

FIRST SECTION

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1982

The House met at 3.p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR.MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement by mutual consent, the members of the Opposition have consented today to forgo Private Member's Day and the normal routine of business for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent importance to the people of Newfoundland.

I might indicate, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a motion debated with the consent of the House this afternoon which the Premier will give notice of, but I do wish to note as well that the official Opposition, when we approached them this morning, had indicated that they had contemplated a motion of this nature. So, Mr. Speaker, the agreement has also been that the normal Private Member's Day, which would have been held today, there will be an extra Private Member's Day next week to replace this particular one, if the Opposition so desires.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how to begin.

MR.NEARY: The same motion?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Of course. Mr. Speaker, today we have learned that the federal government has unilaterally referred the question of the offshore dispute to the Supreme Court of Canada.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Government of Newfoundland is shocked beyond comprehension by this arrogant and cowardly act.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Government of Newfoundland has clearly put its position on this matter. We are eager to negotiate based upon putting ownership aside during the period of negotiations and permanently if an agreement is reached and from the January 25th proposal that we presented to the federal government. Given that the federal government refused to respond to our January 25th proposal and the fact that it was unclear what answer the court would give concerning the SIU case earlier this year, this government embarked upon two specific courses of action to protect the vital interests of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. One, we referred the matter to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland; two, we called an election on the issue to get the views of the people of the Province. We now find that the Government of Canada is blatantly ignoring these two actions. Never before has a federal government ignored the legitimate rights of a Supreme Court of a province to adjudicate on a matter of such importance to that province, and never before has a federal government so arrogantly dismissed the expression of opinions of a people of a province on an issue which so greatly affects them. It is an action that one would only expect from a foreign hostile power and not one from a national government which is supposed to protect and nurture equality and justice throughout the land.

Our most valuable resource, the fishery, is now totally managed by the Government of Canada. We witness daily secret deals -

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

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

MR. NEARY: I hate to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but what is it we are debating in the House now, Mr. Speaker? We do not have a resolution before the House, so what is it the Premier is talking about?

AN HON. MEMBER: We are into Statements by Ministers.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? Is it a Ministerial Statement or what is it we have now?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am leading up to the introduction of a very important resolution in this House in a couple of minutes.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, we either have the resolution or we do not. There is nothing before the House right now.

MR. MARSHALL: Give him the resolution and then go on.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I give notice, Mr. Speaker, of the following resolution:

WHEREAS the offshore dispute is presently before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland; AND WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland is eager to negotiate a settlement based upon putting the ownership aside for the length of the negotiations,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and permanently if a settlement is reached and based upon our January 25th proposal, which is fair and reasonable;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House go on record as condemning the action of the federal government to refer the matter directly to the Supreme Court of Canada;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House go on record as calling upon the federal government to return to the negotiating table on the basis put forward by the Government of Newfoundland."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Is that in order?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The Chair finds the resolution to be in order and certainly feels it is a matter of urgent importance requiring immediate debate. I recognize the hon the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

Learn the parliamentary system.

MR. WARREN:

Shut up!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence and I would appreciate it if the hon. member for Torngat Mountains would be quiet.

Today we have learned, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has unilaterally referred the question of the offshore dispute to the Supreme Court of Canada. And may I say, we have learned about it through the most insidious, insulting way possible to any government that ever called itself a government of the Province of Newfoundland. They did not have the courtesy to let the Government of Newfoundland, just newly elected with sixty one per cent of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: popular vote and forty-four seats out of fifty-two, but had the audacity and the insulting behavior to inform the Liberal party of Newfoundland first and then asked for a meeting with the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) an hour or two afterwards. Now that is how we learned about this very important action, that somehow they think they have the right as a federal government to insult the people of Newfoundland and the Government of Newfoundland. Whatever anybody wants to think of the Government of Newfoundland or the people who compose the Government of Newfoundland, at least they should of had the decency and the courtesy as a national government to inform us directly and in the first instance on a matter of this importance for this Province and for the country as a whole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMEIR PECKFORD: We are shocked beyond comprehension by this arrogant and cowardly act. We have clearly put our position on this matter, We are eager to negotiate based on putting ownership aside during the period of the negotiations, and permanently if an agreement is reached, and from the January 25th proposal that we presented to the federal government. Given that the federal government refused to respond to our January 25th proposal and the fact that it was unclear what answer the court would give

PREMIER PECKFORD:

concerning the SIU case earlier this year, the government embarked upon two specific courses of action to protect the vital interests of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

We referred the matter in the first instance to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. Secondly, we called an election on the issue to get the views of the people of the Province. We now find that the Government of Canada is blatantly ignoring these two actions. Never before, Mr. Speaker, has a federal government ignored the legitimate rights of a Supreme Court of a province to adjudicate on a matter of such importance to that province. And never before has a federal government so arrogantly dismissed the expression of opinion of a people of a province on an issue which so greatly affects them.

It is an action that one would only expect from a foreign, hostile power and not one from a national government which is supposed to protect and nurture equality and justice throughout the land.

Our most valuable resource, the fishery, is now totally managed by the Government of Canada. We witness daily secret deals being negotiated without as much as consultation, in which thousands of tons of this resource are being given away to other countries while Newfoundlanders go without work and a fair chance to be productive. Surely this is ample evidence to justify our request for joint management on such a large and potentially damaging development as the offshore oil and gas, completely beyond the fact that we have special legal claims to the resource in any case.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have watched in bewilderment the struggle of its provincial government over the past three years to have the people here have the same rights to transmit electricity in Canada as other Canadians have always enjoyed in the transmission of oil and gas.

What other Canadians enjoy by right becomes a fight for Canadians living in Newfoundland and Labrador. And now we witness attempts by others to block the hard won concession made by the federal government to introduce legislation which will make us equal in this matter of energy transmission.

Throughout the past three years, through DREE agreements to the CN Dockyard, Newfoundlanders have been treated unfairly and as poor cousins in this Confederation.

We will fight, Mr. Speaker,
this latest action

PREMIER PECKFORD: with all our might. This latest attempt to deny Newfoundlanders a fair share of the wealth which providence has placed at our shores means that Newfoundland will never have a chance to be equal and hence proud Canadians.

I am asking now for unanimous consent of the resolution that I just presented to this hon. House.

The Government of Newfoundland has planned and announced a ceremony to celebrate the new Canadian Constitution and the enshrinement of our Terms of Union in that Constitution on Thursday, May 20th, 1982. In light of this hostile action to the people of Newfoundland this ceremony will be cancelled to protest the action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: In its place we declare a provincial holiday for tomorrow, May 20th, a day of mourning to demonstrate our objection to this arrogant and unfair act by the Government of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, while the rumours were floating around in the last forty-eight hours about the supposed action or potential act of the federal government on this matter, we had assumed that obviously if the federal government was going to try to take this issue directly to the Supreme Court of Canada that they at least would have, number one, the courtesy and the decency to inform the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador - which I have already said they refused to do. And Mr. Chretien had wanted - I think he called earlier this morning or his office called earlier this morning to indicate to our Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) that when he got in town at twelve o'clock he would call

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Minister of Justice, Mr. Ottenheimer, supposedly to inform him of an action that the federal government was about to take. So Mr. Ottenheimer, the Minister of Justice, left a meeting of caucus and went to his office to wait for the call, a call which never arrived until around 1:30 or 1:45 when a secretary from Mr. Chretien's office called to say that Mr. Chretien would like to meet at 3:30. Then the next word we heard was Mr. Chretien had made the announcement without informing the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, and after consulting with the outside of the House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling), who then indicated the position of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland on the matter before the Government of Newfoundland was even informed about what was going to occur or what had been announced. Now the methodology, Mr. Speaker, cannot be anything but condemned as callous and small. What other word can you use -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Small and cowardly.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - to describe that kind of way to deal with a legitimately elected, democratically elected government which represents over 60 per cent of the popular vote of this Province?

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is cowardly, it is insulting, and every other kind of phrase that one can imagine. And then, Mr. Speaker, we had considered that, okay, methodology is one thing, insulting us as they have done over the last few years on numerous issues is one thing; the other thing was what was it the federal court or the federal government was going to actually do, what were they going to do? And of course we assumed, and I think that it was a fairly valid assumption, that they were going to refer the question of ownership and jurisdiction over the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf to the Supreme Court of Canada, that they were going to refer the question of ownership and jurisdiction of the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf off Newfoundland and Labrador to the Supreme Court of Canada. That would seem to be the logical thing to do. And of course our arguments there are twofold and we had amassed - we did not have to amass them because we had been making these arguments for quite some time, that, number one, we have had a proposal on the table from January 25th., which the federal government has never answered, a Canadian proposal, a fair and reasonable proposal to solve this log jam, this legal log jam and get on with developing the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf.

So it was really from our point of view a silly thing to do because we are waiting to hear back on the proposal that we put on the table. The only reason we went to our own court in the beginning was we were not sure what the SIU case was going to turn out like in the federal court, and it could have turned out to mean that it went on to the Supreme Court of Canada without the Supreme Court of Newfoundland adjudicating at all. So we could not take that chance so we referred it to our own court to be totally covered. Otherwise we would not have been totally covered.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Imagine for a minute, Mr. Speaker,
that the federal court did rule on the SIU case and included the
ownership, which the federal government tried to get them to
include. Then we would have been cancelled out from our court
having the chance to hear it. So we had to go to our own court.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We were forced to go because we could not take a chance on the Federal Court saying that the ownership had nothing to do with the SIU case because on the off chance that it did then our court would never get a chance to adjudicate on it. So we were forced to do that. So the number one reason, we had a proposal on the table that we still want to negotiate. The other reason was that the Federal Government of Canada would never in its wildest dreams refer this question of ownership and jurisdiction of the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf to the Supreme Court of Canada when at the same time another court of Canada, the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, was already apprised of the issue and was asked to adjudicate upon it by another legitimate government in Canada, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. So even if they ignored our proposal of January 25th, which they have done, which they have done completely - there is not a word in writing or verbally in response to that reasonable proposal. As I indicated on the TV debate during the election, everybody has stayed away from it like the plague because it is such a good proposal, Mr. Speaker. It is a fair, reasonable proposal which gives to Canada a share of the resources and the revenues from day one and gives to Newfoundland a fair share of the revenues from day one, and at the same time allows both governments together to manage it through a joint board keeping all the thorny issues into a quasi-judicial board which could handle it and make sure that the development never got stopped by some small matter between one government or the other. There was no way that the Federal Government of Canada would ever in its wildest dreams refer the question, ownership and jurisdiction of the mineral resources on the Continental

PREMIER PECKFORD: Shelf off Newfoundland to the Supreme Court of Canada while another court, established by the federal government and the provincial government, another court of Canada was already ready to hear the case and had it referred to it. So what could the federal government do? What could they do? We waited for the last forty-eight hours and, as I say, we were not informed until everybody else was informed, and what do we find, Mr. Speaker? What has the federal government done? And it is a joke, Mr. Speaker. It is a joke. We have all heard that Newfoundlanders are too green to burn. But, Mr. Speaker, what have they done? We got the telex at four minutes to three from the Prime Minister, part of the telex and the rest is to follow later, the information.

PREMIER PECKFORD: What have they done? Have they referred the question of ownership and jurisdiction of the mineral resources off Newfoundland and Labrador to the Supreme Court of Canada? No, they have not, because, Mr. Speaker, they know that they would be attacking the normal and legal process of law followed in this country since 1867. But they have gone through the back door. They have gone through the back door to do indirectly what they know they cannot do directly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. PECKFORD: Oh what a slight of hand, Mr. Speaker. What a trick, what a slight of hand do we have here with this Canadian Government, a slight of hand to try to say to Canadians as well as Newfoundlanders, 'We respect the process of law. We will not put the ownership of the mineral resources off Newfoundland and Labrador to the Supreme Court of Canada while it is in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, we will just put the question of who owns Hibernia.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: What a joke! What a joke!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is Hibernia?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Give them a medal, Mr. Speaker, give them the comedy special of the year. Who are they trying to fool?

I would like to know what some of these Supreme Court judges and the legal experts around Canada think of that joke. I would like to know who is going to be insulted the most, whether it is Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and Canadians from coast to coast, or whether it is those

PREMIER PECKFORD: people who are well learned in the law. How are they going to look upon this slight of hand? Are they going to look upon this joke upon the people of Canada and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?

Mr. Speaker, in the last two or three hours in contemplating the actions that the federal government could take, we were tipped off by a number of reporters in Ottawa and Toronto that they were going to delineate the question to include just Hibernia, and we laughed at it. Mr. Speaker, we laughed at it. We could not believe in our wildest dreams that this would come true, that they

PREMIER PECKFORD:

would try to do through the backdoor what they know they cannot do through the front door. And they have. They have got the audacity, the unmitigated gall to do such a thing. How can a court of Canada rule on Hibernia without ruling on who owns the offshore, pray tell, Mr. Speaker? How can they do it? But it is more insidious than that. It more insidious than that. Because what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker, is something called the National Energy Programme of Canada. That disaster, like the budget, that disaster which has proven-Mr. Clark and Mr. Crosbie got defeated in the House of Commons because of eighteen cents and we have seen thirty or forty cents since under a Liberal Government. And they enunciated a national energy programme which was supposed to see national self-sufficiency in oil and gas by 1990. And they laboured in ignorance as the Alsands project was being developed, and the Alaska pipeline project was being developed, and they waited by Rome or Ottawa or Canada burned, until it was too late to save those mega-projects. And what has happened now, Mr. Speaker? On the backs of tiny Newfoundland they want to try to resurrect their aims and objectives of a national energy programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They cannot do it to BC,

Mr. Speaker, for two reasons; politics, and they do not have the energy. They cannot do it to Alberta because of politics, economics, power and a man called Peter Lougheed. They cannot do it in Saskatchewan or Manitoba because neither have the resources. They cannot do it in Ontario or Quebec, or New Brunswick or PEI, or Nova Scotia. Suddenly we were blessed with some resource which could make us half decent in Canada,

PREMIER PECKFORD: and now we find on the altar of a national energy programme propogated by Prime Minister Trudeau, that they are going to try to sustain their aims and objectives and their well being in Central Canada on the backs of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Not likely, Mr. Speaker, not likely.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: What a cowardly way to deal with people who live in Newfoundland and Labrador. A proposal on the table since January 25th., which they -

MR. HISCOCK: Yes, take it or leave it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, it was not take it or leave it. That is not take it or leave it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Take it or leave it! I have told Mr. Trudeau myself, eyeball to eyeball, and our Energy Minister (Mr. Marshall) has told the Energy Minister in the federal government (Mr. Lalonde) that

PREMIER PECKFORD: this is a conceptual document from which we wish to negotiate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is what we have told them. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, for the first time I shall disclose that during the economic summit in Ottawa I had the opportunity by accident, because the Prime Minister has refused through direct invitations of mine and through indirect invitations of mine through his friends to get a meeting with him personally, so I could sit down as Premier of Newfoundland with the Prime Minister of Canada and discuss that proposal, which was refused directly and indirectly. Is it a wonder if he did not approve it indirectly. I could not get a meeting with him. I still cannot.

But I ran into him accidentally in a room, only he and I, for about seven minutes, and the Prime Minister sat down next to me, because we were about to have a meeting on economic strategy behind closed doors with the other Premiers of Canada, and I said to the Prime Minister, I said, "Prime Minister, Sir, I know you are a busy man, you are busier than I am, you are Prime Minister of Canada and I am only Premier of a small Province, Newfoundland and Labrador. But, Sir, have you had a chance to look at what is going on through Mr. Kirby and the other people who are part of the negotiations, Mr. Cohen and them?" "No," he said, "Brian I think the courts have got to decide". I said, "Mr. Prime Minister, there is a way around this that can save us all time. This is a throny, difficult problem. It can be solved. Have you seen our proposal? I know you are busy, I know you are reading a lot of stuff, but have you had a chance to just glean through it, scan through it?" "No," he said, "I have not seen it". "Well, Sir," I said, "I would really, really commend you to read that

PREMIER PECKFORD: document." I said, "It is not written in stone. It is not written in stone. There are principles in there which we believe in, but we would like to start. We get ownership out of the way so never again can either one of us tear it up. We are willing to sit down on that proposal and look at it. And do not forget, Mr. Prime Minister, we have already agreed to a trigger point. In other words, we agreed right from day one that revenues go to Ottawa, and revenues come to St. John's. And that somewhere down the road as we become up to the Canadian average, we will get less and you will get more. That is in the document, Sir. And I would really like for you to look at that, Sir, and I am available to talk to you about it."

"Well, I do not know," he said "about that. All I know", he said, "is we can do a deal with Nova Scotia," he said, "or it looks like we are going to be able to do a deal with Nova Scotia. We cannot do anything with you fellows." But I said, "Prime Minister, you have not looked. We have a different, particular circumstances. It is not my fault I was born when I was. It is not my fault that Newfoundland came into Confederation. It is not my fault that Newfoundland was a Dominion status. These are things which are

PREMIER PECKFORD:

historical facts and we have to look at them that way." 'I do not know about that,' and he got up and left. And I implored him to sit down and look at that document, and I do not know if he did or he did not. But I have tried personally, Premier to Prime Minister, to sit down with the gentleman and discuss that document as forming the basis - not every letter, not every comma - but forming the basis, some kind of framework in which we could begin to develop the offshore. And they have refused. And they have not to this day, Mr. Speaker, made one comment in response to that document. And here we are now today watching a federal government play out its hand in the crudest kind of politics possible before the people of Newfoundland and the people of Canada and trying to do through the back door what they do not - they know they will be into all kinds - they are going to be in just as much trouble. I do not know who they are trying to fool. They are not fooling us and I do not think they will fool the people of Newfoundland or the people of Canada and, Mr. Speaker, may I add, the Supreme Court of Canada. I do not think anybody is going to be fooled, because the Supreme Court of Canada cannot rule on that one area without impacting upon the whole question of who has ownership and jurisdiction over the offshore mineral resources.

Our proposal is reasonable and fair. Mr. Speaker, beyond that, beyond the way that they have acted and our responsible attitude in return, they are trying to go through the back door to do this. I mean, the larger question looms hauntingly over every Newfoundlander and every community in

PREMIER PECKFORD: Newfoundland and every bay from Nain down to St. Shotts over to Cape Ray and on up to St. Anthony, looms over this land and that haunting spectre looms over us that there is absolutely under God no way for this people in Newfoundland and Labrador to come close to, let alone be equal to the rest of Canada unless and until there is an access to a pool of revenue graduating downward and the Canadian revenue graduating upward over time unless that is available to us to do it. There is no other way, Mr. Speaker, as I have said so often in this House, there is no other way to

PREMIER PECKFORD:

provide a chance for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to have their day in the sun, to be able to say to their sons and daughters in Croque or Triangle or Francois or Southeast Bight or Petit Forte - rather particular and relevant - to come close to the opportunities and services which they legitimately desire and request as good Canadians unless we can get our paws and our hands on a legitimate amount of revenue, which by chance and by some stroke of luck has been available to other Canadians on their resources since Canada became a country in 1867.

We can argue therefore, Mr. Speaker, about the methodology of the Canadian government and how they have approached getting in to the Supreme Court of Canada without even having the courtesy to let us know what they were going to do. And we can debate the merits or demerits of the proposal put on the table by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to which there has not been one iota of response. And then thirdly, Mr. Speaker, and almost as importantly, we can discuss and debate and dialogue over the future of this here land, and whether or not we have just got to keep closing out places, sending people hither, thither and yon to look for a job to keep themselves alive; whether it is possible within the division of Canada that Pierre Elliott Trudeau has and Mr. Lalonde has, who they did not send down here, by the way, and Mr. Chretien has, whether their vision of Canada allows for people in Newfoundland to feel proud and that they are contributing to the great Canadian whole like Alberta has been able to do and Saskatchewan has been able to do and the other provinces who have had resources, somehow we have got to persuade the powers that be throughout this nation that

PREMIER PECKFORD: what this Province and the people
of this Province are asking for is fair, equal treatment,
sharing from day one, but which will at least give us the
vision or the hope or the optimism that somewhere down that
great tunnel there will be a day when we can stand up and
say, yes, we are materially contributing to Canada and have
the opportunities to grow, the opportunities

PREMIER PECKFORD: for equality of services, the opportunities available to our young people are equal to those of the rest of Canada. What a shame it is right now! What a shame, what a tragedy it is even right now the inequality within our own Province. It is incredible, the inequality within our own Province, within one bay to another bay, the inequality in educational services and health services and roads and water and sewer.

