is sending word back he is going to come back and resign. He is trying to get a little sympathy for himself.

MR. WARREN: Did he see Wayne Gretzky last night?

MR. NEARY: Well, his trips are tied in very nicely with the hockey games and with the Super bowl. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I think I said enough on this now. How much am I allowed, an hour or what?

MR. WARREN: You have half an hour yet, 'Steve'.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): Well, yesterday when we started this debate there was an agreement that everyone would go for thirty minutes, but the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary) was not here at the time and he does automatically have an hour.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not going to take an hour, Mr. Speaker. I said everything I want to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We are going to vote in favour of the bill. We are disappointed that it does not go a little further.

MR. CALLAN: We are sorry about the pimple.

MR. NEARY: We are sorry about the hon. gentleman's pimple. But I am sure that t. John's is adequately represented in the Cabinet and in this House and I am sure that the hon. gentleman knows how to prick that pimple if he wants to. So, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing else I can say. I think my colleagues have already spoken. ✕

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.  
As the district of St. John's West has taken on a whole new dimension, of course, with the re-evaluation of boundaries, I think it is necessary to stand and speak on the matter. Unlike the speaker before me I do not think it necessary to waste the time of the House on such unrelated issues as he kept bringing into his discussion. However, I would like to state that several people from my district and I appeared before the Boundaries Commission. Basically I think we more or less congratulated them on the preliminary design that we had before us at that time. The distribution appeared to be quite relevant and in keeping with the terms of reference that the Commission were working under, and the redistribution as it affected my district, although it increases the size by almost -

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

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

MR. WARREN: We do not have a quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

QUORUM CALL

MR. SPEAKER: There is a quorum present. Is it agreed on both sides to waive the three minute delay?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. BARRETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Unlike some of the members who spoke opposite, I think it is the understanding of members on this side that we are here to represent the people of this Province and that there has been some attempt made to distribute elected representatives on some form of population distribution equalization basis. We do not count the cats and dogs in our communities as possible electors or reasons for population distribution, and we feel it very necessary and in keeping with the political process that all the people of our Province have adequate representation. And if that means having eleven or twelve or thirty-five members in a particular urban area, it does not necessarily suggest that it should be otherwise because there are some rural areas that are more sparsely populated. The distribution certainly seems to be most equitable and it is certainly working and the people of this city, of which my district is part, have an equal right to representation as does any other citizen of this Province. I do not think that they should be inconvenienced by a much wider interpretation of the population distribution.

As the member for the district of St. John's West I welcome the addition to my district. It has now more than doubled in size and just about doubled in population. The extension to the boundaries included such new streets to the district as Winchester Street, an extension to Empire Avenue, Monchy Street, Hamel Street, Liverpool Street, Suez Street, Cairo Street, Malta Street, an extension to Mundy Pond Road, Murphy's Lane, James Lane, Amherst Heights, Amherst Place, Colville Place, Kennedy Road, Nightingale Road, Boyle Place, Lloyd Crescent, Noad Place, Pynn's Place, Eastaff Street, Bartlett Place, Berry Street, Martin Crescent, Forbes Street, and several others. That is an indication of the size and responsibilities that an urban

MR. BARRETT: member has to a population, an indication, Mr. Speaker, that this redistribution recognized a more equitable evaluation within the city boundaries. I look forward with a great deal of pleasure to being able to continue to represent this expanded area of my district as I have represented the existing part of the district which remains unchanged. I am sure that the good people of the expanded area will obviously support this side of the House as they have done in the past.

Mr. Speaker, without taking undue time of the House, I just wanted to mention the extent of the expansion to the district of St. John's West and in so doing recognize the reasons for the expansion and our total acceptance of the report in this connection. +

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

+ DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, just a very few words on this motion. The reason why I rise is that I just cannot leave on the record what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said a few moments ago. He gave us, you know, vintage Liberal stuff. Hon. members will recall that during the Smallwood years his administration was always called Her Majesty's rural government, that was sort of a nickname put on it, and the Liberal Party has always tried to pit rural Newfoundland against the urban parts of Newfoundland. This is vintage stuff. They feel that it is to their advantage

DR. COLLINS:

to cause dissension in our Province, because that is what it is. It is damaging to our social fabric to have one section of the community on a locational basis against another section. We are one Province, we are one Newfoundland people, we will rise or fall together, and to take an approach where you cause deliberately dissension in the body politic is reprehensible and it is dangerous, but it is typical Liberalism. Now that is not so with the PC party. The PC party is now represented throughout the Province, At one time it was confined relatively sharply to the urban areas but in recent years, in the past decade or so, there has been a revolution in Newfoundland and now the vast majority of rural Newfoundland is represented by the PC party. And, of course, the urban parts of Newfoundland, and I am referring to St. John's, Grand Falls, Corner Brook and so on and so forth, continue to be represented by the PC party. So this is what this government and our party stands for, the integration and the forward thrust as a united people by Newfoundlanders and that is to be contrasted with the vintage image that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) put forward this morning, which fits in totally with the Liberal philosophy, and that is turn one part of our Province against another. If it is not rural Newfoundland against the urban, it is Labrador against the Island, this sort of thing. This is typical Liberal dissensionism and, of course, it is to be deprecated, the people of this Province have rejected it by the way they vote and the representation they put in this House, and that is why we are so disparate here, why there are so many people on this side and so few on that side over there, because the people of Newfoundland are fed up with this dissension and division that the Liberal party promotes in this Province and they are overwhelmingly