The other day in this hon. House the Minister of Education (Ms. L. Verge) passed along to me a document that the Ministry of Education has been involved in for the last three years and it deals with the grade four classes all over the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and their level of skills as grade four students in St. John's, and their level of skills in Fogo and St. Anthony. And you talk about Canada and the inequalities within Canada! The level of ability of a student in Croque and or in St. Anthony or in Goose Cove, as a grade four - they are in grade four - and they are no more in grade four compared to what the level of skills is in St. John's than I am equal to - what's I do not know what. The inequality within our own Province because of inability to be able to preform through revenues, to give people the facilities in those communities so that their skills - that started in 1979, I think, 1980 and 1981. Now I know there are cultural values involved, I am not talking about cultural values. I hope we keep them in those areas. And that is a very dynamic, you talk about human resource being the most important resource we have, you got to have money behind that. You got to have money and compassion and good strong educational leadership to bring that about and to ensure than throughout all of Newfoundland that these young people have an opportunity to have services available to them

PREMIER PECKFORD: that brings them somewhere near the Newfoundland average and the Canadian average, somehow or another. Not to mention the roads and the water and sewer and the other opportunities. It is incredible, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely incredible, It amazes me beyond measure that we have been able to as a province to sustain the principle of equality and sharing as long as we have. I guess everybody was amazed at the last election and its results. In the last four or five days I was not amazed because I had access to information that other people did not have access to, so I was not amazed at the results in the sense of the context in which I was saying it. But I am amazed that there are so many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians,

PREMIER PECKFORD: who, while they have no work, who while they have unequal services and opportunities are still willing to stand up and say, 'By the Lord Harry, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ottawa, Mr. St. John's, and Mr, Everyone else, are we ever going to break out of this cycle we are in?' And willing to vote without having half of this or without having a job. Fantastic! Absolutely fantastic!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, a people deserve a chance. A people deserve a chance. Who can ever, who can ever look intellectually and with any degree of common sense at the dockyard or at the DREE agreements that are outstanding? Who can with any degree of common sense look at the other interprovincial, intergovernmental things with the federal government over the last while and not be amazed at their lack of compassion and sympathy to a people who want to pull themselves up by their own boot straps and contribute back into Canada? Who can but be amazed at the way we are treated on fisheries? Absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker, the way we are treated on fisheries and these secret deals that are going on and yet we go back for more. And yet we go back for more.

And even though we were not informed about what was going to happen, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) - until we found out that suddenly the Liberal Party was also involved in it and that they had already announced something, I mean, that was enough insult as it was. It was only after that that we communicated to Mr. Chretien, at two minutes to three, or two minutes after

PREMIER PECKFORD:

three that we would have great difficulty entertaining him. We had no difficulty, or we would not say we had any difficulty entertaining him for all the other things for the last two or three days; in not informing us first as a government, or all other diplomatic slights that they performed upon us. We took it and swallowed it for the sake of fair play and common sense. We could not take that final insult to us as a government after coming through an election and fighting an election on the issue.

So here we are today, Mr. Speaker, as the Legislature of Newfoundland and Labrador, faced with an uncanny trick, a trick to try to get their hands on a fantastically valuable resource which should be shared among all Canadians, knowing full well they cannot go to the Court of Canada saying, 'Who has jurisdiction and ownership over the offshore?' 'It is alright Judge, boy, we will just put it in under Hibernia'.

Six hundred million dollars the other day

PREMIER PECKFORD:

to the Imperial Oil and a few more of the consortium to do more work in the Beaufort Sea. How much have we heard about the Beaufort Sea over the last few years? Now the people are getting on to it, the energy analysts in Canada and the companies themselves are getting onto it. They might have 500 million barrels of oil up there, submarginal, and then they have to try to bring it down to Central Canada without interfering with the environment and being respectful to the native peoples and the aboriginal rights that they enjoy. And the bluffery that we have heard from Nova Scotia over the last couple of years! You pick up some papers sometimes up in Toronto and Montreal you would swear that Nova Scotia had Hibernia and we had Sable Island, not the other way around. That is a strange, strange occurrence, as I said on the campaign so many times, when I look at what is happening in Nova Scotia and they talk about 2 trillion, and perhaps 3 trillion cubic feet of gas. And they might even get the 4 trillion cubic feet of gas, and some day it might be marginal, or it might be economic and they are going to develop it, and so much the better for Nova Scotia. But the way in which they picture it, this golden egg that Nova Scotia has. And when you look at it we have 2 trillion or 3 trillion cubic feet of gas that we have to burn off in order to get at 2 billion barrels of oil. We have to burn it off, we have to burn off what Nova Scotia has got to get at the valuable resource. And you get sometimes from our own people making statements that suddenly we are going to lose out on this, we are going to lose out on that because of some blustery statement of half truth uttered by somebody who is looking for more money to put in their own pocket. And then half of us are going around believing it, "Well, boy, is that really true? Old man, they got something up there in Nova Scotia. Is that really true?" is the question. Of course it is not true. It is

PREMIER PECKFORD: a half truth perpetrated by those who want to continue to put us down so that they can exploit more at our expense, so that we continue to be the poor cousins of Confederation, and continue to be exploited for somebody else's benefit, while we are then the quaint people in Newfoundland as espoused by those middle class and upper middle class people of Toronto and Montreal and everywhere else.

"Oh, you have got a wonderful Province down there." "Have we! Very good! Why do you not drop down for a while and just see how we are being treated down here?" It is a lovely Province as long as we are continually piping the resources up there so that they do the manufacturing and all the rest on it. The last of the Newfie jokes, the last of the Newfie jokes. A wonderful place down there, As long as we stay the way we are, a wonderful spot. And then when you kick up your traces, when you kick up your traces and ask for the same kind of things that they fought for - Ontario itself fought for for years

PREMIER PECKFORD: on their boundaries and on their resources. If you look into the legal history of Canada you wonder if you are talking to the right people or not - and when you kick up your traces and ask for the same things that they asked for thirty years ago you are selfish."What is wrong with you boy? You are greedy. You want to much. You are Balkanizing Canada." That is a wonderful word that, 'Balkanizing'. That is the one the Prime Minister used."You are going to split up Canada! What Canada? A Canada out of the mold of an intellect who believes in some kind of republic in which he has all the power? That is what it seems like to me, unilateralism at its worst. How come we got a Canadian constitution today, Mr. Speaker? How come? It is not because of Pierre Elliot Trudeau but in spite of him, because there were some people in Canada -

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - who stood up to him.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: We stood up to that view, to that narrow , rigid view of Canada which dictates that somehow or other all things must rotate around the centre and now and then a few crumbs slip out to the extremities. Now we can all argue intellectually and philosophically about political experiments on this planet. We can all do that. You know, if we could all start all over again how wonderful it would be and what a different way we would mix our political powers. But that is for people who want to examine their bellybutton at length and get large grants from the government to do so. I happen to live in the real world and I happen to recognize and be sensitive to the developments of mankind since 1867 on the Northern

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 383

ah-2

PREMIER PECKFORD: part of North America. And things have happened and people have grown and we have evolved a political experiment called Confederation, for good or for ill, and you cannot change it overnight or at any time, the political

PREMIER PECKFORD: mix and balance of powers and cultural diversity and geography of this place, And therefore you have to recognize that if we are going to continue - now the United States has had a different experience, a very much different experience, and a lot of blood has been shed over it; and Australia, Germany, France and so on - that ours is what it is and therefore you have to go that as your base and then try to develop mechanisms to reflect what is and why therefore, a balanced federalism, one, which we have outlined in our White Paper on the constitution, which was essentially the Canada under the constitution that we have now and enshrining our Terms of Union so that there are still some powers in the provinces as well as some powers at the federal level. And this issue remained outstanding. We wanted it considered at the time. We pushed for it to be considered at the time to have it resolved, and all the provinces of Canada agreed, Mr. Speaker. They all agreed with us. We had all the provinces of Canada agreeing on this question of the offshore. For the sake of what, Mr. Speaker? We agreed, as did other provinces. B.C. was strong on a revitalized senate, Manitoba was high on the Supreme Court and so on. We, good fellows that we are, generous people, we dropped the issue of the offshore, shared management in the fishery, hydro transmission, off the constitutional table for the sake of Canada so that we could get a Canadian Constitution, with the understanding that when we had the constitution here in Canada, and we had no more dealings with England, we could negotiate ourselves as Canadians those still outstanding issues like offshore,

PREMIER PECKFORD: like aboriginal rights and
all the rest of them. And every gave - give and take.
And we have gone out of our way since then to try to
make it not a constitutional thing but to try to solve
it through negotiation, bearing only in mind that we
are number ten in Canada, half the per capita earned
income of average Canadians, to give us a chance to
catch up. But after we catch up, all the rules and
regulations that apply to everybody else in Canada
applies to us too. But there must be a catch-up.
But, Mr. Speaker, for the public record, would you
believe that some day somebody is going to say,
'You mean to tell me the Government of Newfoundland
in 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982 were talking about
catch-up? They are a crazy crowd

PREMIER PECKFORD: because they are even asking for a percentage of oil and gas in the first year less than Alberta and Saskatchewan and British Columbia got when they started their development. They are a strange breed. How can you catch up if you are going to get less than other provinces were getting?

That is our good Canadianism, Mr. Speaker, coming out.

MR. WARREN: They are all leaving.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is our good Canadianism coming out.

MR. BAIRD: You will be gone after the next election.

AN HON. MEMBER: He might be gone before that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: So, Mr. Speaker, all we can do is the Government of Newfoundland say to the people of Newfoundland and to the people of Canada that we will use every legitimate measure at our disposal to fight this initiative by the federal government. The National Energy Programme cannot be saved on the backs of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians alone. We are not just suddenly going to bail them out because now suddenly they are in trouble and because of that we have to sacrifice our chance to be equal on that great national programme. Everything being equal you would be able to jump in and say 'Yes, we got to help Canada and we have to save the self-sufficiency by 1990.' But not on the backs of Newfoundlanders, which will mean that we will have no opportunity in the future to become equal in services or opportunity or employment levels. Not on your life. We deserve better than that. You are using us. You are abusing us. And we must stand up and fight it.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So tomorrow will be a day of mourning and a provincial holiday in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We have cancelled out constitutional ceremony. We had a caucus this morning, we will be having Cabinet meetings and caucus meetings over the next couple of days and we will be announcing further initiatives that we intend to take to object to this unilateral, arrogant, cowardly move by the Federal Government of Canada. And we will leave no stone unturned to ensure some day that sun will shine and have-not will be no more.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Opposition.

The hon. Leader of the

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me set the record straight as far as the meetings with Mr. Rompkey and Mr. Chretien today held during

MR. NEARY:

lunch time. Let me set the record straight for the benefit of the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, who seemed to twist that around somehow or other as being a devious act on the part of the Government of Canada. Let me assure the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that this meeting came about as a result of a telephone conversation that I had last night with Mr. Rompkey. When I heard the rumours around the floor of the House of Assembly yesterday afternoon, I became very concerned about this matter, and I initiated the meeting with the two federal Cabinet ministers.

It was our caucus who initiated the meeting and the initiative was not taken by Mr. Rompkey or Mr. Chretien. I am sure the hon. the Premier or the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) or the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) could have done the same thing. Mr. Speaker, I asked for the meeting and both ministers agreed to meet our caucus. I am pleased to say that we had a very interesting discussion indeed.

DR. COLLINS:

A pleasure

indeed!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, our side gave the hon. the Premier an opportunity to speak in silence and I hope the other side will do me the same courtesy.

The federal action, Mr. Speaker, was inevitable and inescapable and unavoidable, in my opinion, because of the action that was taken in the Newfoundland court by the administration here in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

It was inevitable, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: and all that has happened now is that the federal government has shortened the amount of time that it will take to get this matter settled. Because the matter, once ruled on in the Newfoundland court, would eventually end up in the Supreme Court of Canada in any event. So now by referring the matter directly -

AN HON. MEMBER: It does not make any difference.

MR. NEARY: It does make a difference. By referring the matter directly to the Supreme Court of Canada it shortens the route, but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we deplore the action of the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We disagree with their decision to take unilateral action in this matter. But we were told, during the meetings that the hon. Premier referred to, we were told that the federal government are prepared to stay at the bargaining table until a negotiated settlement is complete. So we hope, Mr. Speaker, that negotiations will resume as quickly as possible because this Party has always stood for a negotiated settlement. We feel that Newfoundland owns the offshore resources.

MR. HISCOCK: They will probably call us traitors.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. We feel that there should be a negotiated settlement. And we know from the discussions we had today with Mr. Chretien, who is a man that I respect a great deal, Mr. Speaker, he is a fighter and he is a strong minister, a very strong minister, so we hope that negotiations will resume as quickly as possible. But having said that, I feel somewhat like the Secretary of the United Nations here today who is trying to negotiate peace between Great Britain and Argentina. I feel like the Secretary of the United Nations, who must be in a very difficult position when he is trying to get the two parties to negotiate on a peaceful solution to the situation in the Falkland Islands when one side appears to have declared war and, after declaring war, says that we are prepared to sit down and negotiate peace. So I feel somewhat in that position today, Mr. Speaker. These most recent developments in the matter of our offshore resources are a turn for the worst in my opinion. They are very unfortunate indeed and have hardened positions, as far as I can see, on both sides of this dispute. And, Mr. Speaker, to listen to the hon. the Premier speak, following his remarks very closely, he would try to leave the impression, the

MR. NEARY: hon. Premier would try to leave the impression to members of this House that only one side is to blame for the difficulties that have arose in the negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion neither side is without blame. Both sides, both the federal

MR. S. NEARY:

and provincial governments, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, deserve to be chastised and scorned for the way they have handled these negotiations. Both side, Mr. Speaker, are to blame for a situation which could have been resolved in the ancient and gentlemanly art of what is commonly known as negotiations.

It may very well be, Mr. Speaker, that historians will look back on these developments with amusement more than anything else because of the juvenile manner in which both sides have behaved. The underlining theme of this issue, Mr. Speaker, since it began between these two levels of government, has been that I will not give an inch because you will not give an inch, and neither side gives an inch because they both believe, somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, that politically they will look weak and ill prepared to carry out their respective duties and meet their respective responsibilities in this regard. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the only form of punishment for the politicians who have been involved in these negotiations, on both sides of the table, is that they should be treated the same as you treat a child who ill-behaved: They should be spanked and sent to bed without their supper.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this not to lessen the importance of this matter but to identify their responsibility in these talks and the behavior of the participants and how they have acted in bad faith and the behavior of spokesman of both sides in these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, it may seem a matter of who feels they are looking after their constituents best.

MR. NEARY: At each turn of the dice, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to us that members on both sides of the bargaining table are treating it more like a theatre, like a political theatre for posturing, more than they are in attempting to act in good faith to try to bring about a negotiated settlement.

Both levels of government, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, have failed to negotiate in good faith, especially those who have been put up as spokesmen for both sides, and who have established a climate in which it was virtually impossible for talks to succeed, or even to be held on times.

The very essence, Mr. Speaker, of the word 'negotiate' implies that each side will give a little. If that were not true, then, Mr. Speaker, negotiations would never take place. Why would anybody want to negotiate if you knew that the other side was unwilling to budge, or you knew at the outset that there was nothing to be gained? Why would you want to sit down and negotiate?

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the current that has been the situation. It is the current situation and we hope, Mr. Speaker, that it will not continue, it will not be the ongoing state of these negotiations. I submit to this House that the problem is chronic and acute and it never gets any better, Mr. Speaker, as the events unfold. It never seems to get any better. It seems, as a matter of fact, to get getting worse, and both sides, Mr. Speaker, as I attempted to point out, are jointly responsible for the present state of affairs.

It is their duty, it is the duty of the federal government and of the

MR. NEARY: provincial government
to negotiate in good faith with a view to reaching an
negotiated settlement. Their duty, Mr. Speaker, is
not to destroy talks, but to go out of their way as
individuals, and collectively, to build these talks
into what ultimately will be a fair and just settlement
for the people of this Province and for the people of
Canada.

MR. NEARY: The provincial government broke off negotiations and set up pre-conditions for the renewal of negotiations. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that fair to lay down pre-conditions for the renewal of negotiations?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true, Mr. Speaker. Would that set a climate for fair negotiations? Fair negotiations, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, begin without pre-conditions. You go to the bargaining table with an agreed schedule of talks and you attempt to negotiate in good faith, and not with guns held to each other's head, Mr. Speaker, before the talks begin. This government, Mr. Speaker, broke off negotiations with Ottawa and then called a provincial general election. They wanted to seek a further endorsement of their actions from the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Although, Mr. Speaker, we have said and we believe on this side of the House that this action on the part of the administration was unnecessary as they had a mandate to do what they wanted to do - they had thirty-four members in this House before dissolution, as opposed to eighteen. They had a clear mandate - and so although we feel, Mr. Speaker, that that action was totally unnecessary and extremely costly to the people of this Province, nevertheless the administration was given a mandate in spades to renegotiate, or to negotiate, rather, with the Government of Canada. Yet, Mr. Speaker, up to now it has done nothing with that assurance and with that mandate that was given by the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to the administration. The people said, "Yes, we want a fair deal on the offshore. We want you to get this matter settled as quickly as possible." But up to now, Mr. Speaker, very little has happened

MR. NEARY: since the election, since the April 6th election and the government were given the mandate. This government, Mr. Speaker, has not changed its position it had before the election, before it got this new mandate and, in my opinion, since the election has been negligent and derelict in their duty, in their commitment to carry out a promise to the people of this Province that, with a strong new mandate to negotiate, the future was secure. That was the hope and expectations that they built up in the minds of the people of this Province. This Province also, Mr. Speaker, unilaterally decided to place the question of ownership of the offshore resources before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and Labrador, and this was done not moments after they accused the federal government of a similar move. Mr. Speaker, what we have in this House is the pot calling the kettle black. We have an administration that has already put the ownership question before the Newfoundland Appeal's Court. They did it unilaterally on a constitutional matter, as the hon. House Leader knows. The provincial government could have asked the Government of Canada to join with them in that action, which is customary in tradition in constitutional matters involving the provincial or federal government. There is ample precedent, Mr. Speaker, it is tradition, it is customary for any provincial government, when they are taking an action in a court on a constitutional matter, that they ask the Government of Canada to join with them in that action.

MR. MARSHALL: It is not.

MR. NEARY: Oh, do not be so foolish, Mr. Speaker. That is a statement of fact, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) go on with your speech.

MR. WARREN: Ah, ha, Willy Nilly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I let the hon. Premier plow on there in silence, and I would hope that the hon. gentleman would do me the same courtesy, Sir.

MR. WARREN: Hairy Willy.

MR. NEARY: So this Province unilaterally, without any reference to the Government of Canada, put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeal's Court. And, Mr. Speaker, let me say this about that particular move on the part of the Province: Every time I hear the Premier of this Province talk about the Newfoundland Appeal's Court you would swear that he was talking about a court where the judges were appointed

MR. NEARY: by the provincial government, or that they would in some way favour the provincial government. The Newfoundland Appeals Court is a court appointed by the Government of Canada.

MR. DAWE: By Newfoundlanders living in Ontario.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DAWE: By Newfoundlanders -

MR. NEARY: By Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, let me repeat what I said.

MR. WARREN: How naive can a minister be. How naive can a minister be.

MR. NEARY: The Government of Canada - the Newfoundland Appeals Court is a federal court. The appointees are made by the Government of Canada. They are Newfoundlanders. So that changes the situation. They are Newfoundlanders and they will not follow the law, they will be patriotic, they will be patriotic people, they will not follow the law -

AN HON. MEMBER: They will follow the law.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? No, that is what the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is saying. If they were from Ontario or Quebec, what the hon. gentleman is saying, is that justice would not be done, or not even appear to be done.

MR. WARREN: That is what he is saying. That is what he is saying.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is following his leader's line.

MR. WARREN: That is right. Yes. Right on!

MR. NEARY: Somehow or other they think they are going to get favouritism in the Newfoundland Appeals Court.

MR. WARREN: That is right. That is what he said.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the offshore case will rise or stand on its own merits -

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - whether it is a federal court in St. John's or in Ottawa.

MR. WARREN: Right on!

MR. NEARY: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are right.

MR. NEARY: But that is not what the hon. Premier has been saying. The hon. the Premier, somehow or other, separates the two courts. He says that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you say that?

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Read Hansard tomorrow. Read Hansard tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, he leaves the impression with Newfoundlanders that they are two separate and distinct courts -

MR. WARREN: The fighting Newfoundlander.

MR. NEARY: - and that we have a better chance in the Newfoundland Appeals Court than we have in the Supreme Court because Newfoundlanders sit on the bench.

MR. CALLAN: He said that on national television.

MR. HICKEY: You are saying that now.

MR. WARREN: Oh, listen to the social worker.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier and I do not think I referred to the resolution yet -

MR. STAGG: That is an interesting question.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. STAGG: An interesting question.

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 392

NM - 3

MR. STAGG:

Where do you stand?

MR. NEARY:

Where do I stand on what?

MR. STAGG:

The judiciary.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I have great faith in the judiciary of this country, the judicial system. I have great faith in it.

MR. HISCOCK:

Do you?

MR. NEARY:

I do not always agree with the decisions that are handed down, but I can guarantee you this, and I am sure my hon. friend, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), would not question, or

MR. NEARY:

try to undermine, confidence in the judicial system of this great country.

MR. WARREN:

The black band will do you no good, boy.

MR. NEARY:

If he did, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would do so at his own peril. We must not do anything to undermine the confidence in the courts and in the judicial system. And somebody pretty soon is going to get a terrific rap on the knuckles if they continue to do that, somebody in high places in this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, the federal government is now arbitrarily doing the same thing that the provincial government did there a few weeks ago. They have unilaterally decided to put the ownership question before the Supreme Court of Canada. And as I said -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Hibernia?

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about Hibernia?