DR. COLLINS: behind and supportative of the approach that the PC party makes in this Province. Now I would just like to emphasize that in a few words more. On the West Coast of this Province, we have very strong ministers representing that area: We have the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House). In the Central part of Newfoundland, we have strong ministers representing that part; the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), an extremely important portfolio for the whole of the Province and we have the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms). In Labrador, even though there is a very small number of people in Labrador compared to the population, we have a very strong, dedicated minister there who has made his mark in the history of this Province almost to the extent that no other minister has ever made his mark, and, of course, I am referring to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie). On the South Coast of this Province we have a minister carrying on an extremely important function, we have the Minister for the Environment (Mr. Andrews). On the Avalon Peninsula outside St. John's we have very strong ministers; we have the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), we have the Minister of Communications (Mr. Doyle) and we have the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), all outside the urban areas on the Avalon Peninsula. And, of course, not neglecting the Northeast Coast where we have the minister of all ministers, the prime minister, the first amongst equals, the Premier of this Province representing the North East Coast and of course he is ably backed - and everyone knows this and there is no doubt about it - ably backed by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). So this administration has got strong ministers

May 18, 1984

Tape No. 1824

MJ - 3

DR. COLLINS: in all areas in the Province,  
we have elected members in all areas of the Province. This  
administration, more than any other administration has knit  
this Province together and knit Newfoundlanders together.  
Mr. Speaker, with just those few remarks I certainly support  
this motion and I call for the question.



On motion, resolution on Electoral Boundaries, carried.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I believe Your Honour will recall that the House agreed the other day that when this motion was passed that the House would then proceed with the introduction of the bill and we would go through the various stages of the bill in the one sitting.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to go on with the bill?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.  
Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act," carried. (Bill No. 32).

On motion, Bill No. 32 read a first and second time.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the said bill be now referred to a Committee of the Whole House?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: My understanding was that members of the House agreed the other day that it would not be necessary to go back into Committee, that we would undertake it that all stages of the bill would be dealt with once the motion was passed. That was my understanding.

MR. SPEAKER: The House has to go into Committee to discuss the clauses of the bill and then come back out.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded that this is not a precedent we are setting here. We do it now because that is one of the bills we happen to agree with, but I hope it is not going to create any kind of a precedent.

On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on said bill, Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Order, please!

Bill No. 32, a bill, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act."

On motion, clause 1, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 2 carry?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the amendment will be an amendment to the tenth line by striking out the words 'Newtown Road' and by substituting the words 'Freshwater Road'.

On motion, amendment carried.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for St. John's Centre.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: I just brought up that matter earlier today and I mentioned that if we did not change it Pennywell Road may not be represented. I can see that we could go from Cookstown Road to Linscott Street either via Pennywell Road or Freshwater Road, so, obviously, Freshwater Road is the way to go and it will mean that Linscott Street, in St. John's Center, will be just a very small part of that street, adjacent to the First Day Adventist School.

DR. MCNICHOLAS: I know that the remainder of Pennywell Road is very well represented by my colleague, the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), and I would hate anybody to think that I was in anyway suggesting otherwise. I did not realize that they had such very capable representation.

On motion, clause 2

as amended, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Shall clause 3 carry?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. WARREN: I do not know if I have this in its proper prospective or not, but I would like to move, seconded by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), that the number of seats in the Newfoundland Legislature be reduced from fifty-two to forty-two.

MR. PATTERSON: Starting with yours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: My understanding is that that would be totally out of order, that such a motion could not be brought in at this stage. That is dealing with the principle of the bill. That is one point. But, of course, the main point is that the numbers of seats in this House are not set by this bill. There is a House of Assembly Act, and the House of Assembly Act sets the representation in this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

As to that amendment it is my understanding that the House has already accepted the motion to accept the report of the commission and any amendment that is made is made only to correct any error

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): in the report. So I would rule that the amendment is out of order at this time.

On motion, clause 3, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 32 with amendment, carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker, returned to the Chair.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and direct me to report having passed Bill No. 32 with amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again, presently, by leave.

On motion, amendments read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The House Of Assembly Act", read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 15).

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

X  
DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce this bill for second reading on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) who is unavoidably absent.