MR. NEARY:

Well the question is Hibernia, which ultimately will - once a decision is made on Hibernia then you can mark it down that decision will prevail throughout the whole country, whatever the court decision is.

Mr. Speaker, as I said I would have preferred to see a joint action, either by the provincial government joining with the federal government, or the federal government joining with the provincial government, if the matter was to be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada.

The federal government consistently, in my opinion, has been thick headed and narrow-minded about these negotiations, and on times I would say,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, totally irresponsible. But the whole theme of my remarks today, Sir, put both levels of government in that category, because it has been shown beyond any doubt throughout these talks that both sides are equally capable of extraordinary self-defeating purpose and scope. This action on the part of the federal government, today is totally unnecessary and in my opinion stupid, as it drives the opportunities for possible resolution and settlement of this matter.

MR. NEARY: to the outer limits of the universe. I was hoping up to today that both parties could return to the bargaining table and that we would get a negotiated settlement, but it would appear now, Mr. Speaker, that the positions are hardening, that the differences between both sides is looming larger all the time.

I still say, Mr. Speaker, and I was reassured of this today at the meetings that we had at lunch time, that these matters have simple solutions. Both sides, Mr. Speaker, should sit down in private, in isolation, and stay there until a settlement is reached, and accept the fact that negotiations mean compromise. Somehow or other the present Minister of Energy in this Province (Mr. Marshall) is paranoid about it, the fact that practically everything in life is a compromise. He interprets compromise as meaning that you have to give something away. He has no confidence in himself, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Canada need the energy reserves that we have offshore, that the oil wells off our coast will provide, and they need them desperately and they need them now. It is a matter of national importance, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, let me go on. That is only one part of my statement. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker, need the revenue that these resources will provide and they need it now. They need relief from further tax increases, they need the cheap source of energy, they need

MR. S. NEARY:

the industry, the spinoff benefits that this resource will bring. They need the dollars that these resources will bring in for our other industries such as the fishery, the forestry, agriculture and so on. We need the resource, the revenue, to create new jobs and we need the security, Mr. Speaker, that this resource will bring. And we need, as the Premier keeps reminding us, equality, whether it be financial equality, whether it be the material things of life, whether it be some other form of equality. But we need, Mr. Speaker, our resource to be developed now, and not ten or fifteen years down the road. We cannot wait. The federal government and the Newfoundland Government in my opinion are guilty and totally to blame for the delay in bringing up this resource from the ocean floor and delivering its wealth to the people of this Province and of Canada. They are guilty as charged, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, and retribution is now. I believe that the ownership of this resource is Newfoundland and Labrador. Ottawa believes it belongs to Canada, Fine, We have a disagreement, Mr. Speaker, so let us negotiate. I am going to tell the provincial government now today, and the federal government now today, how to come out of this asinine fiasco that they have created for themselves, of their own making, of how they can come out of this embarrassing situation smelling like roses. I am going to tell both sides, Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell them both how they can mutually redeem themselves from the face of scandalous and irresponsible and condemning dereliction of duty. The very first step for both sides is that they acknowledge their responsibility to the people of this country, the people in every province and territory of this nation, and to the people of this Province to seek a just settlement and swift development

MR. NEARY: and quick delivery of this crucial petroleum gold mine laying off our coast. The people of Canada, the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, are tapping their feet and twiddling their thumbs waiting for a solution. It is long overdue, Mr. Speaker, and both sides must realize that the people of Canada will not wait forever before taking unilateral action of their own.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, both sides must collect their thoughts on this matter and accept the fact that negotiations mean compromise and not set in concrete or set in stone, as the hon. the Premier reminded us this afternoon. Lay down no pre-conditions or demands, set out and negotiate in good faith. Like every set of negotiations ever held in the history of bartering, Mr. Speaker, you go into negotiations with a figure in your head, an ideal you wish to reach, and then you try very hard to achieve that ideal or reach that figure. But as in every set of negotiations ever held, Mr. Speaker, you realize before you go in that you cannot always accomplish your ideal, you cannot always get that figure that you want because the other side also has ideals and figures set in the backs of their minds. Sometimes during negotiations and in the process of compromise you come halfway, you come quarter way, you give here, you give there, you take a stand here, you are firm on this, you are flexible on that, but you keep the talks in motion, Mr. Speaker. You bluff, you do a bit of wheeling and dealing, you try all the tricks that you know, and eventually you get a good settlement, a satisfactory settlement, you get a settlement, Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory to both sides, to the people of this Province and to the people of Canada.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, both sides must accept the following principle as gospel; it

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 396

SD - 2

MR. NEARY: is a principle by which not only good negotiations are held but by which mankind moves through the universe with other men. The principle is that you acknowledge the other side, and that in the

MR. NEARY:

acknowledgement of the other side you show respect for one another. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador respect the fact that the federal government represents not only all Newfoundlanders but all Canadians in the other nine provinces and in the territories, and the federal government must bargain on behalf of these twenty-five or twenty-six million souls who live in this country. I ask that the Government of Canada respect the fact that the Newfoundland and Labrador Government, the present administration, represents a Province of 560-odd thousand people who for the past 400 years have gotten the butt end of every shaft that was made and they are sick and tired of it and intend to change that historical pastime now for all. I ask both sides, Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity that each is trying to get the best deal it can in the interests of the people and the provinces they represent, or at least, Mr. Speaker, maybe I am being naive, maybe I am assuming too much, but that is the way that it should be. I ask both sides to acknowledge that we are all Canadians and I ask the federal people to remember that as Canadians they represent all provinces and that means they represent Newfoundland and Labrador equally as much as they represent Ontario, Saskatchewan, Quebec or any other province.

In essence then, Mr. Speaker, as the Government of Canada negotiates with Newfoundland they should remember too that it is Newfoundland and Labrador that they represent. The sword, Mr. Speaker, cuts both ways.

I ask the provincial government to remember that all of the people it represents are

May 19, 1982

Tape 397

EC - 2

MR. NEARY: Canadians, that it is one of
the provincial governments of Canada, that Prime Minister
Trudeau is the Prime Minister

MR. NEARY: for each and every Newfoundlander and Labradorian, and that he should get respect as such. I ask the provincial government to remember that we want a just settlement for the thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are out of work, who need homes, who need medical care and so on, and so on. But we also want a just settlement for our country and for the citizens of this country in every province and in every territory. I ask the provincial government to remember it is Canadian and, therefore, has a Canadian as well as a provincial responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot do more today as a Newfoundlander, and as an elected member of this House, of this Legislature, than to urge both sides to lay down their arms, lay down or do away with their preconditions, put aside their prejudices and end their bluster and chest thumping. I ask them to leave behind past attempts at so-called negotiations on this resource, and I ask them to do the following, Mr. Speaker:

I beg and urge the federal government and the provincial government to come back to the bargaining table once again, and I urge them this time when they come to the bargaining table, to come with an open mind. I beg hon. gentlemen and the Government of Canada to come to the bargaining table with an open and free mind and not enter into negotiations that are biased, that

MR. NEARY:

they sit around the bargaining table free from rancor and acrimony. Give them one more last chance, Mr. Speaker. Forget the histrionics and the dramatics that we have seen in this Province for the last several years and that we see in this House just about every day of their lives. Mr. Speaker, it is in their hands. The hon. gentleman looks over and smiles. It is in the hon. gentleman's hands and it is in the hands of our federal MPs from Newfoundland in Ottawa and it is in the hands of the Government of Canada that the faith of this resource and of this Province is held. Mr. Speaker, this is a very precious resource. It is a limited natural resource and I would beg both sides, for the sake of all of Canada and of the people of this Province, to make up their minds, make up their minds here today that they will return to the bargaining table and they will stay at the bargaining table until a resolution of this great problem is an historical fact. It will cost, Mr. Speaker, it will cost them nothing. It will cost the government of this Province and the Government of Canada nothing to do what I suggest, but on the accomplishment, Mr. Speaker, they will receive nothing but praise. It will be a wonderful accomplishment in this country of ours and in this Province, if both sides, Mr. Speaker, would put aside their differences. For instance, let me put a question, because I am sure the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) may follow my few remarks and if he does I would like to put a question to the hon. gentleman: Will the administration in this Province agree to withdraw their case from the Newfoundland court -

MR. WARREN:

A good question. A good question.

MR. NEARY: - if the Government of Canada would sit down and negotiate in good faith?

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Would they be prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WARREN: There we go. Now what is the answer? Yes or No? Throw everything aside and negotiate. A good question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a good question.

MR. WARREN: I say they would say no.

MR. NEARY: It is a good question.

MR. WARREN: They want to have their cake and eat it to.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I said a few moments ago it will cost the provincial government and the federal government nothing to enter into a round of negotiations in good faith and stay at the bargaining table until a settlement is accomplished. This will be the kind of example, Mr. Speaker, and the kind of co-operation and mutual trust that will be respected and applauded throughout every corner of this nation and every corner of this Province and paraded throughout the history books, Mr. Speaker, for decades to come.

MR. NEARY:

Both the provincial and federal government could prove to the people of this Province and to the people of this country that they, as individuals, are larger than themselves, that they are bigger men than most who know them, that they know how to do the right thing for their Province and their country in the crunch.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we could set an example here in these negotiations that would not only be paraded in the history books of this Province for decades to come but would be an example that could be followed by the British and the Argentinians in their present dispute, and even, Mr. Speaker, perhaps by the people of Iraq and Iran and by the Irish in the Northern part of Ireland, by every country in the world now besieged by similar problems that we have in this Province and in this nation, and that it is possible to work out solutions to these problems, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, is that asking too much? Let us look at Anwar Sadat, There was a man, Mr. Speaker, who knew the meaning of the words 'compromise' and 'negotiation'. He successfully concluded an agreement with a race of people with whom in 1967, Mr. Speaker, he had been at war, whose blood he had spilled on the fields of battle. Mr. Speaker, there is an example to follow. If Anwar Sadat could reach an agreement with these very same people he fired his rockets at a few years before, cannot we politicians here in Canada and in Newfoundland settle a minor scuffle between ourselves in private without showing ourselves as idiots

MR. NEARY:

and enemies of each other in our own backyard? Could we not do that, Mr. Speaker? Perhaps we can.

Of course we can, Mr. Speaker. If we want to we can do it, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be worthwhile for both governments to follow my advice and suggestions that I have given here today. As I said, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I feel somewhat like the Secretary of the United Nations trying to bring about a resolution of this dispute that has dragged on now, as far as I am concerned, much too long. Here I am trying to conciliate, if you like, trying to help both sides resolve their dispute and both of them shooting, just the same as the war in the Falklands. I know now, Mr. Speaker, how the Secretary of the United Nations feels trying to bring about peace when both sides are shooting at each other. We have a similar situation here. Maybe the move today by the Government of Canada was a little bit of pressure to bring the Province back to the bargaining table. Maybe it was.

The hon. gentleman sits over there, Mr. Speaker, sneering and snorting -

MR. CALLAN: With his black band on.

MR. NEARY: - yes, with his black band on - and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I am rather disappointed that the Premier made that announcement today that tomorrow would be a day of mourning, that they were going to boycott - or they were going to cancel, I believe. I do not know whose responsibility it is to go ahead with these commemorative ceremonies, whether it is the provincial or federal government. One of the receptions that I read about was going to be sponsored by the Lieutenant-Governor. Is this going to be a slight

MR. NEARY:

to the Lieutenant-Governor?

Is the whole thing cancelled now? Do you know why, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government was holding these ceremonies? Does anybody know? They were holding these ceremonies to commemorate the patriation of the constitution, which included an enshrinement of our Terms of Union with Canada forever under this great constitution -

MR. WARREN: And now they have cancelled it.

MR. NEARY: - a guarantee that Newfoundland would get their equalization grants that we have been receiving from Ottawa for years now written into the constitution, job preference written into the constitution. That is what we were going to celebrate tomorrow and that is what this administration have now cancelled.

MR. WARREN: Gone into mourning.
They are going to the grave yard instead.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, I have to say this that while on the one hand I condemn Ottawa, I deplore their unilateral action in taking this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada, I have to praise Ottawa for - and the hon. gentleman there with the silly grin on his face again - I have to praise Ottawa for having the courage, for having the courage, Mr. Speaker, to put through the Parliament of this nation -

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - legislation that will give Newfoundland a power corridor across the Province of Quebec.

MR. WARREN: And it is becoming law.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat what I have said -

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. NEARY: - in this House before, that this legislation was put through the Parliament of Canada despite opposition from the National Tories. The Tory Party of Canada said no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: They are against that legislation giving Newfoundland a power corridor across the

MR. NEARY: Province of Quebec,
something we have been fighting for thirty-odd years in
this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And the two federal MPs,
the two Tory MPs from Newfoundland abstained from voting
on that legislation.

MR. CALLAN: Fish and Chips.

MR. NEARY: Both of them abstained.

Mr. Speaker, how much effort
did it take for the Government of Canada to persuade the
federal MPs from the Province of Quebec to vote in favour of
that legislation? Seventy-seven members of Parliament
from Quebec voted -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Seventy-four.

MR. NEARY: Seventy-four voted for that
legislation. Seventy-four members -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - from Quebec voted in
favour of that great piece of Liberal legislation, Mr.
Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, because
today we deplore the actions of the federal government, it
does not

MR. NEARY:

nécessarily mean that we have declared war on Ottawa. When the opportunity arises, Mr. Speaker, we will take a tough stand with Ottawa, and that is what we are doing today. We are taking a tough stand against this unilateralness. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen on the other side would wish that we did not take a tough stand with Ottawa. They have used it for a whipping boy now for the last ten or twelve or fifteen years.

MR. MARSHALL:

What do you mean?

MR. NEARY:

I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

Well, of course, you may call it that. I think we are doing it because we feel it is the right thing to do. Mr. Speaker, I might say on the resolution itself that we intend to support the resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, we would like to see it changed in the resolution, and in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the resolution. I would like to move, seconded by my colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), that the motion be amended by adding the words, "and provincial government," after the words "federal government", and by striking out all the words after "table", so that the last paragraph would then read,
Mr. Speaker:

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House go on record as calling upon the federal and provincial governments to return to the negotiating table."

MR. WARREN:

Hear, hear! Good. A good amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Good amendment.

MR. WARREN:

Excellent amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Can you not maintain relevance?

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 403

NM - 2

MR. HODDER:

Read the amendment, stunned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

With the consent of hon.

gentlemen, I will take a five minute recess to consider this amendment.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward):

Order, please!

I have considered the amendment and it is in order. It is in order with the main resolution. Shall the amendment carry?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was rather amused, I suppose, at a statement made on page 4 of the hon. Premier's statement today, the part of it that he read, and I will repeat it in case hon. gentlemen were not listening to what the hon. the Premier said. He said: "Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have watched in bewilderment the struggle of its provincial government over the past three years to have the people here have the same rights to transmit electricity in Canada as other Canadians have always enjoyed in the transmission of oil and gas".

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is that I do not recall in my lifetime, and I do not believe there has ever been a time in Canadian history when another province objected to a pipeline going across their territory. I do not believe there was ever in the history of Canada a single objection to a pipeline going across a province. But there was objection to transmission lines for electricity. And, Mr. Speaker, in that regard all provinces of Canada were in the same boat. Saskatchewan could not transmit electricity across Alberta or Manitoba, Quebec could not transmit electricity across Newfoundland, Quebec could not transmit electricity across Ontario. We were all in the same boat. But somehow or other the hon. the Premier twists this to lead one to believe that Newfoundland was the only one that could not transmit electricity across

MR. S. NEARY: the Province of Quebec. And then he goes on - listen - and asks the question; "What other Canadians enjoy by right becomes a fight for Canadians living in Newfoundland and Labrador. And now," he says, "we witness attempts by others to block the hard won concession ~~made~~ by the federal government..." Mr. Speaker, we had the assurance of the Minister of Justice (Mr. J. Chretien) for Canada and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. W. Rompkey), Newfoundland's Minister in the federal Cabinet, we had their assurance today that that legislation put through the Parliament of Canada is going to remain. And the administration can create all the doubts it wants, it can raise all the smoke screen it wants, it can bring in all the red herrings it wants, it can show only qualified support, it can show only unqualified support to this great Liberal reform that is taking place in the Parliament of Canada. And what I mean by unqualified support, Mr. Speaker, is when the Premier was asked what his reaction was to this great Liberal reform that was being debated in the House of Commons, his only reply was, 'It does not go far enough.' That was the reaction of the Premier of this Province, 'does not go far enough.' The Tories in Canada, the National Tory party, took a firm position to vote against it. The Tories in Canada said Newfoundland should not have a power corridor across the Province of Quebec. Two Tory M. P.'s from Newfoundland did not think that it was important enough to vote on. They abstained from voting. And the Premier of this Province gave the great reform qualified support when he

MR. NEARY: said, 'Yes, we agree with it but it does not go far enough.' No wonder Mr. LaLonde would ask the provincial Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) if they support this great Liberal reform that was going through the House of Commons. Members of the Parliament of Canada did not know if this Province was supporting this piece of legislation or not. And that was unfortunate indeed, Mr. Speaker, with the savage lobby that is going on in the Province of Quebec and in Ottawa in connection with this great Liberal reform.

A resolution was passed yesterday in the Province of Quebec, in the Legislature of Quebec, condemning Ottawa for giving Newfoundland a power corridor across the Province of Quebec, and yet, Mr. Speaker, seventy-four Liberal members of Parliament from the Province of Quebec voted in favour of that legislation, flew in the face of criticism from the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. So the point that I am making, Mr. Speaker, is while on the one hand we are dismayed and concerned and we disagree with this unilateral decision on the part of the Government of Canada, we have great praise for their having the courage to bring in a piece of legislation that would give Newfoundland a power corridor across the Province of Quebec. And when I suggested last Thursday in this House that we pass a unanimous resolution on the floor of this House supporting the Government of Canada in bringing in this piece of legislation, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) refused to bring in the resolution and came in a couple of days later with a very weak, vague, general telex that he wanted to send off to the Government of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, about the holiday: How much is this holiday going to cost and

MR. NEARY:

what will it accomplish?

MR. HISCOCK:

Teachers alone will cost \$315,000.

MR. NEARY:

The teachers alone, Mr. Speaker, I understand, the cost of the holiday for the teachers alone will be \$315,000, that one day holiday.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is peanuts compared to Hibernia.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, it is peanuts compared to Hibernia! What will it accomplish? The government has its mandate. Why go through the dramatics and the histrionics?

MR. NEARY:

Why? The cost of teachers \$315,000; maintenance employees fifty-odd thousand dollars, public employees \$681,000. These three categories alone will cost the Province over \$1 million, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN:

It sounds like a good price to pay.

MR. NEARY:

I beg your pardon?

MR. TOBIN:

It sounds like a good price to pay.

MR. NEARY:

That is a good price to pay for what? It is a good price to pay for the dramatics of the Premier and the administration -

MR. HISCOCK:

Acting on impulses.

MR. NEARY:

- acting on impulse?

MR. DINN:

Over 60 per cent of the people agreed with it.

MR. NEARY:

Oh, I see. Mr. Speaker, listen to this. We just had a pearl of wisdom from the member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) who told us that over 60 per cent of the people agreed with it.

MR. DINN:

A landslide.

MR. NEARY:

A landslide. A landslide?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the government was given a mandate, a mandate to settle this offshore question.

MR. MARSHALL:

How can we?

MR. NEARY:

The hon. gentleman says, 'How can we?' I have been telling the hon. gentlemen all afternoon how they can settle the question.

MR. WALSH:

At least they are (inaudible) one way or the other and they have not done that.

MR. HODDER: Do not be silly.
You do not even know what you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, have I
been just talking to the walls here this afternoon?
The hon. gentleman obviously has not been listening
to what I have been saying. I have been saying,
'Set aside the partisan policies, set aside the
prejudice, set aside the preconditions and sit down
at the bargaining table and negotiate in good faith'.

MR. WALSH: The only thing we
are asking is to set aside the ownership issue.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon:

MR. WALSH: The only thing we
are asking is to set aside ownership forever and let
us get on with the thing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me
state again the Liberal position in this Province. Let
me state it again. What it has been, what it is now
and what it will continue to be: The position of the
Liberal Party of this Province, since the first permit
was issued for offshore drilling back in the mid '60s,
the position of this Province is that we own the
offshore resources.

The Liberal administration
of that day, back in the mid '60s, Mr. Speaker, sponsored
two university professors, paid for it, the project, to
put two plaques on the floor of the Grand Banks.

DR. COLLINS: How much did that cost?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The Liberal Government
of that day -

MR. HODDER: Not as much as this
holiday.

MR. NEARY: - paid for and sponsored

MR. NEARY: two university professors, one of whom is now deceased, to put two plaques on the floor of the ocean on the Grand Banks caliming the ownership out to the Continental Shelf in the name of Newfoundland and Labrador.