DR. COLLINS: These are amendments to the Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act and these amendments have been discussed fully with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and there has been full agreement by that association with the changes brought in and many of them, of course, were brought in because of requests on their part for the study by the Department of Education. They agreed with the requests and recommendations and then they were put into this bill.

Mr. Speaker, a fair number of these, like so many pension requirements and sections in acts, are of a somewhat technical nature. I think that, nevertheless, the explanatory notes attached to the bill lay them out. I would suggest that rather than going through them at this particular stage one by one, if there are any points for clarification that should be brought up, hon. members will bring them out. But, as I say, there are ten clauses, there is a comment in the explanatory notes on each one of those clauses, it lays out exactly what the clauses are designed to do, and as I said, these clauses are being amended in conjunction with and in conformity with suggestions and recommendations and agreements with the Newfoundland Teachers' Association.

I move second reading. X

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

X MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing, you know, what a little pressure can do. Ever since the House last met, we have received petitions from all over the Province. Each member from his own district has

MR. NEARY: received individual petitions from teachers requesting these changes to the Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act. So, Mr. Speaker, we are delighted that the administration have yielded to the pressure, and we can only take the hon. gentleman at his word, that there was prior consultation with the NTA on these matters and that they are in complete agreement. Do I understand the hon. gentleman correctly? Is the hon. gentleman saying that the NTA are in agreement with these changes, these amendments? And, if so, were there any that they are not satisfied with? Were there some left out that should have been in, or are they all in, Mr. Speaker? Because, I must say, it is a rather technical thing, the half of it I do not understand. X

DR. COLLINS: There were extensive discussions between the Department of Education and the NTA.

MR. NEARY: And they are quite happy with it?

DR. COLLINS: And they are quite happy with it?

MR. NEARY: Well, if they are happy with it, Mr. Speaker, so are we.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave. (Bill No. 15).

DR. COLLINS: Order 12, Mr. Speaker.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Establish The Heritage Foundation Of Newfoundland And Labrador." (Bill No. 33).

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

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is to establish officially the Heritage Foundation of Newfoundland and Labrador, which has been a commitment of the government since, I guess, two years ago when it was first announced in the Throne Speech as an intention of the government and, subsequent to that, of course, there have been funds appropriated in the budget for the operation of the Foundation.

Just very briefly, I might say the mandate of the Foundation will be to stimulate an understanding of and an appreciation for the architectural heritage of the Province,

MR. SIMMS: What has happened in the past is that over many, many years we have had requests from interested groups and interested organizations requesting some sort of professional assessment and funding to assist them in the preservation of a variety of heritage projects, many of which, of course, were of real significance to the Province. We could not find it possible to address these requests simply because we did not have a programme and, therefore, no funding to meet this particular need. But we believe there is a very significant need for it, and it has become evident that a serious attempt to preserve a significant amount of the Province's built heritage needs to be undertaken, therefore, my department was directed some time ago to do some preparatory work for the establishment of a foundation which would have the mandate to fund the stabilization of heritage valued properties in the private sector. We have also had broad consultations with many heritage groups in the Province. In fact, I think somewhere in the order of sixty groups have communicated with us, or we have communicated with them during the past year or so indicating to them what our intentions were, what our ideas were with respect to the development of the foundation and we received a very positive response and a very favourable response. In the budget, Mr. Speaker, we have appropriated an amount of \$200,000 for this present fiscal year to begin the work of the foundation. I want to address, if I might, the question of how the programme will be implemented. There would be two stages, really. The first would involve the establishment of a registry,



MR. SIMMS: a provincial registry of heritage structures, work which is already underway, and the second step would be to establish the foundation which would then have the power to designate buildings to the registry and approve any restoration grants. Both of these steps, of course, would occur concurrently, at the same time. The foundation itself, as outlined in the legislation, will be a duly constituted legal body comprising of seven to twelve board members appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and reporting directly to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth. (Mr. Simms)

MR. NEARY: I hope he will be non-partisan, like the hon. gentleman always is.

MR. SIMMS: Non-partisan. In fact, they will be people, hopefully, people with specific historic interests, maybe historians; you would need maybe an accountant on the board, and a lawyer, that type of person. In addition, it is proposed to have geographical representation on that board and, as I say, these people would have the required technical expertise in carrying out the duties that they would have to do. The board will be required to make representations to the minister on the operation of the foundation, be required to authorize research of existing and possible registered sites, arrange for the development and production of educational material, designate buildings to be included in the registry that I previously mentioned, and then, of course, consider and approve grants for the restoration of buildings. Grants will be provided for external and structural repairs and will not normally be made for internal furnishings or decoration work or for utilities and building services. There would be a maximum limit on

MR. SIMMS:

the individual grants in any one year to a successful applicant. And I just want to briefly address why we would need a foundation as opposed to a government department. The reasons are very straightforward. First of all, a government department would not have in its existing staff structure a sufficient number of people to deal with this particular problem; secondly, a government department would not have the advantage of having geographical representation in making decisions; and the other major thing is that government projects do not always invoke the community support or the sense of community pride that is necessary for the success of this type of project. And so for those reasons and others, including the fact that the foundation, of course, will have much greater flexibility because it would be able to obtain funds from the private sector and because a foundation board can invest its funds and gain interest, we think that this particular process is much, much more compatible to what we really want to do.