DR. COLLINS: How do the sculpins like it?
MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?
DR. COLLINS: How do the sculpins down there like it?
MR. NEARY: I know what the sculpins think of the hon. gentleman, and I know what the financial people think of the hon. gentleman too.
AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, politically.
MR. NEARY: Well that is another matter. We will deal with that in due course.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!
MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, right from the time the first permit was issued in this Province, when we had a Liberal administration the position was that we own the offshore resources. And we, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government of that day took it upon themselves to issue permits even though the hon. gentleman may not agree that permits were issued to the proper people. That is another matter or whether they dispute who got the permits. At that time, Mr. Speaker, it was quite easy to give away a permit. It was quite easy. There was nobody lined up at the door looking for a permit.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government took it upon themselves that we would ignore what Ottawa was doing and we would issue our own permits for oil development and drilling and oil production off our coast. So I hope this government does not claim a monopoly on that although they have been skillfully getting

MR. NEARY: away with it over the last several years. We get a new crop of news reporters and they think it is something new. Go back and check the records and see who took the offshore ownership in the name of Newfoundland and Labrador. It was the Liberal administration.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, when Sedco I sailed in to Newfoundland waters back in the early 1970s and started drilling for oil and gas on the Grand Banks off the coast of Newfoundland, there was no coverage, no protection for workers on that rig, for Newfoundland workers on that rig, no protection, Mr. Speaker. It was considered at that time to be a vessel, anything that floated, and this was a semi-submersible rig, it was in the category of a vessel and

MR. NEARY: there was no Workers' Compensation anywhere in Canada, and I do not think there is today, that covers workers, that protects workers on ships or boats that move in international waters, no protection even today. But what did the Liberal Government do, Mr. Speaker, at that time? The Liberal Government flew in the face of all logic and covered the Newfoundland workers on that rig, Sedco I, covered the workers on that rig under provincial Workers' Compensation. That is what we did at that time. And, Mr. Speaker, if we had not done that back in 1970 or 1971, if we had not done it the families of those who lost loved ones on the Ocean Ranger would have had no protection. It so happens, and it is something that I am rather proud of, that I was the acting Minister of Labour in this Province. I was the one who piloted that memorandum through Cabinet when I was acting Minister of Labour, in addition to my other duties in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: What is not true?

AN HON. MEMBER: You are acting now.

MR. NEARY: I am rather proud of that, Mr. Speaker. But it is another indication, Mr. Speaker, of who it was that took possession of the offshore in the name of Newfoundland and Labrador before hon. gentlemen on the other side were out of their knee pants. They were still going around in short britches, Mr. Speaker, they were still in knee pants when the Government of this Province, which was a Liberal Government, put the plaques on the floor of the ocean, gave coverage to workers on the rigs, flew in the face of all logic to cover these workers, and if it had not been for a Liberal Government there would have been no coverage.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we covered them under Workers' Compensation. And I might add, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, that our decision to issue permits and our decision to cover the workers under Provincial Workers' Compensation and our decision to put plaques on the floor of the ocean went unchallenged by the Government of Canada, unchallenged.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long do we have to listen to this?

MR. NEARY: I have another hour in case the hon. gentleman does not know it. Mr. Speaker, these three items should be a clear indication.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have not gone one hour.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Bugs Bunny is at it again. I let the hon. the Premier plough on in silence, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the hon. gentleman would do me the same courtesy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if any hon. gentleman wishes to say anything I think he has to say it from his seat, Your Honour is aware of that rule. That is basic, elementary, any school kid would know that you do not speak from somebody else's seat in this House. If you wish to open your mouth you have to do it in your own seat, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, these three items should give a clear indication to members of this House that it was a Liberal administration that took the offshore resources in the name of Newfoundland and Labrador and the

MR. NEARY: decision went unchallenged
by the Government of Canada. And I would think now, Mr. Speaker,
that one of the strongest, strongest points that this
government have in claiming the offshore resources, is the fact -

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, right on. Right on.

MR. NEARY: - is the fact that provincial
Workers' Compensation coverage was given to these rigs and the
Government of Canada did not even bother to question it. We
have been doing it for the last twelve or thirteen years, we have
been covering these workers. Now all of a sudden oil, as time
went on when it was impossible to get somebody to drill off our
coast, as time went on oil and gas was discovered and then it
took on new significance, new prominence, Mr. Speaker, took
on new significance and new prominence. Then, of course,
positions begin to harden

MR. NEARY:

somewhat, Mr. Speaker, Positions then began to harden and then the political rhetoric started to fly around, instead of sitting down around the bargaining table after we reached that point in our history, when we knew we had gas and oil off our coast, when we had reached that point in our colourful history, then both sides should have had sense enough to sit down and bargain in good faith and straighten out the management of the resource, the development of the resource and so forth and so on. So I think I have established beyond any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that it was a Liberal government in this Province that first claimed the resource offshore in the name of Newfoundland and Labrador.

And in the second place, Mr. Speaker, the position of this party has always been that we believe in an negotiated settlement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I recall several years ago - I do not know how long ago it was, a few years ago - when my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), speaking in this hon. House took the position - I believe he was Leader of the Opposition at the time, was he? - he took the position, my colleague did, that the government should attempt to negotiate a settlement of the offshore resources. And in case the media does not remember what happened at that time, in case the newer members of the House do not remember what happened at that time, you know what happened, Mr. Speaker? The present Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) accused my colleague of being a traitor to Newfoundland; how dare my colleague suggest

May 19, 1982.

Tape No. 412

ah-2

MR. NEARY: there be a negotiated
settlement. Hansard, Mr. Speaker, Hansard will bear
me out, that the administration viciously attacked my
hon. colleague.

AN HON. MEMBER: And Carter.

MR. NEARY: Pardon. Yes, the member for
St. John's North (Mr. Carter) joined in. There is a pair of
them over there, he and the Government House Leader.

MR. NEARY: There is a pair of them, Mr. Speaker; if you put them in a barrel I do not know who would come out first, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) or the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

MR. WARREN: It would not be much difference anyway who came out first.

MR. NEARY: No, it would not make much difference, it would not be much odds. But, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), who dared to suggest several years ago a negotiated settlement, was viciously attacked by this administration who told him he was going to sell out, he was attempting to sell out, he was a traitor and a coward and a traitor to Newfoundland. Does the hon. shiny nosed, wild-eyed, red checked member for Burin - Placentia (Mr. Tobin) know what happened a couple of years later? Does the hon. gentleman know what happened a couple of years later?

MR. TULK: Does he know what is happening now?

MR. NEARY: No, he does not know what is happening now. But in case the hon. gentleman does not know I will tell him.

MR. TOBIN: I know a lot what happened -

MR. NEARY: The administration -

MR. WARREN: How much did you give to your friends? How much went to your friends the last six months?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WARREN: How much went to your friends in the last six months?

MR. TOBIN: They will not need an enquiry to investigate me.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only advice I can give the hon. gentleman, if I were the hon. gentleman,

MR. NEARY: a new member in this House, I would be very careful about throwing around -

MR. DINN: He has a lot to worry about! He has read your book.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should bear this in mind, that once mud slinging starts, then nobody knows where it is going to end. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should keep that tucked away in the back of his mind, and all hon. members should do the same thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: How much did you give to your friends in Marystown during the election?

MR. NEARY: All hon. members should do the bear that in mind, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: How much did you give to your friends in Marystown during the election. How much? How much did you give your friends in Marystown during the election?

MR. NEARY: All hon. members should keep that in mind, especially new members.

MR. WARREN: He took care of the Marystown crowd during the election who were on welfare.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, so here we are today at this impasse now. We have gone the route, we have tried to be consistent, we have been consistent in our position. We said, and we have been saying and we will continue to say we own the resource and there should be a negotiated settlement. But who altered their position, Mr. Speaker? In case the hon. gentleman does not know, who altered their position? The hon. gentleman knows who altered their position?

MR. TOBIN: Answer your own question. Do not ask me.

MR. WARREN: They are all fixed up in Marystown.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), who made his maiden speech in this House yesterday, can tell me who altered their position. Was it the Liberals? Here is what we have been saying since the mid-1960s, since the first permit was issued: We own the resource, we think there should be a negotiated settlement, and we think that the matter of ownership should be set aside. Now, who altered their position?

MR. BAIRD: You know what happens to the man who sits on the fence.

MR. TULK: What do you mean sitting on the fence?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we have not sat on the fence. We, on this side of the House, have been consistent in these matters.

MR. WARREN: Not like that side.

MR. NEARY: We have made it clear beyond any doubt.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And, I believe now, I am the third if not the fourth, I am the fourth leader I believe to follow the party line, the party policy on this matter.

MR. HODDER: Show them what theirs was.

MR. HISCOCK: Yes, tell them what theirs was.

MR. NEARY: Now, what was their position, Mr. Speaker? What was the Tory position?

MR. TULK: Total ownership.

MR. NEARY: Total ownership. No ifs, ands and buts, no questions asked, total ownership, that is it. Fight to the bitter end, that was their position.

MR. WARREN: That is why the member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) crossed the floor.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, the member for Baie Verte, who was a colleague of mine at one time in our caucus, crossed the floor -

MR. WARREN: On ownership.

MR. NEARY: - crossed the floor on ownership because the caucus of which he was a member at that time would not toe his line, total ownership or nothing. And he was our energy critic and he went across the House, the member for Baie Verte.

MR. DWYER: He was vindicated by the election, was he?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe he was. Maybe he was, Mr. Speaker. Only time will tell, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the hon. gentleman was vindicated or not.

MR. HODDER: He went over on total ownership though.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman wanted total ownership. And Hansard, the newspapers, the media of the day will bear me out. Hansard will bear me out. The hon. gentleman made a speech, a very dramatic speech, in the House, an emotional speech -

MR. TULK: A very hard one for him to make too.

MR. NEARY: And a very hard speech, I would think, for him to make and then paraded across the floor of the House on the ownership question.

MR. HODDER: He wanted total ownership.

MR. NEARY: 'Total ownership', he says, 'or nothing'. Now, how far has the administration come? Well they have come around to our way of thinking, Mr. Speaker. They have come around finally to the Liberal way of thinking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: You are wasting time.

MR. NEARY: Having adopted our position, the Liberal position, to negotiate, Mr. Speaker, then -

MR. TULK: They do not know how to do it.

MR. NEARY: That is right, they do not know how to do it. That is right. They do not have confidence enough in themselves to be able to do it. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) is paranoid.

MR. HISCOCK: There are a few anti-Confederates there.

MR. NEARY: That is right, I am glad the hon. gentleman reminded me of that.

MR. BARRY: They do not want total ownership.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) is paranoid. He thinks, Mr. Speaker, he thinks negotiations and compromise are - somehow he interprets that in his little mind as a giveaway. He has no confidence in himself, the hon. gentleman.

MR. WARREN: That is right, that is right. Right on.

MR. NEARY: He cannot outfox or outwit or outsmart the feds, so what does he do? He finds every excuse in the book not to sit down and negotiate. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that I am wrong, I would hope that I am wrong, but I smell -

MR. TOBIN: Do you ever.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the latest move, the latest move on the part of the administration, I smell a skunk, Mr. Speaker. I have a feeling, I have a feeling that what those devious minds of the people who are spokesmen for this Province, what they were attempting to do was to drag the negotiations on until the next federal election, drag it on till the next federal election, hoping somehow or other they would be able to annihilate the five Liberal M.P.s from Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Things can change very quickly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not a suspicious man by nature, and I hope I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, but it certainly would appear that the only strategy, the only strategy that this administration have is to twist and turn and squirm and play political games because they want to get the five federal M.P.s from Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN: It is not going to work.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are gone anyway.

May 19, 1982

Tape 415

RA - 2

MR. NEARY:
not know about that.

Well, they may be gone, I do

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are after LaLonde.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, it would appear
to anybody, any thinking Newfoundlander, that what they are
doing is dragging out the negotiations - I mean get the

MR. NEARY: controversy, not the negotiations - there are no negotiations - get the controversy nearer to another Federal election, and then use the issue in the Federal election to try and defeat the five Liberal MPs from Newfoundland and try to get a Tory government up in Ottawa.

MR. WARREN: It is not going to work though.

MR. NEARY: That is the name of the game, Mr. Speaker, but it is not going to work.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear! It is not going to work, no.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they would sell Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders for their own political gain.

MR. WARREN: They are trying to do it, that is right, that is right. That is what they are doing. Yes, that is what they are doing.

MR. DAWE: You agree with Rooney, do you?

MR. WARREN: Look at the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), for example.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I say I hope I am wrong -

MR. WARREN: You are right, you are right on.

MR. NEARY: - but it is something we have to consider. It certainly would appear that way. I think it was a mistake on the part of the Premier of this Province to remove the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the former Minister of Mines and Energy in this Province. I think that it was a grave mistake -

MR. WARREN: He was doing a great job.

MR. NEARY: - to either force out the

MR. NEARY: minister - or he voluntarily resigned, I am not sure which. It certainly looked like the hon. gentleman was forced to resign.

MR. WARREN: He was doing a good job too.

MR. NEARY: There was a disagreement. The Hon. the Premier was not getting as much publicity on the offshore matter as the hon. gentleman was. The hon. gentleman was building up a great deal of respect. The hon. gentleman was getting a head of steam in this Province. He had been a leadership contender. He was building up great respect with the electorate -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - the people of the Province. He was doing a good job as Minister of Mines and Energy. I said that before today. I said that while the hon. gentleman was minister of that department, that he was a minister who surrounded himself with good people, he surrounded himself apparently with the right

MR. NEARY: kind of people who gave him the right kind of advice. And I think it was tragic and unfortunate that the Premier was so envious and jealous of the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. NEARY: - that he wanted him out of the Cabinet because the hon. gentleman was stealing the limelight, was getting the headlines.

MR. WARREN: Yes, the Premier was worried about him.

MR. NEARY: And the Premier was worried about his own -

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is right.

MR. NEARY: - image and about his own leadership and that the hon. gentleman may be a threat -

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - if a leadership convention was held.

MR. WARREN: That is right!

MR. TULK: He is a bigger threat to the Premier now.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman, the next thing we knew, he was out, much to my dismay. And I thought for sure, in this round of Cabinet appointments, that the hon. gentleman would have invited back in, would have invited to take his place, to take his place where he rightfully belongs -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - as Minister of Mines and Energy for this Province. That would have been a step in the right direction. That would have been an indication to all and sundry, Mr. Speaker, that the administration wanted to settle the offshore controversy, that they wanted to settle it.

MR. WARREN: He is not interested, is he?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman likes a good fight, I know that. I have had a lot of arguments in the House and outside the House with the hon. gentleman. He is a fighter. I respect him. I do not think he would have sold Newfoundland down the drain, I think he would have fought hard for a good deal for Newfoundland. I think the hon. gentleman saw the moves, being a good chess player, saw the moves back months ago, months and months ago, that this matter was headed for the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. TULK: Remember what he told the Premier?

MR. NEARY: What was that?

MR. TULK: He told the Premier he would not be successful.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right. The hon. gentleman, yes, that is right, he did. By God, even I am getting -

MR. LUSH: He would make a prophet.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the hon. gentleman told the Premier he would not be successful. MR. Speaker, that would have been an indication to the people of this Province that the administration wanted to settle this matter one way or the other.

MR. TULK: They did not want to.

MR. NEARY: It is obvious. They did not put the member back into the Cabinet so it is obvious they do not want an early settlement.

MR. WARREN: They want to go for another election.

MR. NEARY: They do not want an early settlement.

MR. WARREN: They want another election on it.

MR. NEARY: Well they at least want another federal election on it, they may not get another provincial, but they want at least to stretch it out so that it will be an issue in the federal election and they might be able to

MR. NEARY: annihilate five federal MPs from Newfoundland, Liberal MPs. And they might be able to form the Government of Canada - who knows?

MR. HISCOCK: And then they will do away with our power corridor through Quebec.

MR. NEARY: And then, Mr. Speaker, if they did happen to form the Government of Canada, would Mr. Clark then take away that power corridor across the Province of Quebec?

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is the first move. That is the first move.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it has been obvious right from day one with the large mandate, with the large majority that the government have on that side of the House - they have forty-four members, we have eight - it has been obvious from day one, Mr. Speaker, that there is serious discontent already in the Tory benches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear! Yes, Sir. If four guys want to come over now we would not take them.

MR. NEARY: I am not saying that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) in any way is discontented or disgruntled -

MR. BARRY: Who are they?

MR. HISCOCK: You.

MR. NEARY: - I am not saying that Mr. Speaker, because I do not think the hon. gentleman cares. He has established himself now practicing law in this Province, and I wish him every success in it.

MR. TULK: He cares as a Newfoundlander.

MR. NEARY: As a Newfoundlander he does. He probably would have liked to be given the opportunity to finish the job that he started. He would have liked to be given that opportunity. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are all on an ego trip. The hon. gentleman is no different, and human nature being what it is, the hon. gentleman would have loved to get a crack at it, but he was not invited. But I do not think the hon. gentleman has that much regard or respect for the present leader on that side of the House to care less. But there are members over there who feel very bitter and disgruntled and are very discontented today because they were not invited -

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 418

MLeP - 2

MR. HISCOCK: Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt).

MR. S. NEARY: - to sit in the Cabinet or they were not invited to be a parliamentary assistant.

MR. G. WARREN: That is right. The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond) is disgruntled.

MR. TOBIN: What has this to do with the motion?

MR. NEARY: It has all to do with the motion.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The voters in Conception Bay South would have liked to see their member invited into the Cabinet. And he probably would make a good Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker. But what did he get sloughed off on him? A Parliamentary Assistant!

MR. WARREN: In Justice. In Justice.

MR. WOODROW: That rotates every year.

MR. WARREN: They are coming to take you away.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the poor old member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), the poor old member for Bay of Islands has been overlooked so often now -

MR. BARRETT: This is completely irrelevant, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: - that we are beginning to feel sorry for him.

MR. BARRETT: The resolution is -

MR. NEARY: He would have made a better Minister of Energy than the present minister. Any one of the members I have mentioned would.

MR. LUSH: Great negotiator.

MR. NEARY: The member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) who has been overlooked so often, he does not even get asked to be a parliamentary assistant.

MR. TOBIN: What does that have to do with the resolution?

MR. NEARY: It has all to do with it.

MR. WARREN: He is a fighting Newfoundlander.

MR. POWER: Why do you not call relevance, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER: You are very confused.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would suspect -

MR. WARREN: You will go the next time, 'Charlie' boy.

MR. NEARY: - that the man who resents the present minister and the Premier more than anybody else is the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). Everytime he hears the Premier and everytime he hears the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) talking about their oil and gas regulations, the hon. gentleman must cringe -

MR. TULK: Squirm.

MR. NEARY: - squirm - regulations that the hon. gentleman worked out, drafted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thought I let the Premier go on in silence in this House.

Incidentally, are we going to finish this resolution today or are we going to go on tonight, tomorrow or what?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sometime. Sometime.

MR. NEARY: We are going to go on tonight? We are going to finish it today.

Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WARREN: We are here until three o'clock tomorrow.

MR. NEARY: - how much more time do I have left?

AN HON. MEMBER: Your time is up.

MR. BAYRD: Your time was up
years ago.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Twenty minutes.

MR. NEARY: Twenty minutes.

Well, Mr. Speaker,
having said all the things that I have said -

MR. TULK: Give them twenty more
minutes of wisdom.

MR. NEARY: - having begged the
administration and Ottawa to get back to the bargaining
table, having done all I can do here today as an
elected representative of the people to try to bring
about a negotiated settlement, having said all that,
Mr. Speaker, I will say this, that our side of the House
will vote for this resolution provided the government
will go along with the amendment.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. NEARY: We will vote for the
resolution as amended.

The amendment is a
very fair amendment.

MR. MARSHALL: It is not necessary
to go that way.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not
know if the hon. Minister of Energy, the Government
House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is indicating that they would
agree to the amendment or not.

MR. MARSHALL: I will tell you when
you sit down.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is
going to tell us when I sit down. The hon. gentleman is
going to get up and be highly indignant, he is going to
hurl his insults right, left and centre.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Like you. Like you.

MR. NEARY:

No, I hurled no

insults today, Mr. Speaker--

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

-nor anytime in this

House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday

in this House we saw a shining example of who starts the
mud slinging in this House.

MR. WARREN: The Premier.

MR. NEARY: We saw an example yesterday and anybody who wants to find out can go and check Hansard. Mr. Speaker, all we are asking, so that we can support this resolution and send a unanimous resolution to the Government of Canada, we are asking the government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to accommodate us with a minor amendment to the resolution, a very minor amendment.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: It is a minor amendment, Mr. Speaker. We are just asking the hon. gentleman to strike out all the words after 'table' and just say, 'Be it further resolved that this House go on record as calling on the federal and provincial governments to return to the negotiating table'. Or does the hon. gentleman just want to make it a one-sided affair? Does he just want Ottawa to come back to the bargaining table? Blame everything on Ottawa, get them back to the bargaining table on the hon. gentleman's terms. It has to be a two way street. If it is not, Mr. Speaker, then it is a political document.

MR. WARREN: It is like a boxing match.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Mr. Speaker, what we have now is just like putting two boxers in the ring. Only one can win.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. NEARY: That is right. My hon. friend said that today. One of them is bound to get knocked out if they stay there long enough.

MR. TULK: That is a good comparison.

MR. NEARY: Of course it is. Mr. Speaker, right now I would think once the word gets out about the debates that took place in this House today and about the meetings that took place, the announcement by the federal

MR. NEARY: Minister of Justice, I would think, Mr. Speaker, that once the word gets out on all these matters through the media that we, as politicians, are going to be looked upon as being rather childish and immature. We are, Mr. Speaker. We are now. You would be surprised the number of people who think politicians are crooks and on the take. But I believe in their hearts, Mr. Speaker, I do not think they believe that. But they certainly believe that politicians are immature and childish and cannot get along together. They cannot agree with one another. You have one party disagreeing with the other. You have members in a party disagreeing with his own party, both sides. You have NDPers disagreeing within their own party, Tories disagreeing within their own party, Liberals disagreeing within their own party, parties disagreeing with each other.

MR. NEARY: and it gets confusing and frustrating for the electorate. And they say to themselves it is a wonder that anything is ever done in the House of Assembly or in Parliament or in government, it is a wonder that anything is ever done, the way they fight and argue and quarrel and squabble. It does not have to be that way, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, boy.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it does not have to be that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: True to form. True to form.

MR. NEARY: We should be able to show the people of this country and of this Province that we can settle scuffles between ourselves. We should be able to show the people of this Province and of this country that we are not all idiots -

MR. BARRETT: There are a few on that side of the House.

MR. WARREN: Ignoramus, ignoramus.

MR. NEARY: - we are not all idiots and we are not all enemies of each other, and that we can settle disputes, we can settle disputes in our own backyards, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: Ignoramus Crosbieite.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Ignoramus Crosbieite.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion, as hon. gentlemen know, I had occasion to go to Washington alone.

MR. BARRETT: Because you could not get anyone to go with you.

MR. WARREN: Go on, you Crosbieite ignoramus.

MR. NEARY: I went to Washington, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The government, the administration, refused to send a representation to Washington. While I sat there in that room, Mr. Speaker, while I sat there in that room, probably the only Newfoundlander in history ever to appear before a committee of Congress, while I sat in that room, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BARRETT: (Inaudible) in Panama (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Ignoramus! Close up, ignoramus!

MR. NEARY: - it suddenly dawned on me that I was alone, that I was speaking for 560-odd thousand Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, I let the Premier speak in silence. I hope the hon. gentleman will do me the same privilege.

MR. WARREN: A bunch of ignoramuses.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could Your Honour just ask the hon. gentleman from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) to restrain himself?

MR. WARREN: Ignoramus, that is what he is.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Here I was, all alone, Mr. Speaker. Not only was I fighting for 560-odd thousand Newfoundlanders, but I was fighting for every

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 422

RA - 1

MR. S. NEARY: for every merchant seaman and every worker on a rig, a semi-submersible rig that flew the United States flag.

AN HON. MEMBER: Those who stood brave for ages.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, it was a very lonely position to be in and a very responsible position. But the message that came through loud and clear, Mr. Speaker, from members of the United States Congress, who were quick off the mark to investigate the Ocean Ranger tragedy, the message that came from the Chairman of that Committee of Congress, and the members of Congress on the Committee, who are all sincere fellows, here is what they said, Mr. Speaker, here is what members of the United States Congress said about the problem of jurisdiction in Canada. They said to me, 'Mr. Neary, it would seem to us that you have to get your own House in order up there in Canada.'

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Members might recall the chairman of that committee being on television.

MR. BARRETT: You would not know if you were going to (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: It will not be you.

MR. BARRETT: That is right.

MR. WARREN: It will not be you, I will tell you that.

MR. BARRETT: That is right (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: You are tied up with Crosbie too much.

MR. NEARY: And then, Mr. -

MR. WARREN: Tied up with Crosbie too much.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: -Mr. Speaker, then I began to realize

MR. NEARY: how serious this matter is; it is so serious that it has international ramifications. The reason the enquiry was going on in the United States, and I went down a second time to attend the hearings, the reason is because the United States or Canada does not recognize United States jurisdiction inside the two hundred mile limit on semi-submersible rigs, and vice versa. The United States takes the jurisdiction for granted. They feel they have every right to send in semi-submersible rigs and ships flying the United States flags. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, how bad I felt in the board room before a sub-committee of Congress, how bad I felt about the weak position that we were showing ourselves to the rest of the world? Here you had members of the United States Congress saying, "Get your own House in order. Up-date your legislation. Get your jurisdiction straightened out".

MR. NEARY:

That was the advice and the message from the Congress of the United States. Mr. Speaker, can we do it? Of course we can do it. All we want is the will to do it and then go ahead and do it. Mr. Speaker, what will do we need? What will it cost us to do this? Who will lose face? Who will ridicule us, Mr. Speaker, if we do this? How tall will we stand in this Province and in this country as a people if we did this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, who will lose face? Nobody, Mr. Speaker, will lose face. But I am sure after I take my seat the temptation will be there when I finish for members on the other side of the House to get up and say, and they would want to be awfully hypocritical if they did, to say, 'Oh, but we have been willing all along to negotiate, to go to the bargaining table. It is the other side that refuses.' I say, Mr. Speaker, they should resist that temptation. There should be a new day dawning in this Province. They should decide to get back to the bargaining table and they should decide to win in this argument with Ottawa. They should not decide to lose. Mr. Speaker, they should be brave and they should take heart. We can all be winners in this matter, Mr. Speaker. We can all be Canadians. We can all be neighbors and we can all be friends in the same land and we can accomplish the same aspirations and the same dreams. We can win, Mr. Speaker, but we have to want to win. And it will take great courage and new recognition of our responsibilities to carry out this great task ahead of us. And I pray, Mr. Speaker, that we are up to it.

MR. NEARY: We want to send out a message to Ottawa, loud and clear, from this hon. House that we unanimously disagree with the unilateral action taken by the Government of Canada to put this matter before the Supreme Court of Canada, that we believe in a negotiated settlement. And we want to vote for that resolution. And all we are asking the hon. gentleman is to change a couple of words, to make a minor amendment so that we can have a unanimous agreement in this House. We have no hesitation at all in supporting the resolution if the hon. gentleman will just put aside his prejudice and his bigotry and his nastiness just for a few moments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: I wish the hon. gentleman (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Lay it aside for a few moments -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - and accommodate, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition. Do not try to intimidate us, as the hon. gentleman always does. We want to do this in the best interest of Newfoundland.

MR. MARSHALL: Are the insults yours or are they (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we want to do this in the best interest of Newfoundland and of the people of this Province. We want to forget the little political game-playing for a change. And if the hon. gentleman will give us something that we can vote for, then I can guarantee you that he will get the majority of the members on this side of the House to vote 'aye'.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) of your own.

MR. NEARY:

Well, maybe the hon.

gentleman does not care. Maybe the hon. gentleman does not care. I would hope I am wrong again, Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. gentleman does care enough not to get up and attempt to intimidate members of the Opposition, to provoke us into saying things that we do not want to say.

We feel just as bad about this as anybody in this House, about this matter being referred to the Supreme Court of Canada. We are totally opposed to it, strong in our condemnation of the Government of Canada for taking this unilateral action, and highly critical, because we believe, Mr. Speaker, as we have always believed, that there should be a negotiated settlement.

Let me repeat again.

just in case some hon. member will get up on the other side and try to monopolize the fact that they are the only Newfoundlanders, the only party in Newfoundland that believes that Newfoundland owns the offshore resources.

The Liberal Party of this Province has always believed, still believes and will continue to believe that we own the offshore resources.

MR. NEARY:

We believe that there should be a negotiated settlement. Listen to this, just in case it does not sink into some members' thick skulls. We own the offshore resources, we believe that there should be a negotiated settlement, we agree that the ownership should be set aside while the negotiations are going on. And we are against, opposed to unilateral, federal action to refer the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada. We are opposed to that. Now what more can we say? We will vote for the resolution.

MR. BARRY: Two hours to say you agree?

MR. NEARY: Pardon!

MR. BARRY: Two hours to say you agree?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter and a couple of hours I do not think, when we are talking about our offshore resources is going to make that much difference. I hope that the hon. gentlemen learned something, especially the newer members who did not understand the position, who may be fooled into thinking that someone from that side of the House has a monopoly the ownership or something. We believe that, Mr. Speaker, and we hope that the administration will take the advice that we have given today, and that they will withdraw their case from the Newfoundland Appeals Court, the government of Canada withdraw their case from the Supreme Court of Canada, and sit down and negotiate in good faith. What more can I say, Mr. Speaker? Have I persuaded hon. gentlemen? Have I convinced hon. gentlemen? We want to vote for the resolution. The hon. Premier is back in his seat and he missed a good speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: We are prepared to support the resolution as amended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And I understand, I understand that the government side of the House, they have forty-four members,

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 425

PS - 2

MR. NEARY: they can out vote us, they can do what they want. But if they are sincere, and not playing political games and they want to accommodate the Opposition, make that minor amendment and they will have our full support, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. RUSSELL): The hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the amendment that is proposed by the leader of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - - and I will give the members opposite the reason. And that is because there is a very deliberate attempt to delete the reference in the Premier's motion to returning to the negotiating table on the bases put forward by the Government of Newfoundland.

MR. BARRY: Now, the members opposite have refused today, and have consistently refused, to accept and acknowledge that what this Province has been seeking, what this government has been seeking, is reasonable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And they are still, in this dark day in Newfoundland history and, I would submit, in Canadian history, they are still refusing to place their wholehearted support behind the reasonableness of what has been spelled out in the proposal put forth by the provincial government. Why do you think, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland spoke out in the last election? They could see that it was this Province that had put forth a detailed proposal. It was the federal government that had put forth nothing, Mr. Speaker, for the people of Canada or the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: They have ignored, for example, the fact that contained in this proposal is a tremendously significant concession on the part of the Newfoundland Government, where Newfoundland said, 'We are prepared to say that if the situation occurred where, by the luck of having natural resources, we could end up being the richest Province in Canada, we will agree that this luck of the draw will not apply to us, and we will have a trigger point where, if this Province is going to become rich out of all proportion to our fellow Canadians, we agree in this proposal to accept the principle that we be required to share. I mean, it is almost an insult to the people of Newfoundland to assume that you would need to have anything spelled out as far as Newfoundlanders sharing. God help us, our problem in the past has been probably we have been too

MR. BARRY:

quick to want to share.

Share! Share! Share! But did we get any recognition, Mr. Speaker, from members opposite today or in the past? Was there any recognition of the tremendous concession that had been made publicly, laid on the table in these negotiations? No, Mr. Speaker, we did not.

And I am sorry to see the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) still refusing, not just refusing to acknowledge, attempting to undermine and undercut the reasonable position that is being

MR. BARRY: put forth by requiring that that be deleted from the resolution in order to get the support of members opposite. Now I ask members opposite, if they want that section deleted from this motion, they will have to have the guts, the internal fortitude, to get up and say what they do not like about the Newfoundland proposal, spell it out for us. What is it you do not like?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Members opposite are trying to suck and blow at the same time, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: They are trying to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds. Now they cannot have it that way, and the last election should have shown they they cannot have it that way. They have to take a stand and they have to explain their stand. And their stand is either that they support the proposal that is put forth in this memorandum or they do not support it. And they should have the courage to speak out as to what is the situation with them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect for a few moments on what has led us to this sad day in Newfoundland and Canadian history. I would submit that a very large factor in seeing us here today is the fact that we had a Trudeau government re-elected in 1980. And I regret to say to a certain extent there were Newfoundlanders who had something to do with that, in re-electing five of seven federal Liberals in that election, when we had had Prime Minister Clark being prepared to accept and, in fact, to accept by agreement the position taken by the Province, to recognize Newfoundland ownership, Mr. Speaker. So, we, I think, all recognize that with respect to the offshore, just as with respect to this sorry state of the Canadian economy today, that to a certain extent we have brought it on ourselves.

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 427

1B-2

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, who could have believed that in re-electing the Trudeau government in 1980 we would have seen the rising of the characteristics that we have seen from this federal government since their re-election? The first characteristic, Mr. Speaker, a characteristic of vindictiveness. They have taken the position

MR. BARRY: that they are going to punish all those who dared stand in their way on just about any issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: We have seen the decision to punish Newfoundland by refusing to enter into any but the most minimal DREE agreements, the ones that you really had to rub their noses in public dismay before they would sign them. We saw, and we continue to see their refusal to meet with the Premier of Newfoundland.

I mean, has anybody in the history of Canada ever seen a situation where you have the Prime Minister of Canada unwilling to meet with the Premier of a province to discuss an issue of this magnitude?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. BARRY: It is an example of the poisoning of federal/provincial relations that has been encouraged -

MR. NEARY: It takes two.

MR. BARRY: Okay, I will get to the 'it takes two'. To a certain extent we have things to answer for as well, I will accept that. But I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are certain characteristics: One is that characteristic of vindictiveness that I believe has led to the poisoning of federal/provincial relations. Combined with that is the characteristic of pettiness. And, I suppose, there was nothing more petty than to use the Queen, Her Majesty the Queen, to rub the noses of those premiers who had not gone along with Mr. Trudeau's constitutional proposals, and to invite only the two Premiers to lunch with the Queen who had supported Mr. Trudeau's initial

MR. BARRY: constitutional proposals.

Did you ever see anything as petty in all your life,

Mr. Speaker?

So we have the characteristic of pettiness. Then we have, Mr. Speaker, the characteristic of arrogance, and the characteristic of lack of principle as shown by, Mr. Speaker, the statement that Mr. Lalonde made to me when I was speaking with him about offshore resources. He is very honest. I like dealing with Mr. Lalonde, you know exactly where you stand with him. He is a bright chap, but he is out front.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a snake.

MR. BARRY: Yes, there are snakes and there are snakes. I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. But he is up front, he is prepared to tell it as it is. And he told it to me as it is. He said, 'All of these reasons you may have heard about why we do not want to recognize Newfoundland's ownership, look, here it is: We do not want to have the same types of problems with Newfoundland as we have had with Alberta. That is it, period'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Now, where is the principle there, Mr. Speaker? Where is the great federal/provincial constitutional principle that the Government of Canada is standing on? Arrogance, no principles, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. BARRY: But, Mr. Speaker, the final characteristic, and the one that the people of Canada, not just the people of Newfoundland, are going to call them most to account for is the characteristic of inefficiency. It is the inefficiency, Mr. Speaker, of the Trudeau Government, the bumbling nature of the Trudeau Government, that has lead them to the point where, with the collapse of the national energy programme, with the collapse of the Alsands, with the collapse of the Alaska gas pipe line that they finally look around in desperation, almost, to see where they might ravage and pillage to try and make up for what they lost by their own stupidity and inefficiency. And they turn to Newfoundland, the second smallest Province, Mr. Speaker, with only seven members in the House of Commons, only two of those with the guts to get up and speak out. They turn to Newfoundland and they figure that Newfoundland will be easy pickings. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that by the time we are finished this debate today they will have the message loud and clear that Newfoundlanders are no longer easy pickings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, my recommendation to the Prime Minister of Canada, my recommendation is that when he receives his resolution unamended, as I know he will from this House of Assembly, that he would immediately get on the telephone to the Premier and that he would say to the Premier, 'What is past, is past. Let us start from this day and let us sit down and let us negotiate a fair and proper and reasonable deal on the offshore.' What I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that there should be an offshore summit with the Premier and the Prime Minister of Canada.

MR. NEARY: What about St. Pierre and Miquelon?

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 429

MLeP - 2

MR. BARRY:

I am getting to St. Pierre
and Miquelon. Then it is not all desperation moves here.
The fact that they are just dealing with Hibernia, while it is
bizarre, eccentric, one might say

MR. BARRY:

possibly stupid - they might be crazy like the fox, too - by just dealing with Hibernia they avoid any allegation that they are tampering with Quebec's offshore mineral rights, or Nova Scotia's, or P.E.I.'s, or New Brunswick's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Or France.

MR. BARRY:

They avoid dealing with possible problems with France over St. Pierre and Miquelon. No, they figure, we will isolate and try to corner the little Province of Newfoundland and take them on, bring the full weight of our Federal Government Justice Department onto Newfoundland so that we can try and rip them off.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not going to work. It being six o'clock I would like to adjourn the debate, if I could, to continue whenever we are sitting again.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

It is noted that the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has adjourned the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I do now leave the Chair until eight o'clock tonight.

SECOND SECTION

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

8:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1982

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

Order, please!

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, before the House

rose at six o'clock, I had pointed out that I believe the reason we have arrived at this dark day in Newfoundland and Canadian history is to a large extent due to the poisoning of federal/provincial relations which we have seen the Trudeau government get us into. And I mentioned the characteristics of that government, the vindictiveness, the pettiness, the arrogance, the lack of principle, but particularly the inefficiency, bungling and stupidity on economic matters which has now gotten us to the stage where they are desperately trying to salvage their National Energy Programme by picking on this Province's resources.

Mr. Speaker, I recommended that the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) should get down off his high horse, should recognize that the position which has been laid before his government by the Province of Newfoundland is a reasonable proposition, a proposition which goes further, I think, in terms of recognizing the willingness of this Province to share with the other peoples of Canada, more than any other proposal that I can recall in my time in politics or, in fact, that I can recall ever any other Province acknowledging. This Province has said, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to offshore resources, 'if by some fluke of nature we have ended up with resources that will lead this Province to great riches, wealth that would be out of proportion to other provinces of Canada, that we will tie ourselves to share when we reach the point of equality with other provinces'. Now, is that unreasonable? No, it is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And the point that has to be made, Mr. Speaker, is that the federal government has not responded to this proposal. I mean, the utter arrogance of coming in - I saw Mr. Chretien on television again tonight saying, "Oh, we are prepared to negotiate". What indication, now what indication has the people of Canada, the people of Newfoundland received that they are willing to negotiate apart from the fact that they are prepared to sit down at a meeting? Do we have anything that has been produced in the press or anywhere else that indicates their willingness to negotiate? I would submit, Mr. Speaker, we do have a concrete proposal from the Government of Newfoundland. We have not had a response from the Government of

MR. BARRY:

Canada, And it is because members opposite have refused to recognize and deal with the reasonableness of the Newfoundland proposal that I cannot support their amendment.

MR. STAGG:

Or read it! They have not read it.

MR. BARRY:

Well, I wonder if they have read it, Because if they had read it I am sure that they would be on their feet in full support. Now, I am not here to question the patriotism of members opposite. The members opposite are good God-fearing Newfoundlanders -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? What?

MR. BARRY:

- making a contribution to their Province as best they can.

MR. CARTER:

No, I do not agree!

MR. BARRY:

But I do question, I do question, however their good judgement, Because Mr. Speaker, what we see is the party on the opposite side of the House making the same mistake which led to their utter humiliation at the polls last month, and that is an attempt to play political games.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

An attempt to play political games on an issue of monumental importance to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, members opposite, when they get up, should deal directly with this question. Do they or do they not accept that the proposal, which has been put before the Government of Canada by the province of Newfoundland, is an acceptable one - a reasonable one, is a good basis for negotiation? If they accept that, Mr. Speaker, that it is reasonable and it is a good basis for negotiation why are they trying to have it removed from the resolution that is before the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite have asked this House to agree to an ammendment.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, could you control the members behind me as well as in front of me until I can make my point here?

MR. LUSH: Where are the good ones, behind you?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the thrust of the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition is that we delete the reference to the Province and the Federal Government sitting down to negotiate on the basis of the Newfoundland Proposal. Now, if they are making that submission it has to be because they think there is something wrong with this proposal as the basis for negotiation. And I believe they owe a duty to this House and to this Province to point out clearly, and specifically and exactly, where it is that they believe that this proposal falls down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And I will be listening with interest to members opposite to find out why they disagree with this proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: Certainly!

MR. BARRY: This proposal

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 433

RA - 1 Evening session.

MR. L. BARRY: For settlement has been a public document, has been a public document for a number of months?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Since the 16th of March.

MR. BARRY: Since the 16th of March?

MR. DINN: Your leader has it. Your leader has it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who? Who?

MR. L. BARRY: The Premier put it forth during the election campaign, and obviously the people of Newfoundland who looked at this proposal said to themselves, 'That is reasonable. What the Province is seeking is reasonable and should be supported'. And they ended up supporting with - sixty - odd per cent?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sixty-one per cent.

MR. BARRY: Sixty-one per cent.

MR. STAGG: And rising.

MR. LUSH: 61.1 per cent.

MR. BARRY: Now, I will ask members opposite, let us have their opinion. Do they support this as a reasonable basis for negotiating? If this is a reasonable basis for negotiating -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - if this is a reasonable basis for negotiation, then why is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asking that reference to it be deleted from the motion that we are going to send up to the Federal Government in Ottawa? Why do they want it deleted?

DR. COLLINS: Do not be so ignorant.