So, as I said, I have outlined the nature of the grants and that there would be maximum limitations and so on and so forth. This legislation and what is outlined in the bill is really a broad outline of how the foundation would be constituted and operated. Obviously, there is still much work to be done on the establishment of the criteria or designation for establishing the format for the registry, developing the appropriate application forms and so on, and obviously we have to undertake a comprehensive educational and information programme which will be set up by the foundation itself.

It is straightforward, I think it is a major step forward in an attempt by his government to preserve the Province's heritage and I sincerely seek the support of the members of the House. I think, as I say, it is a significant step forward in our

MR. SIMMS: attempts to preserve the Province's heritage.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of curiosity, are we moving towards finishing the House today? because if we are, I doubt if we can make it by 1:00 p.m. Will we stop the clock at 1:00 p.m.? Is that what the hon. gentleman has in mind? Could he tell us how many more pieces of legislation are for second reading?

DR. COLLINS: About four or five. I do not think they are controversial, or that type of thing.

MR. NEARY: What will we do, stop the clock at 1:00 p.m.?

DR. COLLINS: If it is agreeable, yes.

MR. NEARY: His Honour is standing by, I presume, to come in and sign the bills, is he not?

DR. COLLINS: Yes. No problem with that.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed then to stop the clock at 1:00 p.m.?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief. I think I have to agree with the hon. minister that there was \$100,000 in last year's budget that was not spent because the foundation was not in place. And I notice this year, instead of \$100,000 there is a figure of \$200,000 going to be spent. So we are going to pay up for the year we lost, last year. However, I hasten to also say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister must have been out to lunch for the past year. Why did he not bring the bill in last year so at least the foundation could have been in full-swing

May 18, 1984

Tape No. 1829

SD - 3

MR. WARREN:

instead of waiting an extra year?

I am quite pleased, also, Mr.

Speaker, that the minister mentioned that there would be geographical representation on the board. I think that is very, very valuable.

MR. WARREN: And let us hope that this Board will be provincially represented, much more than most of the Boards that this government have put in place. Because, Mr. Speaker, about 80 per cent of the members on every board that this government have put in place are from this side of the Overpass. Let us look at the geography of this Province and let us make sure that if there are going to be eleven or twelve members on this Board, that all Newfoundland and Labrador will get fair representation. Mr. Speaker, as for historians and people with historical backgrounds, I can assure the hon. minister that you can go out over the Overpass and you will find them; you will find them in Grand Falls, I am sure you will find them out in Corner Brook, you will find them in Clarenville, you will find them in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, you will even find them in Nain, Mr. Speaker. So I would like to tell the minister I agree with the foundation and I also agree that there has to be geographical representation. So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill. X

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

X MR. SIMMS: First of all, I want to address the question of why we did not bring the legislation in last year. The answer is quite simple actually. We have been having very broad consultations with interest groups and communications back and forth for a considerable period of time, and we have given them the opportunity to have some input into it. In fact, what is in the legislation really reflects the opinion, I think, of those groups in the Province who would have some interest in this particular matter. So that is the reason.

MR. SIMMS: Secondly, with respect to the Board I do not think the hon. member can in all sincerity just stand there and toss out the figure of 80 per cent of all boards appointed by this government -

MR. WARREN: 75 per cent.

MR. SIMMS: - being represented by people this side of the Overpass. That is just not accurate. I am quite sure he just saying it to get headlines, I suppose.

MR. WARREN: 75 per cent.

MR. SIMMS: In fact, any of the boards that I have appointed or I am familiar with at all are very representative geographically of the Province in general and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: And I want to assure the hon. member what he has said is just not true. And in the case of the foundation that will be established, I can assure him that there will be good geographical representation by people with the proper expertise to serve on such a significant foundation.

I move second reading, Mr. Speaker. X

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Establish The Heritage Foundation Of Newfoundland And Labrador", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently, by leave. (Bill No. 33).

Motion, second reading, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Elevators Act". (Bill No. 3). ✓

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Russell): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

X MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I can cover this relatively quickly. The purpose of the amendment is to bring tower cranes and overhead travelling cranes under The Elevators Act. We have a very good elevator inspection group in the Department of Labour and Manpower now and whilst the general

MR. DINN: application of inspection is under the Occupational Health and Safety Act, it is felt that for regulatory purposes etc. should bring these under The Elevators Act itself.

So I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Elevators Act", read a second time, ordered referred to the Committee of the Whole House, presently, by leave. (Bill No.3).

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Govern Collective Bargaining Between The Government Of The Province And The Interns And Residents In The Province". (Bill No. 19).

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

~~X~~  
MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I think hon. gentlemen will recall that during the last set of negotiations with interns and residents there were some problems with the negotiations and indeed we had, on March 1, 1982, approximately 180 residents and interns commence the withdrawal of services.

One of the things that the interns and residents brought up during negotiations was the fact that they wanted their own Collective Bargaining Act. And it was agreed at the bargaining table that a task force would be set up to investigate and report back on the setting up of collective bargaining for interns and residents. The task force deliberated and listened to arguments and so on, and brought back their recommendations.

MR. DINN:

Government accepted all the recommendations of the task force report and as a result of that we have the bill you see before the House today which provides for the capability of collective bargaining, with certain nuances in the bill that are specific to interns and residents. As an example, during the collective bargaining process, when the interns and residents get conciliation services from the department of Labour and Manpower and as they proceed through the negotiations, they have the same capability in this piece of legislation as is in the Teachers' Collective Bargaining Act, whereby there is not a decision made by the Minister of Labour and Manpower as to whether to set up a conciliation board or not. Once they request a conciliation board it is an automatic function, that conciliation board is set up to determine or to provide that conciliation service. In most sets of negotiations the decision to set up or not to set up a conciliation board is left with the Minister of Labour and Manpower. The interns and residents, as a result of the task force report, have agreed with the fact that they get conciliation board service when the request comes in for that service. So other than that there are not too many differences between this act and the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, and subject to any questions hon. members may have, I move second reading. X

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Mountains.

The hon. the member for Torngat

X MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, we have no objections in seeing the interns and residents coming under collective bargaining in this Province. In fact, Mr. Speaker, why should they not?



MR. WARREN: I would like to throw a couple of questions out to the minister. Are these interns and residents now members of NAPE or are they going to be in the NAPE Association? I presume the minister did have consultation with the residents and interns, are they presently in favour of this bill or are there sections of this bill that they are quite concerned about? The second thing, Mr. Speaker, is about essential employees. I have not had a chance to go through the bill in a thorough manner but I hope that as essential employees this bill will make it mandatory that those interns and residents cannot walk out of a hospital in the heat of a strike, that they will be required to perform their duties, which are essential in the medical profession?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. WARREN: No, I asked him for the answer to a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I will agree if it is permissible in the House. If the hon. member wants to continue to kind of ask questions on this thing because it is important, perhaps the hon. member could ask the questions when we are going through it clause by clause in Committee.

MR. WARREN: I might not know the answers but I know the questions.

MR. DINN: The interns and residents have their own association and they chose their own bargaining agent to go in and negotiate with Treasury Board and the Hospital Association. But during the last set

MR. DINN: of negotiations there was a problem, As a matter of fact, we had a strike because they felt that they should have their own collective bargaining act. As a result of that during the negotiations, as part of the negotiations they said, 'Okay, we will agree to the contract as it is, but we would like for you to agree to setting up a task force to lay out our collective bargaining act.

MR. WARREN: Which is this?

MR. DINN: Which is this. The task force, having listened to input from both sides,

MR. DINN: made the report to government and government accepted that report in its entirety. Now, I cannot say, for example, that Treasury Board who negotiated on behalf of the government are 100 per cent in favour or love everything in the bill. I cannot say that nor can I say exactly the same thing for interns and residents. As a matter of fact, the hon. member will recall during that period last year the interns and residents wanted arbitration. But nobody really has arbitration in the Province other than the police and the warders, so they did not get the arbitration. As a result, the task force recommended that when they requested a conciliation board that it not be in the hands of the minister to decide, that it be an automatic granting of that board. So that is the saw-off that is the quid pro quo, if you wish, for acceptance or for the task force to report to government. And that is what they reported to government, and that is basically what government agreed to do. +

On motion, "An Act To Govern Collective Bargaining Between The Government of The Province And The Interns And Residents In The Province," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

(Bill No. 19)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Registered Nurses Act." (Bill No. 24)

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

+ DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, again on behalf of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House) I introduce this bill for second reading. The provision is quite simple. Hon. members

DR. COLLINS: , of course, are fully aware that we have Grade XII in this Province now.

Previously there was a requirement that those entering nursing school would have a Grade XI qualification, that was the end of their high school years. With the end of the high school year now being Grade XII, this provision will change that to Grade XII as the requirement for eligibility for admission to a school of nursing. So with that I move

second reading. +

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

X MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am in order or not but I think that this bill should be shelved for six months. I think it is very unfair. I believe that making it necessary for an applicant to complete Grade XII to qualify for the nursing profession, is a deterring factor. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are women and men in Newfoundland and Labrador who could qualify as nurses, Mr. Speaker, without having the educational ability. Having Grade XII will not necessarily make a good nurse or a bad nurse. I think it is unfortunate that the minister would come in with such a bill, making Grade XII compulsory.