MR. NEARY: Give it to us so we can read it. I have not even seen it.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not that this Province, it is not that this Province is afraid of going to court. Let nobody underestimate the strength of our legal case, Mr. Speaker, and we have shown that by our willingness to refer

MR. BARRY: it to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland on appeal. But why, Mr. Speaker, why is this extraordinary slap in the face being given to the people of Newfoundland, to the judiciary of Newfoundland, by taking the Hibernia area out of this reference that has been put to the Newfoundland Court of Appeal. Now, do not let anybody fool you. If the Supreme Court of Canada says that ownership of Hibernia lies with so and so, can anybody here believe that that will not affect the case that is before our Newfoundland Court of Appeal? Can anybody here accept that that will not cut the legs out from underneath our judiciary here in this Province. And why, Mr. Speaker, why should we not have the opportunity, why should not our Province have the opportunity of listening to the opinion of judges here in this Province who are familiar with local conditions? Why should not the Supreme Court of Canada have the benefit of their wisdom, of their arguments, of their statement of the local situation in deciding ultimately at the

MR. BARRY:

Supreme Court level? But no, it must be that the Federal Government is afraid of what the decision of the Newfoundland Court of Appeal might be. Well, I believe they should have every great affaire as to the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that we will have a good case to put before the Supreme of Canada does not take away from the fact that what is being done here today by the Federal Justice Minister is shameful. It is shameful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Any lawyer worth his salt will tell his client that you should only go to court as a last resort. The decision on this issue, on this offshore issue, is an all or nothing proposition. Either Newfoundland will have ownership, or the Federal Government will have ownership.

MR. HODDER: Why did we go to court?

MR. BARRY: It will be all or nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did we pick this route?

MR. BARRY: Because, Mr. Speaker, we were put to the situation where we had no choice. The Federal Government with its arrogance, with its refusal to respond

MR. CARTER: They did not even respond.

MR. BARRY: - to this proposal -

MR. CARTER: They did not even reply.

MR. BARRY: - with the fact that it was pushing another case in the Federal Court of Canada, the S.I.U. case, put this province in a situation where it had no choice but to refer the matter to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland on appeal. Now, the Leader of the Opposition used first of all, Mr. Speaker, I think it is an example of the interest of this issue in the Province that we have such a representation in our galleries tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And I think that the words should get back to the Federal Government in Ottawa, that even

MR. BARRY: Even though the election is over the people of this Province is still concerned with issues such as this which have such a great importance for the future of themselves and our children. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition used an apt analogy, the analogy of a Falkland Islands crisis. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt as to who the aggressor is in this situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And he is not here in this chamber. This is a case of pure, naked, aggression.

MR. STAGG: Right.

MR. BARRY: Now, the Falkland Islands, the hypothesis is that they may be, the Argentine may be

May 19, 1982

Evening Session
Tape no 435 JC-1

MR. BARRY: looking for the oil and gas resources around the Falkland Islands and to claim the resources of a portion of the Antarctic. Well, we do not have to speculate as to what is behind the aggression of the Federal Government. We know, they are out purely and simply by their aggressive act to take away a particular resource belonging to this Province. Mr. Speaker, just as in international affairs aggression can not be condoned, similarly I submit in the field of Federal/Provincial affairs aggression can not and will not be condoned. The people of this province will not accept it and I submit that when we see the next Federal election we will see that the people of Canada will not accept it.

SOME. HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: It is time for this tired and sick government that we have in Ottawa to go Mr. Speaker. The time has passed for it to go, as the people on our unemployment lines can tell the Prime Minister. Go for the sake of Canada. Go and go quickly. The Prime Minister has spent the last fifteen years approximately in public life in Canada, solving the crisis in Quebec. And just look at the solution. We have a separatist government elected in Quebec, we have relations with the Quebec government I say, as strained as they have ever been in the history of Canada. Is the Prime Minister of Canada trying to bring this Province to the same point? Why does he not wise up to the fact that this Province believes strongly in the fact that if we have a resource, it must be developed on a basis where the people of Newfoundland can join in that development? We do not want to be paternalised. We do not want to be treated as though we do not know what we are doing or we are not able to handle our own affairs, Mr. Speaker. The time has come for the Prime Minister of Canada to recognize that what we are asking is not something that is unreasonable, we are asking for a fair share of revenue, indicating a willingness to share with our fellow

May 19, 1982

Tape no. 435 Evening Session
JC-2

MR. BARRY: Canadians, but we are also asking for the opportunity to participate in the management of this resource. Now Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before dinner I believe that the way out of this impasse is for the

MR. BARRY:

Prime Minister to call up the Premier and to say that the time has come for an offshore summit. If we can have a summit on nuclear disarmament, if we can have an economic summit, then I think that this issue, as far as the people of this Province are concerned, and, I submit, as far as the people of Canada are concerned, is deserving of an offshore summit. And the fact that the Prime Minister has not been willing to sit down except for a seven or eight minute occasion when it happened to be by chance that they ended up in the same room together, and even the Prime Minister did not have the face to turn his head away and refuse to talk, but he has refused to sit down in a formal meeting to discuss this issue with the Premier, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that that also is shameful for the Prime Minister of Canada.

Now this can be solved.

It is an issue which can be solved by good faith and willingness to negotiate on the part of all sides. From time to time, Mr. Speaker, I think we in the Province have reacted in frustration in ways or through statements that might indicate that we are taking a rigid attitude, but I think by and large it has been clear that what has been put forth, as the Premier reaffirmed this afternoon, has been put forth as the basis for negotiations, a good basis for negotiation.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is moments like this in the history of a nation, in the history of a province that calls for statesmanship. Prime Minister Trudeau, in the few days he has remaining to him in that post, can, I think, crown his political career by the great act of statesmanship, which would not be asking all that much when I think of it, of calling up the Premier and saying, 'Let us make one final attempt

MR. BARRY: to settle this issue'.
Mr. Speaker, I say
the Prime Minister can do no less.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question. Question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Question?

MR. MARSHALL:

On the amendment,

questions.

MR. NEARY:

Wrong.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I agree that this is a sad day for Newfoundland and I trust that in the next few moments that I can speak, Mr. Speaker, without emotion and without giving the kind of partisan speech that we just listened to. This is too sad a day, Mr. Speaker, for that kind of a situation, for that kind of emotionalism and for that kind of partisan speech that we just listened to. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope over the next few moments that I can speak as an ordinary and as a common Newfoundlander, as a humble representative from rural Newfoundland, as a member, Mr. Speaker, who was able to stem the tide, was able to stem the current, and become one of the eight on this side of the House, as one, Mr. Speaker, that some people, at least, believed to be a Newfoundlander. I hope, tonight, that I can illustrate, Sir, my concern for the developments over the past twenty-four hours.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate, but I do have to answer some of the questions that the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) raised. The hon. member asked what was it about Newfoundland's proposal that we dislike. I want to say first of all, Mr. Speaker, that I have never seen the Newfoundland proposal. I have never seen it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be intimidated -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - and, as I have said, I do not want to become emotional because I am as inclined -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - and as capable of becoming

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 438

MLep - 1

MR. T. LUSH

that I believe that they put forward the best proposal possible and I will accept it blindly. I believe hon. people opposite have had the interest -

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear !

MR. LUSH

- of Newfoundland enough at heart

that they got a good proposal ,and I accept it blindly, I accept it blindly.

AN. HON. MEMBER

You would think they would have had the decency to give us a copy.

MR. LUSH

I accept it blindly, Mr. Speaker, but I have never seen it, but I accept it blindly.

DR. COLLINS:

Your leader has it.

MR. LUSH

So we do not disagree with the proposal, or at least I do not, Mr. Speaker. I do not disagree with the proposal. I have not seen it but I have enough confidence in hon. gentleman opposite, the people working in the top echelons of the government , I have enough confidence that they have put forward a reasonable proposal and I will accept it ,Mr. Speaker. So we do not disagree with the proposal I do not think anybody does on this side of the House, and I am not sure any of us have seen it, I have not, I have not, but, Mr. Speaker, I accept it, having confidence in the patriotism of hon. gentleman opposite to put forward the best proposal, and I accept it. But, Mr. Speaker, why then was this amendment put forward? Why was the amendment put forward ? The amendment Mr. Speaker, was put forward to remove some of the pre - conditions to negotiations. That has been our position, We do not agree with going to court, either to the Newfoundland Supreme Court or to the Supreme Court of Canada, We believe in negotiations, and we were trying to help to bring these

MR. LUSH: negotiations around, we try to remove some of the preconditions, three preconditions. Three preconditions, Mr. Speaker, three preconditions were attached to the government statements today, three preconditions.

One condition, Mr. Speaker, was that ownership be set aside during the negotiations. That was stipulation number one. That was stipulation number one, that ownership be set aside during the negotiations. The second one, Mr. Speaker, was that when a final decision was made, that ownership be still set aside. Point number two. Point number three was that the Newfoundland proposal be accepted. Three preconditions to negotiations. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask, what would have happened had the federal government listed so many preconditions?

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 439 (Evening)IB-1

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, that is not the way negotiations are done. The Newfoundland proposal, we would have hoped would have formed, Mr. Speaker, a part of the negotiations. This is what we would have hoped, that the Newfoundland proposal would have been discussed at the table. What kind of negotiations are these, when we are asked to accept them before negotiations begin? Negotiations, Mr. Speaker, are not contingent upon preconditions. And so, Mr. Speaker, that is why we have put forward the amendment to remove these conditions.

But the situation is, Mr. Speaker, as insidious as it might sound, that hon. members opposite want to do everything they can to not get the support of people over here. Mr. Speaker, they want to back us in a corner of not supporting them. Why, Mr. Speaker, just a couple of days ago when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) indicated his support for the mandate that this government had received re the offshore and re the corridor through Quebec, when the Leader of the Opposition indicated that we were going to support the government on this, the Premier indicated it was too late, that we are now getting on a bandwagon. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are not getting on a bandwagon. Our position has been enunciated a long time ago, where we stand on those issues.

Today the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) did not talk like a person who was looking for our support. The government would be very, very happy, the government would be most happy, and that is unfortunate to say, Mr. Speaker, they would be very happy if we did not support this resolution. They would be very happy if they backed us into a corner and said certain words and used certain rhetoric that we could not support them. It is not our support they are looking for, Mr. Speaker. They do not want our support. We advanced

MR. LUSH: this amendment, Mr. Speaker, in sincerity. And I have said the reasons and they are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, to remove these preconditions, to remove these preconditions.

But I have some news for hon. members opposite. Mr. Speaker, whether they accept our amendment or not, we are going to support this resolution. We are going to support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: And if the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), and if the Premier (Mr. Peckford) do not want our support, I am going to tell you now, tonight, that we do not care if they

MR. T. LUSH:

do not want our support because we are supporting the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, just to illustrate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. T. LUSH: - just to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, just to illustrate -

MR. NEARY: Let us have the vote.

MR. TULK: Let us have the vote 'Bill'.

MR. T. LUSH: - just to illustrate, Mr. Speaker,-

MR. MARSHALL: Since when (inaudible).

MR. L. LUSH: See, Mr. Speaker, they do not want our support. They do not want our support.

MR. BARRETT: It is never too late (inaudible)

MR. T. LUSH: They do not want our support.

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible) crazy about it.

MR. LUSH: That was not their hands, Mr. Speaker, we just heard on the desks, that was their tails, That was their tails you just heard tapping over there.

MR. MORGAN: You are wagging your tail,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. HICKEY: Give up the bull.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, just to illustrate that we are not getting on a bandwagon -

MR. STAGG: You were just dumped off it.

MR. LUSH: 1975 was the first time I came into this House, Mr. Speaker, and let me just quote a resolution, a Private Members resolution that was given in my first session here, put forward by Mr. Rowe, then the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde. Let me read, Mr. Speaker,

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 440

RA - 2 Evening session.

MR. LUSH: let me read the resolution.

MR. MARSHALL: The member for Bay de Verde (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Do not be catty, You are more of a gentleman than that now.

MR. MARSHALL: The disappearing 'Rowes'.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, let me read the resolution.

MR. NEARY: Boy, you are getting awfully arrogant over there.

MR. TULK: Statesmen, statesmen.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Look at the people who are concerned.

MR. LUSH: Let me read the preamble to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, It says, "BE IT RESOLVED that this House" - and this was made in 1975, 1975, Mr. Speaker, BE IT RESOLVED that this House reaffirms that Newfoundland and Labrador owns and possesses jurisdiction in respect of the resources of the sea bed, including minerals and hydro carbons in the area extending to the edge of the Continental Shelf and the margin adjacent to Newfoundland and Labrador or to a limit extending two hundred miles from the inner limit of the Canadian territorial sea whichever is the greater'. That was in 1975, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: -first when I came to the House.

That was the resolution, Mr. Speaker, that was advanced by this side of the House -

MR. HODDER: The Liberals.

MR. LUSH: - this side of the House. We have not changed, unfortunately, we were on this side then, we are on this side now, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is again, that is again, an attitude of hon. members opposite. They are awfully concerned about the last election. And, Mr. Speaker, that is their problem, they are always concerned about elections. They are always concerned about elections, Mr. Speaker.

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 440

RA - 3 Evening session.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Well, I am going to make a little
confession. I am not at all concerned about the last
election, I am concerned about the next one, Mr. Speaker.
I am concerned about the next one.

MR. STAGG: You should be.

MR. LUSH: And if hon. members

MR. LUSH: keep up their
arrogance, I can tell you where they are going to be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I
wanted to answer the question from the hon. the member
from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) and tell him why we put
forward the amendment to the resolution, and I hope
that I have demonstrated that. And that is the
sincerity behind it, Mr. Speaker. As I have said before,
I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary)
in speaking today said that he found himself as a
conciliator. And this is why the resolution was put
forward in an attempt to remove these preconditions
to the negotiations.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we
disagree, we disagree with the federal government's
unilateral action to put this before the Supreme Court
of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: We disagree with it.
We disagree with it, Mr. Speaker, we disagree with it.
I hope the Newfoundland people will get that message,
that we disagree with this unilateral action.

However, one must ask
what brought this about, Mr. Speaker. What brought this
action about? It is a strange thing, Mr. Speaker, it
is a strange thing. Is it not strange that hon. members
of the government, the Provincial Government of Newfoundland
can put it before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland but
when the federal government decides to play tit for tat
and to put it before the Supreme Court of Canada that is
not right. That is not right, Mr. Speaker, that is not
right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in
accordance with the Standings Rules of this hon. House
a member has a right to speak in silence. And my hon
colleague, Mr. Speaker, is making a good speech and
he is being interrupted by the arrogant members on
the government benches. I would submit, Your Honour,
that you ask the members to your left to restrain
themselves so that my hon. colleague can continue with
his speech.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order,
Mr. Speaker. It is obvious, I would agree, that an hon.
member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. HISCOCK: Provoking.

MR. MARSHALL: From the content of the
speech of the hon. member, would that he would speak in
silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order
I wish to remind members on both sides of the House that
when an hon. member is speaking he has the right to be heard
with the silence of the rest of the members in the House.

The hon. the member for
Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I realize
that the truth is coming out, because hon. members do
not like to hear the truth. Mr. Speaker, our position
for a number of years

MR. LUSH: on this offshore issue has been that we own the offshore, that we possess the offshore, that the federal government should recognize our ownership and our jurisdiction, but that it should be a negotiated settlement. That has been our position. That has been our position, and today as I have said we feel sorry, and we agree with hon. members that it is a sad day, that the federal government decided to put this before the Supreme Court. Mr. Speaker, that side deserves, that side deserves some attention as well. I was about to say that the provincial government, they were the people who initiated the court action. They were the people who initiated the court action. It was they, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: - it was they who initiated the court action. It was they, Mr. Speaker, it was they. And let the people of Newfoundland know, let the word go out this evening, it was the provincial government who initiated, or which initiated, the court action. It was they, Mr. Speaker, it was they. And it was they, Mr. Speaker, it was they on the premise, on the premise, Mr. Speaker, that the Newfoundland Supreme Court would be more favourable to our position. Now, Mr. Speaker, what a discriminatory remark to make about the judiciary system of this Province. What a discriminatory remark to make about the judiciary of this Province. What an erosion of justice, Mr. Speaker, to think that the Supreme Court of Newfoundland which, by the way is a federal court, appointed by the federal government, all the judges of the Supreme Court are appointed by the federal government and to think that they would rule - that was the reason given

MR. LUSH:

that the Supreme Court of Canada would rule in favour of the federal government's position. That has been the idea, that has been the notion which this government has been trying to put forward to the Newfoundland people. What happened, Mr. Speaker, just a little while ago when the Constitution was placed before the Supreme Court? One would have thought that they would have ruled in favour of the federal government. Did they, Mr. Speaker? Did they on the constitutional issue when that was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada? Did they rule in favour of the federal government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. LUSH: I see some members saying yes. That is not the way I saw it.

AN HON. MEMBER: A legal mess.

MR. LUSH: They were straight down the middle, Mr. Speaker. Right on the fence, Mr. Speaker. That is why it got referred back to Parliament again. A good thing, by the way. I happen to agree with that. It came back to Parliament again.

But in that very notion, in the enunciating of that very concept, what the Premier and his government were doing unwittingly or otherwise was to erode the judiciary, the effectiveness of the judiciary in this Province, the judicial system, our Supreme Court. That is what they were doing. But, Mr. Speaker, let the word go out that it was the provincial government that initiated the court action. And the federal government, by putting it to the Supreme Court, it was just a matter of tit for tat. And today hon. members opposite are going around crying wolf. Mr. Speaker, it was tit for tat.

MR. LUSH:

Oh, hon. members will say, the federal government negotiated in bad faith because ownership was to be set aside. Hon. members were looking for a way out. They were looking for an excuse to break off negotiations. Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH: For two years, for two and-a-half years they were indoctrinating the people of Newfoundland, they are indoctrinating the people of Newfoundland about the big bad wolf in Ottawa.

MR. HISCOCK: Did a good job. Did a good job.

MR. LUSH: That is what they were doing, Mr. Speaker, putting out propaganda, putting out their little leaflets, putting out their little brochures with misrepresented facts on them, trying to, Mr. Speaker - misrepresenting the facts, misrepresenting the truth. This is what they were doing for two and-a-half years, carrying on a programme of propaganda against the federal government. And when they figured, Mr. Speaker, when they figured that they had the people of Newfoundland behind them, they figured they would break off negotiations and call an election. That is the truth of the matter. That is what happened, Mr. Speaker. They did not want a negotiated settlement, they wanted, first of all, to win an election. They wanted to win an election on the offshore. They wanted to win an election. They have done it, Mr. Speaker, they have done it. They have done that, they have their mandate and the reason, as I have said, was the case with the S.I.U. It was the case with the S.I.U. where the federal government put in a reference of ownership. And very hastily that was the excuse, that was the obstacle that they had been looking for. What happened with that case, Mr. Speaker? What happened with it? Had the government waited six or seven days, the court threw it out. The judges did not even deal with the ownership, they said it was irrelevant to the case. It was irrelevant to the case. But by then we were into the election.

MR. LUSH: By then we were into the election. So, Mr. Speaker, the case is clear. The case is clear that this government were looking for, were looking for a way out. They were looking for a reason, they were looking for an excuse to get out of these negotiations to call an election. But, Mr. Speaker, despite all of that, in spite of all of these circumstances, we on this side today, we on this side today stand with them, we stand as one. We stand as one in disagreeing with the federal government in referring this case unilaterally to the Supreme Court of Canada. We disagree with that position. We disagree, Mr. Speaker, with it in the strongest possible terms. We disagree with it. We disagree with the fact that the provincial government referred it to the provincial courts, because we believe that it should be a negotiated settlement. And that is why, Sir, we have advanced this amendment. That is why we advanced that, we wanted to remove some of the preconditions attached to the Newfoundland position, because we believe that these preconditions which were set up are

MR. LUSH: indeed items and issues which should be negotiated around the table. We tried to remove these, but if the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was speaking for all members on the government side, and one can only assume that he was, if he, indeed, was speaking for all members on the government side, then this amendment will be defeated. It will be defeated, as we have said so many times in the past, because forty-four beats eight any day, beats eight any day. So, Mr. Speaker, if it is defeated, if it is defeated, as we know it will be, as we know it will be, then we accept that, we were just trying to help the government out. But, as I have said, before, we will support the motion as it stands, we will support the motion as presented by the government. We will support the motion because we want to demonstrate, we want to demonstrate to all of Newfoundland and to Canada, and to Canada, when it comes to supporting Newfoundland, when it comes to working for Newfoundlanders, when it comes to any issue that is to the benefit of Newfoundlanders, to all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that we are going to stick with Newfoundlanders and we are going to stick together. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we will support this resolution even though hon. members opposite will not vote for the amendment. We are still going to support the resolution. And I am a little disappointed and rather sorry that hon. members opposite could not see fit to accommodate the opposition on this very reasonable amendment, very reasonable amendment. There is nothing insidious about it, Mr. Speaker, nothing at all other than the sincere and genuine motive to remove the three preconditions that were of -

MR. TULK: Obstacles.

MR. LUSH: The three obstacles, I suppose, in a way. That is the way we looked at it, three obstacles to negotiations. Because we see no reason for preconditions attached to

MR. LUSH negotiations, and that is why we advanced the amendment, But as I said before, it looks like the hon. members on the government side are not about to support the amendment. But, Mr. Speaker, we will support the motion because we believe in the ownership of the offshore, we believe in developing the offshore for the maxium benefits of the people of this province, and that's why we are going to stand behind the motion. And if hon. members want the support, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members want the support of members on this side, one would expect that from time to time, from time to time

MR. STAGG: Occasionally.

MR. LUSH: Occasionally, that on the odd occasion they would support some amendment put forward by this side of the House. But no, Mr. Speaker, with such a reasonable amendment they saw no reason to support it. But, as I have said, Mr. Speaker, we will support it. And I hope that our support, and I hope by giving the unanimous support of this House that indeed this will have some effect on the federal government and that it will have some effect on the provincial government, and that both sides will see the futility, Mr. Speaker, of going to court, they will see that the best way that the Canadian way to resolve this particular impasse, to resolve this particular problem, is through negotiation.