MR. PATTERSON: When you could have one (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, an individual applies to go to nursing school and she has Grade X or XI, I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that she can read and write and talk as well as the

May 18, 1984

Tape No. 1832

ah-3

MR. WARREN: member for Placentia  
(Mr. Patterson). In fact, Mr. Speaker, it should be  
a requirement that members of this House have  
more sense than the member for Placentia has.

However, Mr. Speaker,  
we definitely do not agree,

MR. WARREN: We came on too fast with Grade XII in this Province. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this bill should not have been brought in for at least another year. We should at least give it a six month hoist.

MR. SIMMS: You should have read the bill, boy.

MR. WARREN: There is nothing to the bill, it is only extending the educational requirement to Grade XII. X

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): If the hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

X DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member raised an issue which obviously is of concern to him but I would like to assure him that the graduates from Grade XII who will now apply for nursing school are essentially the same people who otherwise would have applied for nursing school if they had had Grade XII. But they only had Grade XI, because we only had Grade XI in the Province. So we are not putting on an additional burden. If an individual in this Province now has Grade XI and if they wish to upgrade themselves to Grade XII, there is very little difficulty doing that in the Province these days. But the vast majority of applicants of schools of nursing now will have completed their Grade XII anyway. So really this is just amending the present act which is really outmoded by the fact that at that time Grade XI was our maximum year in high school. So this is really putting the act in sync with what is now the common way that people get their high school in this Province. And I would point out that it does not apply to those who graduated before July 1, 1983. X

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Registered Nurses Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill No. 24)

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act". (Bill No. 16)

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, our present Public

Service Pension Act contains a section that again is really outmoded.

I am not even certain why that section was put in in the first place but, actually, that section, "limited survival rights for those pensioners who married late in life", there is no good reason for it. If a person earns his pension, no matter when he got married and so on and so forth, that should not have any bearing on the right of survival rights to the surviving spouse/

So this act really will repeal Section 22 of the Public Service Pension Act.

On motion, a bill, "An Act

To Amend the Public Service (Pensions) Act", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently, by leave. (Bill No. 16)

Motion, second reading of a bill,

"An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In the Statute Law".

(Bill No. 20)

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, this is just a

normal type of act that comes up in the Legislature from time to time where there have been errors that have been mainly in the printing of the bill. They are just anomalies that occur sometimes, that you have a difference in the statute,

MR. MARSHALL: one statute counteracts another. There have not been any consequential amendments with respect to it, and I have it here, anomalies and errors with respect to the statute law. For instance, there is an amendment to the Custody Jurisdiction Enforcement Act correcting the mistake in inclusion of the Provincial Court in Newfoundland and the definition of the word 'court', and to make two consequential amendments to the act. And in the Dental Act it would include 'the Government of the Province in groups with which the Dental Association may co-operate'. So, it is anomalies and errors in the statute law.

I want to point out though, Mr. Speaker, that since this administration came to power the bill is getting less and less, there are fewer and fewer errors.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Remove Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law". read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently, by leave.

DR. COLLINS: Order 6. That is the adjourned debate, Mr. Speaker.

X MR. SPEAKER: I think that was called before. I am not sure who adjourned the debate, to be honest with you.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think that has been debated. I introduced it and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition made some very incisive observations with respect to it - it is the one with respect to the deputy ministers, just changing their designation. So I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Transportation Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently, by leave.

*Dept. of Transp.  
Act  
(bill #6)*



On motion, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Shops Closing Act." (Bill No. 31).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976." (Bill No. 29).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 1 carry?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I will be just one moment. When we were in debate on second reading I undertook to check out the aspects as to the effect this bill would have on transfers and registrations to third parties for the hon. the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). The answer I have to give to that is that we do not know that any vested interest exists because there is no transfer or registration requirements for these licences. So as far as we know there are no third party interests which are affected, and the whole purpose of this bill is just to clarify what has been, to all intents and purposes, a matter of practice, that is charging people fees when they remove quarry materials.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed Bill No. 29 without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The District Court Act, 1976". (Bill No. 1).

On motion, clauses 1 and  
2, carried.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):  
Finance.

The hon. the Minister of

DR. COLLINS:

I move that after clause 2  
the following be added, and this will be clause 3: 'This  
Act coming into force on a day to be proclaimed by the  
Lieutenant-Governor in Council'.

Motion that the said act

be amended by adding clause 3, carried.

On motion, clause 3, carried.

X Motion, that the Committee  
report having passed Bill No, 1 with amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend

X The Department Of Transportation Act." (Bill No. 6).

Motion, that the Committee

report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend

X The Elevators Act." (Bill No. 3).