Mr. Speaker, we hope on this side of the House, we hope for the benefit of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that that is the way it will be. We hope, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government will decide to pull it out of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland and that the federal government will likewise decide to pull it out of the Supreme Court of Canada and that together, in the Canadian way of doing things, they will get down and negotiate and get the best settlement possible for Newfoundland and Labradorians and for Canadians. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in order to ensure that all hon. members have an opportunity to express their views on this important issue, I move that the House not adjourn at eleven o'clock tonight.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): It has been moved and seconded that the House do not adjourn at eleven o'clock tonight. Those in favour 'Aye'. Contrary, 'Nay'. I declare the 'Ayes' have it.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we have had four speakers in this debate already. We had the Premier who expressed the outrage that all Newfoundlanders

DR. COLLINS:

feel at the action taken by the Federal Government today. We had a stirring speech by the member from Mt. Scio (Mr. Barry), which I think again expressed the feelings of the people on this side of the House and I think many people in this Province. We have also had two speakers from the Opposition. We had the Leader of the Opposition and I say this, Mr. Speaker, I was very, very disappointed in the Leader of the Opposition. We know in this House that the Leader of the Opposition can give a very good speech. His content is not always to our liking, but we know that his delivery, and his style, and his vigor is often very, very entertaining, if not constructive. But I say this, that the Leader of the Opposition's performance in this House today was very disappointing. He was listless, he read most of his remarks because his heart was not in it. He felt that he was going through just an exercise, he really was not behind what he was saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

I sympathize with the Leader of the Opposition, I sympathize very distinctly because he knows that the action the Federal Government took today was inexcusable. It was inexcusable! But, nevertheless, in the Liberal tradition a sellout was in order. So the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was on the horns of a dilemma. He knew that he could not in all sincerity support what the Federal Government did, but nevertheless, the tradition of sell out was in his soul. So I sympathize with the Leader of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

We, Mr. Speaker, are at a crossroads in this Province on this day, we are at a crossroads. And the Leader of the Opposition should not have said: 'A plague on both your houses or

DR. COLLINS: each one is just as bad as the other,' he should have stood up and said what was in his heart, 'forget the Liberal tradition', in the case where Newfoundland is at risk at this point in time. I will come back, perhaps, to the Leader of the Opposition a little bit later. But we had another speaker, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) who just sat down, and I do have to answer a number of the points that the member for Terra Nova brought out. The member for Terra Nova expressed sadness at what happened today. He expressed that a number of times. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is too gentle an emotion for today. It is not sadness we want to hear today, we want to hear anger. Your temperature was too low, Sir. We want to hear anger at what happened today, not sadness.

MR. LUSH: I will have it the next time!

DR. COLLINS: The member for Terra Nova also expressed concern about what happened today. We do not want to hear concern, we want to hear rejection. The Newfoundland people want to hear rejection

DR. COLLINS: of this federal initiative today. The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said, "We do not know what the Newfoundland government stand is on this. We do not know anything about this document which is dated January 25th. We do not know anything about this". A document that was made public at a press conference at the latter end of March, "We do not know anything about that". What credibility can we give to the opposition if they will not even read a document that is vital to the future of this Province? And they expect us to pay attention to their remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, also, what credibility can we give to the member for Terra Nova when he says that the Newfoundland government acted in bad faith, they did not go up there to negotiate, they went up just to win an election? What credibility can you give to the Opposition when they say that about the elected administration of this Province? Mr. Speaker, the member for Terra Nova said the representatives of the Newfoundland government went up to misrepresent. I mean, that is absolutely disgraceful. What credibility can you give to the members Opposite? They are small in number and we are large in number. We want to play fair ball with them. But what credibility can we give them if they come out with that nonsense, that the government of Newfoundland goes to Ottawa with the intent of showing bad face, with the intent of misrepresentation? That is totally disgraceful, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Terra Nova, talked of preconditions and he stated some of them correctly, some of them not correctly. He stated the first one, that the ownership issue should be set aside during negotiations. Now, he suggested that the Newfoundland government made that precondition. We did not make that precondition. The

DR. COLLINS: Prime Minister made that precondition when he spoke to Memorial University students. He said, 'Let us negotiate and put the ownership aside'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: That is where that precondition came from. Mr. Speaker, he also said, another precondition was that ownership be put aside permanently if an agreement was reached. Yes, that was our precondition. Yes, it was. It is a logical precondition. What is the use of reaching an agreement if it is not going to be permanent? What flows out of an exercise if it can be torn up at the drop of a hat? It is only logical that we should put forward that precondition and that we agree to that. Now, then, the hon. members said that there was a third precondition. He said the third precondition was that the Newfoundland proposal be accepted. That is totally untrue, Mr. Speaker. That is totally untrue. We said that our proposal should be answered by the Federal Government. We did not say a precondition of negotiations should be that our proposal be accepted. Our proposal was put forward for discussion for negotiation.

DR. COLLINS: It was our side of things and we asked the federal government to respond. And has been said a number of times here already today, there has been to this date no response from the federal government and we all know why there is no response.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) also made much of the Liberal position in this issue. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the words of the Liberal position on the offshore resource many times, and they remind me of a deck of cards. At the first puff of wind that position goes out the window. Just like the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) at one point said, 'Oh, we will be tough with the federal government when the time comes'. I think he had in mind he was going to hit the federal government with a feather. He was going to hit them with a feather, you know. That was being tough.

The Liberal position on the offshore has been wishy-washy from day one. It has been words, no substance, no willingness to back us up, no willingness to stand on the line and be counted when the time comes. Mr. Speaker, the member for Terra Nova said 'We will support. We will agree.' We accept that, we accept their support. Our difficulty is not accepting their support, our difficulty is in keeping their support in place. It keeps sliding away. At any point when it is expedient, sure, they give the support. But when things really come down to it, where is that support? That support is gone out the window.

The resolution the hon. member mentioned, sure that resolution extended support, but what representations have members opposite made to the Liberal Government in Ottawa? What representations, what pressures have they put on them? It is very well to bring in resolutions but it is action that counts. And that is what

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 449 (Evening)

IB-2

DR. COLLINS:

opposite.

we want from the members

Mr. Speaker, also in the
same vein, the hon. member says

DR. COLLINS:

that he disagrees with the federal government. We do not want him to disagree with the federal government, we want him to reject, reject, we want him to reject the federal government action. Do not just disagree with it and then go home and tomorrow morning get up and just read the newspaper and carry on as normal, stand up and be counted, reject what has been done by the federal government to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the member opposite also said that the Newfoundland Government was the one who initiated the court actions. Mr. Speaker, the record will show that on two separate occasions the federal government set out to subvert those negotiations by court action. When the negotiations were underway, they set out to subvert them by asking the federal court to broaden the terms of reference given to it, to broaden the question to it, with the expectation that that would then go to the Supreme Court, this in the middle of negotiations. You know, one can only say it was a total act of questionable faith. I will try to be diplomatic.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the Minister for Energy (Mr. Marshall) went to Ottawa - Montreal, actually, the other day to meet with his counterpart in the federal government to again see if we could put the negotiations back on the rail under the same conditions that pertained right from the beginning. No sooner had he left there and come back to this Province when again the federal government aimed to subvert the negotiating process by going into the Supreme Court today - by putting a question to the Supreme Court today. So any question of who was bringing the court presence into this whole issue, the record will show that it was not us, it was the

DR. COLLINS: federal government
which took the initiative in both instances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one
further point on the court. There are a number of
lawyers in this House and I hope they will speak to
this. It has been suggested by members opposite that
our wish to have it go to the Supreme Court in the
first instance is that we expect that they will give
us an undue favour. Mr. Speaker, that, I think, is
an insult to the Court of this Province. On this
side we reject that interpretation totally. We
reject that totally out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, there
is a tradition how questions of importance, such as a
constitutional question, are to go forward. They should
go first in the Supreme Court of the province affected
because that court can give the central court advice
of a nature that would not be expected from any other
court.

DR. COLLINS: That court in the province to which the question particularly pertains, that court has a knowledge of the nature of the question, of the nature of the issue, a knowledge of the nature of the people involved that is indispensable, that is indispensable to the Central Court, and, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Central Court could not give an adequate answer to the question put to it unless it had such advice from such an indispensable source. Now, that is the reason why the traditional route is used. And to suggest that we are trying to do something underhanded by putting it into our own Supreme Court, I think is despicable. There is no other word for it, Mr. Speaker, it is a despicable way to interpret our action. Now, Mr. Speaker, I said that the Leader of the Opposition made a number of points today, and, you know, one can only comment on them to reject them, He said that there is a skunk in all this. And I think I am quoting his actual words, he said there is a skunk in all this. I suggest that there is a skunk in all this, there is a pet skunk, a P-E-T skunk, and we know what P-E-T refers to.

MR. DINN: Very good, very good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr, Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Oh boy! Oh boy!

DOCTOR COLLINS: - the Leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Neary) suggested that we lay down arms, that this is the time to lay down arms, when our position, when the future of this Province, when the one good chance, possibly the last good chance that this Province has to reach equality, to reach some semblance of equality, because it is not guaranteed to reach some semblance of equality, with other provinces, the Leader of the Opposition (MR. Neary) suggest that we lay down arms. Mr. Speaker, we on this side, say take up the defence of this Province at this time, Do not lay down arms, take up the

DR. COLLINS: defence of this province.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: An that is why we call on our friends opposite to help us to take up the defence of this Province from undue and unnatural attack from outside. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to read this statement, this letter, this telex, whatever one might term it, that

May 19, 1982

Tape 452

Evening Session
JC -1

DR. COLLINS the Prime Minister of Canada sent to the Premier of this province without having a very sinking feeling in one's stomach. Firstly, Mr. Speaker, the beginning of this statement states that, 'It is clear that our two governments cannot reach an agreement'. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending a First Ministers' Conference a couple of years ago on the Constitution which was a three day conference. The first two days the Premiers put forward their position and those positions were seen to be so understandable, so sensible, so reasonable, so contributory that all the national press commented on them and it looked as though at last there was a breakthrough. On the last day, when things were going so well, the Prime Minister had his say. Within an hour or more the conference was a shambles and it was portrayed that way from then on, that this First Ministers' Conference was a shambles and nothing could ever come out of it. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is the same attitude on the part of the Prime Minister of this country that is expressed in this letter that ruined that conference, as this is an attempt to ruin the negotiations that should go on between the two governments. There is a statement, We cannot reach. It is his perception, it is his edict, it is his determination that we can not reach an agreement. That is not our position, our position is that we can reach an agreement if there is will on both sides. And we do have that will. But there is no expression of that sense of a will to reach agreement in this letter from the Prime Minister of Canada. Mr. Speaker, another point We avoid a certain word in this House. There are statements made in this House that people do not agree with. We avoid - we use a euphemism usually, when we refer to these, we say they are untrue or whatever. We avoid a certain word and I am going to avoid that word when I consider some of the statements that the Prime Minister of Canada put in here because the statements in here fit in with that word that

May 19, 1982

Evening Session
Tape 452 JC-2

DR. COLLINS: I am going to avoid, and I will say that these statements are untrue. I will use that euphemism, that some of these statements are untrue. One statement here, Mr. Speaker; 'I was convinced that our two governments should be able to reach an honourable agreement to which both would commit themselves regardless of the outcome of any court ruling on ownership.'

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that is a totally untrue statement. There is no way that an agreement can be committed - the governments can be committed to an agreement without a constitutional change. There is no other way. Any agreement, unless it is in our Constitution, cannot commit government. And that position was put to the federal government, that an agreement should be entrenched in the Constitution and they totally rejected it. So that is an untrue statement. That is a dishonest statement.

Secondly, 'It was on this basis that our negotiators conducted extensive negotiations with your representatives last Fall and Winter'. Mr. Speaker, we had continual reports from our negotiators throughout that process, and the word that was in there was that the federal government were not coming forward, they were not responding, they were not contributing. To try to indicate that my negotiators conducted extensive negotiations is untrue, it is dishonest. It is not telling it as it is. It is not factual. And I think it is disgraceful that the Prime Minister of our country should lend himself to such duplicity as this.

Mr. Speaker, he goes on:
'Now, you have taken a different approach. After leaving the negotiation table in Februray your government has decided to impose preconditions. Now that is incorrect, Mr. Speaker. Those preconditions were in there from the beginning. It is not now. We are not bringing in something new now. Those were understandings right from the word go, when those negotiations started. To suggest that now this is something new is dishonest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: It is dishonest.

Mr. Speaker, finally, 'In advance of some serious negotiations to set the issue

DR. COLLINS: of legal ownership aside permanently, that was not a condition, that legal ownership should be set aside permanently. it was our position that it should be set aside permanently if agreement was reached. Now, Mr. Speaker, unless you include that last clause it makes the Newfoundland Government seem totally unreasonable, that we should suggest right from the word 'go'

DR. COLLINS

that ownership should be set aside permanently. We said it should only be set aside permanently if agreement was reached, and that is a very, very fundamental phrase or clause that was left out of the thing. And that again is giving a totally dishonest and misleading impression.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on in this manner because it is of such importance, it is so crucial that the facts not be confused, that the issue not be fudged, that the thing be presented to our people with clarity, as it was, as it has happened, as what the implications are. It is so important that that be brought out, I will not take up totally the time of this House, or even the time allotted to me, because I feel that every member in this House should get that point out to the people. So I will sit down now, having made what I hope is some contribution of clarity in this matter, and I will say that I am totally against the amendment and that the resolution as brought in by the Premier should go as it is up to the federal government, so they will understand that the people in this province will withdraw anything that has been done, any action taken up to this time, if honest negotiations will take place. But they must understand that we will never withdraw under threat, or under a disadvantage that they are attempting to impose upon us. Near! Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the statement that was made by the Premier, one of the things that stands out most in it, to me, is that this, an action that one would only expect from a foreign, hostile power and not from a national government. To me, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. HISCOCK: believe very strongly, with great conviction, that this is how this government here, in our Province looks upon the national government. They do look upon it as a foreign government, and they do look upon it as a hostile government. Part of the reasons why it is a hostile government is how we have been treating it. I have asked the question to people here in this House and in the gallery, Why is it that former Premier Moores and Mr. Jamieson could build the Trans-Canada, build up the Burin Peninsula, build up the Northern Peninsula, 'Mr. Ed. Roberts' could help build a medical school, we could put North East Atlantic Building here, we could put the Taxation Building here in St. John's, we could get the Coastal Labrador DREE agreement, we could get the Forestry agreement, we could get \$50 million for the up-grading of the railway, and X number of other things, but after three years, we have a Premier and a government, and now they have a new mandate, and we cannot get anything?

MR. HISCOCK: Why is it that we find ourselves in this country of Canada in the worst recession ever in recent history. In other words, a depression. And here we are now - the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) uses the word 'fudging', we should not fudge on this issue. No we should not fudge on this issue, Mr. Speaker. Here we have the highest unemployment in Canada, we have the highest unemployment in this Province. When the Liberals left power in this Province we had unemployment of 9.5 per cent. Now we have almost 18 per cent, and some places in my district have 80 per cent and 90 per cent.

So when I ask, Mr.

Speaker - when it comes to another part that upsets me very, very much, it is that the member for Mount Scio, (Mr. Barry) and also in the Premier's speech here, when he talks about the fair share of the wealth which the Province has placed at its shores means that Newfoundland will have a chance to be equal and hence proud Canadians.

I am a Canadian, I am as proud as anybody is in B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan or Nova Scotia. And I will say to you this, Mr. Speaker, and to the people who are in the gallery, that after 115 years Nova Scotia is still a have not province, Quebec is still a have not province and so is New Brunswick and so P.E.I. And if Ontario wanted to be, because of the down-turn in industry in that province, and because of the automotive industry, Ontario should also qualify as being a have not province. So do not go talking about treating citizens in this country as not being equal, because we are going through rough times, and because we are taking the short road, the small political road, and that is to get political points, now we are paying for mistakes that were made in the past.

MR. HISCOCK: And there is no question that when you look at, Mr. Speaker, the past fifteen years of Mr. Trudeau and the nine months Mr. Clark was there, this Province has done very, very well in many things. But in the past three or four year the Western economy has gone bottom up. And I am not going to blame it on the national government, and I am not going to blame it on Mrs. Thatcher or Reaganomics or anything else, but I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to this House, that if we are going to pull ourselves out of that and we are going to see

MR. HISCOCK: the sun shine on this Province. And we are going to see our younger people not have to go away to Alberta or to Manitoba, the only way that is going to be possible is if we get mega projects in this Province and in this country on the go. And I find it rather ironic that here we are fighting and splitting hairs on when it should be developed. I am beginning to ask the question, do we want Hibernia We have now sent it to the courts, to our own provincial court which is fair and fine. But when the national government does, then there is something wrong with that. We have a right in this House to stand up for the provincial will, for the provincial right of this Province which we all will do. But one thing I find rather upsetting about this House now - and maybe it is because of the majority of forty-four - is that we are not allowed, Mr. Speaker, we are not allowed even to think in this Province anymore of another position, that the federal government in the right of the Nation might have, might in the smallest way, Mr. Speaker, might have a case for that ownership also.

We, the Liberal Party, have been on record for years and years saying that we own it, we believe we should have control and management. We do know that the government here under 'Mr. Peckford', three or four years ago said, 'We have to have total ownership, total control'. Now we see them saying, 'We want to have joint management'.

So I am saying, Mr. Speaker, in fairness and because we should not be intellectually dishonest to our people - the Premier said something today that I will try to continue to make as part of my philosophical platform as long as I am in this House. He said that people in this Province are too green to burn and that somehow or another the baymen are ignorant and x

MR. HISCOCK: number of other things.

The fallacy that -

MR. HODDER: The Premier said that?

MR. HISCOCK: - our people are green.

And the other part is a fallacy in this Province, that the baymen, somehow or other, are green, etc.

MR. HODDER: The Premier said that?

MR. HISCOCK: One of the things, Mr.

Speaker, that I feel very strongly about is that as elected representatives in this House it is our duty to make sure that we present all the facts, both sides, to our people so they can make a rational choice. Not emotionalism, not on nationalism that we see. We see now in our own country of Canada Quebec claiming Labrador and the Pequistes claiming it. We also find now or sometime in the future maybe, there may be if Quebec ever separates or in the future if Newfoundland and Labrador ever separate, there may be violence like the Falkland crisis.

In Quebec, by the way, in all their schools they teach on all their maps that Labrador belongs to them. Somewhere along the line philosophically there has to be a confrontation. There just has to be, because the two are unreconcilable. The same thing with the Argentines who claim the Malvenas and the British

MR. HISCOCK: who claim the Falklands, they were led to a confrontation. And I say now, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in this House, we have a confrontation. We, as a Province, claim that we own it and the nation, as a nation, in benefit of all Canada claims that it owns it. Not only that it owns here, but it owns in the Beaufort Sea, it owns off Labrador, it owns off Quebec and owns off Nova Scotia. But are we, Mr. Speaker, in this Province trying to co-operate to get the maximum benefit, the maximum revenue? No, we are not. We are crying poor and foul etc. and we are not being treated as equal Canadians. The people in Alberta, when they were given a deal after long negotiations with the federal government, it probably was not what they wanted, nor B.C. or Nova Scotia or even Ontario in certain things. They have not got it, but yet, Mr. Speaker, somehow in this Province we are now in a situation that we want all or nothing. Now we are saying that the federal government, itself, is taking us unilaterally to court. With regard to taking it to court, I do not necessarily support that position but I will say this, Mr. Speaker, that the business community of this Province are going bankrupt daily, and if there is no settlement reached, either negotiated or by the courts, there is going to be none of the small businesses around in this Province to make use of Hibernia, and we will see the large multi-nationals come in from other places and we will see, Mr. Speaker, them take over. I am not saying we are going to give it away, I am saying settle down, get up to Ottawa, or have Ottawa come down here, and come up with some negotiations. But no, Mr. Speaker, we are now at a stalemate. As the Leader of the Opposition said,

MR. HISCOCK: "Both sides in many ways are being very, very childish and are being very stubborn." We, Mr. Speaker, are the ones to lose. We are the ones to lose. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I find rather ironic about the situation we have now, we have had since my election and even before that, the government here continually referring to the Liberals selling the Upper Churchill down the drain. I think, Mr. Speaker, within two or three years I will be able to get up and say the reason why we have not gotten maximum

MR. HISCOCK: benefit and control and other things over Hibernia, is not because of Pierre Elliott Trudeau or because of Ottawa, it is because of the inflexibility of this government, wanting its own way and its own style and lack of negotiations.

But with regard to other things, Mr. Speaker: The Alsands - why have the Alsands gone sour? The only reason why the Alsands have gone sour - there are two reasons, one the lack of co-operation between the Conservatives in Alberta and the Liberals in Ottawa. That is one.

Two was with the national energy programme; that because Canada felt that we should have more control over our own natural resources, that we should have a state control of 25 per cent etc., the large multi-nationals went down to the States. It was okay when they left here. It was okay when they pulled out their rigs and went there, but because the nation wanted to do it in a greater contest, it was wrong.