Motion, that the Committee

report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Govern

Collective Bargaining Between The Government Of The Province  
And The Interns And Residents In The Province." (Bill No.19).

X Motion, that the Committee

report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Establish

The Heritage Foundation Of Newfoundland and Labrador."

(Bill No. 33).

Motion, that the Committee

report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
+ The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 15).

Motion, that the Committee  
report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
+ The Public Service (Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 16).

Motion, that the Committee  
report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

X A bill, "An Act To Amend Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law." (Bill No.20).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

<sup>used</sup>  
A bill, "An Act To Amend The Registered Nurses Act." (Bill No. 24).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

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

X MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report they have passed Bills Nos. 31, 29, 6, 3, 19, 33, 15, 16, 20, and 24 without amendment, and Bill No. 1 with amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion, amendment to Bill No. 1 read a first and second time.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The District Court Act", read a third time, (Bill #1) ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion, the following bills were read a third time, ordered passed and their titles be as on the Order Paper.

X A bill. An Act To Amend The Shops Closing Act." (Bill No. 31).

X A bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976." (Bill No. 29).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
X The Department Of Transportation Act." (Bill No. 6).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
X The Elevators Act." (Bill No. 3).

A bill, "An Act To  
Govern Collective Bargaining Between The Government Of  
X The Province And The Interns And Residents In The  
Province." (Bill No. 19).

A bill, "An Act To  
X Establish The Heritage Foundation Of Newfoundland And  
Labrador." (Bill No. 33).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
X The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 15).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
X The Public Service (Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 16).

A bill, "An Act To Remove  
X Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law." (Bill No. 20).

A bill, "An Act To Amend  
The Newfoundland Registered Nurses Act." (Bill No. 24).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I understand  
that His Honour the Administrator is on his way, so  
perhaps we could have a bit of an adjournment until he  
arrives.

MR. NEARY: Why do we not sum up with  
a few niceties while we are waiting?

MR. MARSHALL: I was just about to do it.  
X I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have had a very  
productive initial sitting of the session.

We have run out of legislation  
and I have to confess that after today I have run out of  
insults that I can heap on the Leader of the Opposition,  
(Mr. Neary).

MR. MARSHALL: Bearing that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would wish to wish everybody a very productive Summer, a very enjoyable Summer and I look forward to seeing them in the Fall.

I express appreciation to the employees of the House who have been of such valuable assistance throughout this portion of the sitting.

MR. SIMMS: The Hansard staff. And do not forget the press.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon.gentleman wants to get credit for the press. He hopes there is going to be a big, screaming headline tomorrow, "Simms reminded Marshall, do not forget the press".

MR. SIMMS: It will be in the Grand Falls Advertiser, boy.

MR. MARSHALL: But, as we say, last but certainly not least, I wish the press a very pleasant Summer and I express our appreciation of the coverage that has been received of these deliberations. We look forward, Mr. Speaker, to reconvening in the Fall for the Fall Session, at which time we will deal with such legislation as is there. In the meantime, I want to assure the members of the Opposition and the general public that the government will be striving with all might and main in the ensuing months in the best interests of the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank Your Honour and his staff for their continued co-operation and support. On this side of the House we have always found Your Honour's

MR. NEARY:

office to be most co-operative and helpful to us. I want to thank also the staff at the table, the Clerk and the Law Clerks at the table who have also gone out of their way on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate the Opposition and to give us advice, which we appreciate very much. We are not as knowledgeable on this side of the House as we would like to be in the rules and we have to rely sometimes on the advice of the Law Clerks and the Clerk of the House and, I must say, they give us very good advice.

I also want to say a word of gratitude and appreciation to the Editor of Debates and the employees in the Hansard Office. They probably have the most arduous duties of all, Mr. Speaker, of anybody in this House, because now they are working irregular hours; I believe there was an experiment started this session of the House. And how they ever manage to record what members say in this House is beyond me. Mr. Speaker, sometimes when I am sitting here, I can hardly understand myself what is being said, and they have to spell the words -

MR. SIMMS: You should be on this side listening to your fellows!

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am talking about members on that side.

They manage to get the words spelled right, they even make members look good and, you know, that is a masterful job, Mr. Speaker, and they are to be congratulated for the fine work that they do.

I would not want to leave out the Legislative Librarian. Mr. Speaker, that lady and

MR. NEARY: her staff have always been generous and kind and co-operative with us.

I also want to say a word of praise for the commissionaires; we have some new commissionaires, and we have a new Sergeant-at-Arms who is doing a very commendable job. We have some new Pages in the House; I did not get an opportunity before to welcome them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And, of course, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to leave out the Parliamentary Press Gallery. I just finished an interview only about a half-hour ago with a young lady and when I finished, she said to me, 'I did not realize that the press, the media, was so important to this House.' Because I said in my interview that the Parliamentary Press Gallery is the eyes and ears of this House. There is no point in us asking penetrating -

MR. SIMMS: A half-hour interview.

It had to be The Daily News.

MR. NEARY: No - asking penetrating questions, looking for information, trying to get answers, debating, there is no point in it all unless it is all reported to the people. I mean, we would just be talking to ourselves or talking to the four walls. They are the most important - they are the eyes and ears of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And a word of thanks to my colleagues, of course, for their continued co-operation.

Now, one observation I have to make, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down.

We know we are going to have a leadership in the Fall and I may or may not occupy this seat, Mr. Speaker, I may or may not.



MR. SIMMS:

Well, we hope.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

We know we are going to have a new Prime Minister of Canada.

MR. TOBIN:

We may have two yet.

MR. NEARY:

Well, we will certainly have one between now and the time we come back again. I hope it will not be too late in the Fall because we have a lot of urgent public matters to debate. But the word

MR. NEARY: today is that the Premier may not be around. Now, Mr. Speaker, if he stays, well, then, I might be tempted, but if he leaves, then I do not know what I will do. Because, Mr. Speaker, I heard Mr. Chretien the other day saying, "Give me seven weeks with Mr. Mulroney". Well, all I ask is give me twenty-one days with the hon. gentlemen there opposite. That is all I ask of them, Mr. Speaker, and then I may be back in the Fall. X

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it was a gross oversight on my part and I want to really apologize the the House. I really wanted to, in the great spirit that has developed in the last two or three minutes -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) break down?

MR. MARSHALL: No. It was a great oversight and I want to really apologize sincerely to the House because I want to wish the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) God speed in his efforts to get into the Senate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I hope that the hon. gentleman makes it. I really do. And we can tell him that on this side of the House we are all for him and we will not treat too kindly the attempts of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) to circumvent him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: I hope this is not the last of a long period of time. I suspect he will be here.

MR. NEARY: I will be around for a while yet. Wishful thinking.

MR. MARSHALL: But if it is, Mr. Speaker, we want him to know that wherever he goes he most certainly goes with our blessing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Administrator has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Admit His Honour the Administrator.  
Your Honour, it is my agreeable duty on behalf of Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, Her Faithful Commons in Newfoundland, to present to Your Honour a Bill for the appropriation of Supply granted in the present Session.

A bill, "An Act For Granting To Her Majesty Certain Sums Of Money For Defraying Certain Expenses Of The Public Service For The Financial Year Ending The Thirty-First Day Of March One Thousand Nine Hundred And Eighty-Five And For Other Purposes Relating To The Public Service." (Bill No. 23).

HON.A.S.MIFFLIN(Administrator): In Her Majesty's Name, I thank Her Loyal Subjects, I accept their benevolence, and I assent to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present Session passed certain Bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The ~~Tobacco~~ Tax Act, 1978." (Bill No. 8).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The ~~Gasoline~~ Tax Act, 1978." (Bill No. 9).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The ~~Income~~ Tax Act." (Bill No. 5).

A bill, "An Act To Authorize The raising of Money By Way Of Loans By The Province." (Bill No. 26).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The ~~House Of Assembly~~ Act." (Bill No. 32).

- X A bill, "An Act To Amend The District Court Act, 1976." (Bill No. 1).
- X A bill, "An Act To Amend The Quarry Materials Act, 1976." (Bill No. 29).
- X A bill, "An Act To Amend The Shops Closing Act." (Bill No. 31).
- X A bill, "An Act To Amend The Education (Teachers' Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 15).
- X A bill, "An Act To Establish The Heritage Foundation Of Newfoundland And Labrador." (Bill No. 33).
- X A bill, "An Act To Amend The Elevators Act." (Bill No. 3).
- X A bill, "An Act To Govern Collective Bargaining Between The Government Of The Province And The Interns And Residents In The Province." (Bill No.19).

+ A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Newfoundland Registered Nurses Act." (Bill No. 24).

+ A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Public Service (Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 16).

+ A bill, "An Act To Remove  
Anomalies And Errors In The Statute Law." (Bill No. 20).

A bill, "An Act To Amend The  
Department Of Transportation Act." (Bill No. 6).

HON. A.S.MIFFLIN (Administrator): In Her Majesty's Name,

I assent to these bills.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

X MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that this  
House adjourn and that when this House adjourns today it  
stand adjourned until Thursday, November 8<sup>th</sup> 1984, at 3:00  
p.m. provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction  
of Mr. Speaker or in the case of his absence from the  
Province, the Chairman of Committees, after consultation  
with Her Majesty's Government that the House should meet at  
an earlier time than the adjournment, the Speaker or in his  
absence, the Chairman of Committees may give notice that he  
is so satisfied and thereupon the House shall meet at the time  
stated by such notice and shall transact its business as if  
it has been duly adjourned to that time.

On motion, the House at its  
rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 8, 1984  
at 3:00 p.m. X