And the other thing, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Alsands, it was because it became uneconomical, unprofitable to have it. That is the reason why the Alsands, as well as the Colorado Alsands are not in production.

And with regard to the other parts, Mr. Speaker, why is it that we do not have the Lower Churchill on stream after ten or twelve years? And why is it that Mr. Bill Rompkey and the seventy-four Quebec M.P's could form, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Boo! Boo!

MR. HISCOCK:

- could support, Mr.

Speaker, the national energy programme, having a power grid to Quebec, but the person never had the guts or the

MR. HISCOCK: fortitude, who can walk out of the House up in Ottawa, Mr. Crosbie, turns around and abstains, abstaind, and Mr. McGrath, abstains from the national programme to allow us the power grid. And because Mr. Clark wants to get a few seats in Quebec, what does he do, Mr. Speaker? What does he do? He turns around and supports the Pequiste government and says, 'No, Newfoundland and Labrador should not have a power grid across Quebec'. That is what we see, the hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker, of the politics of this government - not government, but politics, Mr. Speaker.

And I would like to turn around and talk with conviction not on party lines but in many cases one has to. But that is what you see about the hypocrisy of it. But with regard to the other one, Mr. Speaker, we have seen now the power line wanting to go through Quebec, and we have seen that the national Conservative Party has sold out Newfoundland. The Conservative Party there is saying the

MR. HISCOCK: Liberals sold out Newfoundland with regard to Hibernia. Well, if the Liberals in Ottawa sold out Hibernia, I would like to know what the Conservatives did with the power grid across Quebec.

MR. BARRETT: What are you talking about?

MR. HISCOCK: The other one - yes, what are you talking about, is right. How would a person who works for Mr. Crosbie know? How would he know? The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I am rather concerned -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The two Tories from Newfoundland abstained from voting.

MR. HISCOCK: The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I am rather concerned -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The Tories voted against it. The Tories voted against the power corridor across Quebec.

MR. HISCOCK: There is another thing, Mr. Speaker, that I am rather concerned about in this Province, that we are now entering a stage of emotionalism. Emotionalism, Mr. Speaker, is the weakest form of political support, or any way that you could turn around and try to get the support of the people. It is not rationalism, Mr. Speaker, it is not turning around and asking, Mr. Speaker, when we should do this or how we should go about it. Appeal to the people, and go out in the woods and cut your finger and say, 'Boys, I was down having a beer now with the boys. That is what we have, Mr. Speaker, emotionalism! Emotionalism!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Emotionalism, Mr. Speaker. What we have seen is emotionalism. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I have to ask the question of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and also, probably, of Mr. Ank Murphy when he was here, over on this side, with only three in 1966, how they saw the 39 members on the other side get away with the abuse of power,

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker. One of the things in this election - sure I would have liked to have been on the other side. But I can tell you this, this experience over here of being one of eight looking at 44, and how you are going to turn around and abuse the people of this Province and the rights that you have been now given, the people in this Province, I think, will do the same thing to this government here as they did in 1976, when Levesque had 102 seats and Bourassa had 7 and they kicked him out. So we are seeing, Mr. Speaker, purely emotionalism, appeal to our people, 'Stand up and be counted. And somehow or another, Mr. Speaker, the person who cannot stand up, or will not stand up and be counted is a traitor. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) spoke in this House and said that there should be a negotiated settlement with Ottawa. And what was he called by the opposite side, the government of the day?

MR. HISCOCK: He was called a traitor, because he suggested, because he suggested a negotiated settlement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: And what are they looking for now?

MR. HISCOCK: Now what are they looking for? They are crying wolf, they are crying wolf, Mr. Speaker, because the federal government has gone unilaterally to court. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the business community of this Province is probably saying, 'It is a very good thing that the logjam now will be broken. Whatever it will do, both of these court cases can be dropped immediately, as of now, if both sides agree to get down and come up with a negotiated settlement'.

MR. WARREN: Right on!

MR. HISCOCK: And the last thing offered in the statement by the Prime Minister, they are still looking for a negotiative settlement. But the plot, Mr. Speaker, is now started as of today, and unless this government finds, Mr. Speaker, finds themselves in the situation of being able to co-operate with the federal government like Nova Scotia, and also Alberta, and Saskatchewan, and B.C., unless they can find that, I think, Mr. Speaker, we on this side will be able to point the finger and say 'Okay, the Upper Churchill might have been bad, but what you did with Hibernia was inexcusable, Mr. Speaker, inexcusable!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Another thing we find out when we ask the question, Mr. Speaker, why is it that we are now in the court, we find one province and a national government taking each other to court? It is obviously due to an attitude and a frame of mind, and that is one that they are still smarting from, the idea that the Liberals got back into power. That is one thing that

MR. HISCOCK: they are still smarting over, and number two, Mr. Speaker, they now smell blood. They now smell blood and they are basically turning around and I feel for partisan reasons. They are not really concerned about a settlement, because they know the commercial viability of Hibernia has to be 90 per cent of world prices, and Canada will only go to 75 per cent by 1985. We also know, Mr. Speaker, that it may not be commercial with regard to the glut, two or three years from now. So, time is on their side. As the Premier said, time is on their side and he will see Mr. Trudeau, and all the Trudeau years will be like a thin veil over the Canadian people, Mr. Speaker, but now a thin shroud.

MR. HISCOCK: But, now, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is whatever reason - okay, we can probably afford to wait, I do not know. But all I know is that there are businesses going bankrupt, that the hotels that were supposed to be built down in St. John's and X number of other things are still waiting. And maybe, Mr. Speaker, the ones with the money can afford to wait. But with regard to this other statement -

MR. PATTERSON: Ask Mel Woodward.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: The last one in Springdale.

MR. HISCOCK: The main thing that I am also concerned with is why is it we do not allow ourselves to be able to look at both sides? I also agree that we are elected representatives of this House. But, I think we are doing a disservice to the nine other provinces, the nine other provinces of this nation of ours by being in a way, partly in the way we are now. I find, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of racism in this Province, there is a lot of racism. And the racism is geared towards the French in the Cabinet of Mr. Trudeau and the national government. And there are a lot of people here in the galleries, and within this House, if they had to admit the truth they do not trust them and they do not feel that they are a part of this equal Canada. And I find, Mr. Speaker, that this is upsetting. I feel also - or not feel - but I know, I think, that this government is perpetuating this, when you say that the Province is too green to burn, that is basically the way you want to keep them. You want to keep them that way and feel that, Mr. Speaker, when there is an election, go out and promise them a stadium, go out and promise them a bit of road, or call up the workers of the opposite candidate and say, 'If you go working for that guy then watch out, I got your name'.

MR. HISCOCK: Or go out, Mr. Speaker, and hand deliver cheques, Mr. Speaker, during an election.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about.

MR. HISCOCK: That is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, that is what we are doing in this Province of ours. But when it comes -Mr. Speaker, somehow or another when we are down and out and Baie Verte wants money to keep open the mines, and Grand Bank wants money to open up the fish plant and when, also, St. Anthony wants money, and also Labrador for various things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: Somehow or another it is cap in hand, somehow or another it is a handout. I would ask the question to this House and to the people here, Why was it that we joined Canada? Why did we become an equal part of this nation, an equal part? Not a second-class, one-tenth part, but an equal part. And the obvious reason, Mr. Speaker, was so that we could depend on that. But, also, in the hard economic times so B.C or Quebec or the other areas could depend

MR. F. HISCOCK

on us for a helping hand. And if you look back in the history of Canada - not only in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker - Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were, were, Mr. Speaker, the top of Canada at the time. And they had the sailing ships, and then when steele came in it went and moved on to Montreal and took it back, and then when the industrial age came it went to Ontario. And now because of the oil and gas it is moving West. And some day, Mr. Speaker, it is coming here. But, I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, Alberta is saying it it only going to last ten or fifteen years, and Alberta may be coming to us for part of a heritage grant or for loans or whatever. And we may find ourselves in fifty years down the line having to go to P.E.I. or having to go to Quebec. And if we continue this framework that we have, Mr. Speaker, then I feel, as the Premier said, a cliché is being worded, balkanizing. It is not balkanizing the nation that we have got, it is the two concepts of the nation. I am, and proud to be, a centralist I am quite proud. I paid my own way to go up and see the repatriation of the Constitution. I was also quite pleased to be able to see the Queen of Canada and the Commonwealth come and bring that. I do not think that she was used, I think it was a legal responsibility offered in that way. And with regard to that, Mr. Speaker, what we find now in this situation we are in in this House, we find that somehow or another we have two concepts. One is that the ten provinces can go their own way, set up their own principalities and whatever. And I, for one, believe that fifty years from now, sixty years from now, twenty-five years from now, Alberta may be looking for us. And if we do not learn to share, we do not have it as a principal, not only in our Constitution - equalization is now put in the constitution, but that is not good enough

MR. HISCOCK: unless we have the spirit of being Canadians. There was a CBC reporter who was interviewing 'Mr. Peckford' in the Cabinet Room with regard to a statement that he made. And the Premier turned around and said, 'Ah, boy, you do not understand us, you do not talk our language, you will have to come down here, boy, and learn to talk like us. You are a mainlander. And there is that sentiment in this Province.

MR. PATTERSON: Up-along.

MR. HISCOCK: Up-along is right. The mainland. Well, I am very pleased that I represent the mainland.

MR. NEARY: That is right. He does.

MR. HISCOCK: And if you know Labrador, it is on the mainland.

MR. HICKEY: What part of the country?

MR. HISCOCK: Labrador.

MR. HICKEY: Labrador?

MR. HISCOCK: Yes, it is on the mainland. So with regard to that, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: - the Minister of Social Services was

MR. HISCOCK: campaigning in Labrador once and was in Quebec and thought it was Labrador. So I am not surprised that he really does not know where it is.

But, Mr. Speaker, with regard to some of the things the member for Mount Scio said, the punishment that somehow or another the national government is giving. I do not see any punishment being given by the national government. They are a national government and have given \$50 million to the C-Core. And I have listed what it has done for St. John's. I know we have our disagreements with Ottawa and that. And I do not necessarily always agree with them all the time.

With regard to the pettiness, there is pettiness, Mr. Speaker, on both sides. And with regard to ineffectiveness and productivity, as I said, when the Liberals left power here we had a debt of something like \$500 million. It is now up to about \$3 billion. And also unemployment of 9.5 per cent now up to 80 per cent in some areas, Mr. Speaker.

But equalization is a very, very important part of our Canadian fabric. And I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we, in this House, have to be very cognizant of the fact that we are a nation, that we belong to a nation, that we have first priority as Canadians to Hibernia because it is off our coast. We have first priority with regards to the control and the management and the revenue of that. And I would go as far as to say, being in Ontario and Quebec and B.C., that all the people there agree and all the people in Canada are more than glad and pleased that we have now that touch of wealth. But they are also looking at us in such a way as to wonder why we are becoming inward, why we are becoming narrow-minded, where a lot of our characteristics as people have gone.

MR. HISCOCK: For political reasons, I suppose, we are focusing on Trudeau. And, as I said, they smell blood because the Western Hemisphere is in poor economic times and Canada is also. They are going to blame it on Mr. Trudeau. Well, Mr. Trudeau has to accept that responsibility just as the Conservative Government regime here in this Province has to accept the responsibility of not doing anything about the Upper Churchill, not having done anything about Hybernia until now, not having been able to conclude negotiations, not being able to do anything about high unemployment, not being able to do anything about inequality. And the Premier talked about the inequalities in this Province and all money we could do with. I would like to tell the Premier the inequalities in my district, the inequalities within my own district, and what the \$5.5 million that is being spent on his office could do for my district, Mr. Speaker.

Why is it that Jamieson and Moores could do it?

MR. HISCOCK: Why was it that Smallwood and Pickersgill could do it? And why is it that other members can get things? Why is it? Is there such a personality conflict? Is our Premier so stubborn? Is that the reason why Mr. Walter Carter is not in the Cabinet? Is that why 'Mr. Leo Barry' is not in the Cabinet? Mr. Speaker, obviously part of the answer is 'If you are not with me you are against me'. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, I am, according to the Premier's words, a traitor, against this Province, that I do want to see conditions in my district of schools with outdoor toilets, and stoves in the middle of the classrooms and only one phone in a community, that I want to keep them that way, that I am a traitor, that I do not want to see any improvement, that I want to see our people backward, I want to keep them green, I want to see them ignorant. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, that is basically what this government believes, that if you are not for them that is what you basically support.

And as I said, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the things that we have in this Province, we have a long-standing tradition in this Province of fighting. We have a long standing tradition of supporting a fighter, and that is probably one of the reasons why the Premier has forty-four seats, that our people are a little bit gullible and like a fighter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK:

And I will say it, and I will say it anywhere. I have said it, Mr. Speaker, in my district, that maybe it is the Irish influence, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is the Irish influence, maybe it is coming from the old world, leaving the oppression and having to come over and hide away in Heart's Content

MR. HISCOCK: and Heart's Delight
and find out, Mr. Speaker, that we want something
better, that the pot of gold is at the end of the
rainbow.

But, Mr. Speaker,
I also said in the election that we are something like
the wolf who has a piece of meat in his mouth and
when he walks across the river and see his
reflection drops the piece that he has and goes after
the bigger piece. So that is the way we are now,
Mr. Speaker, with Hibernia, we want the lot. We
do not realize the pot of gold is with us now, that
Hibernia with all its blessings is not going to make us
a have Province until more than twenty years from now,
and it may not be on stream for another ten, so we are
talking about thirty years.

And I would like to
do something about a convention centre here in St.
John's, and tourism here. And I would like to be able to
do something about agriculture in this Province. And
I would like to turn around and do something about the
mining industry and the forest industry in this
Province. But no, Mr. Speaker, we are now always on
one train and one train only.

MR. HISCOCK: If my time is up, in concluding, I, Mr. Speaker, support this amendment. I believe both sides have to swallow a bit of their pride and get back to the table. I think it is incumbent upon both governments, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that they do the best for Canada and for this region of Canada. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, instead of the Premier holding up his proposal he will not only hold up his proposal but will turn around and have a bit of humility and go on behalf of the Province.

I thought - but again there is no sense in dreaming - if the Premier had forty-four seats I would assume automatically he would have gotten on the phone the next day and said, 'Mr. Trudeau, I have forty-four seats. I am setting up a meeting with you and I will be in Ottawa within the next three or four days and could you see me'. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STAGG: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for recognizing me. I have no doubt that we have on our side here this evening forty-four, or forty-three because the Speaker cannot speak in the debate, although I am sure that if he could speak in the debate that the Speaker would speak out loud and clear on this issue. And there are many of us here on this side of the House who want to have our say. We have endured the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), we have endured him. We have endured his speech without punctuation. We have endured his schizophrenic speech. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a tribute to him and it is a condemnation of the lack of communications in this Province that this member is back in the House. Any member who could get up and give the diatribe that that member just gave, and then at the end of it say that

MR. STAGG: he supports the resolution and he supports the amendment. I would say has a verbal dexterity that we have not seen in this House before.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at where we are. First of all we came into this House of Assembly in June of 1979 at a time when there was a new government in Ottawa, the Clark government in Ottawa. It was a new day dawning for all of us. And we entered a new session of the Legislature. As a matter of fact, it was one of the main reasons why I decided to come back into politics because we, for once in our lifetime, had a chance to make good on some things that we had always stood for. And the Premier, in his own inimitable fashion and in the way that we have become accustomed to, acted with dispatch and got a letter off to Mr. Clark early in Mr. Clark's tenure and early in the reinstatement of the Peckford government in

May 19, 1982

Tape 466 (Evening) JC - 1

MR. STAGG: June of 1979, and we got a letter from Mr. Clark who was then the Prime Minister of Canada. Just let me say to you, just let me talk about paradise lost and paradise regained, with all due respect to John Milton. Let me tell you what the Prime Minister of Canada in 1979 in a letter to the Premier of the Province dated - let us see when the date on this is. It is dated on September 14, 1979, what Prime Minister Clark said would be his position, the position of the Government of Canada with regard to our offshore resources and I am going to read it into the record. The basic principles concerning offshore mineral resources - this is in a letter to the Premier of Newfoundland from Prime Minister Clark dated September 14, 1979. Number one, 'The Province of Newfoundland should own the mineral resources of the continental margin off its coast insofar as Canada is entitled to exercise Sovereign rights over these resources in accordance with international law. Such ownership would be to the extent possible, of the same nature as if these resources were located within the boundaries of the Province'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: 'Within the boundaries of the Province', that is what Joe Clark said. That is what Joe Who said. That is what the man who is pilloried by the public in this country, that is what he said, the greatest patriot that Newfoundland has ever seen. What a great Newfoundlander, Joe Clark.

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: That is what he said on September 14, 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Let me read that into the record again. 'Such ownership should be to the extent possible, of the same nature as if these resources were located within the boundaries

MR. STAGG: of the Province'. Within the boundaries of the Province.

MR. HODDER: Read the whole letter.

MR. STAGG: I will let you read the letter, because I doubt if you have read it, or if you have read the letter. You have not read the proposal. You have not read the proposal. You fought an election but you did not read the proposal that was released on the March 16, 1982. You did not read it. You fought an election. You did not know anything about it. You come into the House here today caterwauling and trying to put a spurious amendment before this House, hoping that the public will buy it. Well, they do not buy it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Let me tell you, the eight of you who are left because of the lack of communication - and the member for Eagle River, (Mr. Hiscock) made a racist slur about Newfoundlanders saying they were gullible and they were green. Well, there may be some because, the eight of you, if the public had known that you did not know, that you did not know, what the election was being fought on, they would have turfed you all out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: They would have turfed every one of you out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: All we needed in LaPoile was 22 more voters, and that great institution in the House of Assembly, that great institution, the member for LaPolile, would have been turbed out. And he still may be turbed out yet.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Now, let me deal - I am only on point one yet of Mr. Clark's letter. Point one. Such ownership should be to the extent possible, of the same nature as if these resources were located within the boundaries of the Province. The legislative jurisdiction of the Province should to the extent possible be the same as for those resources within the boundaries of the Province. Now, what do you say about that? What do you say about that!

That was where we were in 1979. And, ladies and gentlemen, maybe what I am doing here tonight, and what we are all doing here tonight, we are casting the first - this is the beginning of the federal election campaign of 1981.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: 1984

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: George Orwell wrote the book, Nineteen and Eighty-Four, and let me tell you big brother, big brother is watching you, Pierre. Big brother is going to do away with you. They will not call an election until 1984. They will not call an election until 1984. They must call an election by February of 1985, that will give them there five years. I predict that there will be no election until 1984. And they will go down. Point two in Mr. Clark's letter: 'Such ownership of and legislative jurisdiction over offshore resources by Newfoundland will be consistent with and subject to the division of legislative competence as between parliament and provincial legislatures under the Constitution of Canada: Part three: 'Thus the legislative jurisdiction and responsibilities of the Government of Canada in areas such as the protection of the environment, national defence, customs and exise, shipping

MR. STAGG: and navigation, external affairs, and the management of international and interprovincial trade and pipelines will continue! Perfect! Perfect! That is what we have a national government for. These are the sorts of things that the national government is involved in. Point four: 'The above principles will be further confirmed and implemented by the signing of an agreement' - by the signing of an agreement! - 'between the Government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland and by appropriate legislative action and constitutional change'. Now, ladies and gentlemen, if there are any of you here in the galleries, and to some extent we all speak to the galleries and to the press, and those of us who never get covered by the press, well that is the press's fault. That is the problem with the press. But there are good things said here by members of the House that are not covered.

MR. LUSH: You can see the reason why they are not covered.

MR. STAGG: And let me tell you -

AN HON. MEMBER: We feel that these are the best (inaudible) in the galleries.

MR. STAGG: And let me tell you, that if there are any people here in the galleries tonight who voted Liberal, who voted Liberal in February 1980 because they thought they would get cheaper gas, or because they thought they would be part of the minority who believe in reform for everybody except themselves - that is what the Liberal philosophy is, you know, reform for everyone, reform for everyone except me. It does not apply to me. IF there are any of you here tonight, well, I forgive you. I forgive you because the people of Canada, other people more sophisticated perhaps than we, they have fallen for that line too. Well, ladies and gentlemen, let me tell you I am starting the federal election campaign here in the House of Assembly tonight. We will be fighting it tomorrow, we will be fighting it for the next two years. And

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 467 (Evening Session)

PS - 3

MR. STAGG: when its over, it will be 1965 re-visited,
when the Premier went around the province and said, 'We need
seven Liberals

MR. F. STAGG:

in Newfoundland. Well, I am telling you, Mr. Speaker, that in 1984 there will be seven P.C.'s or eight - I believe under redistribution we get eight. However many it is, 100 per cent of these people, 100 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: 100 per cent of the seats in Newfoundland will be Tory. They will be Tory. And while I am at it, let me talk about the Tory Government of Nova Scotia.

MR. NEARY: 100 per cent (inaudible)

MR. STAGG: The Tory Government of Nova Scotia, as far as I am concerned, do not deserve to be called Tory. They are a bunch of Liberals. The Tory Government of Nova Scotia is a bunch of Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Yes, that is right, they are a bunch of Liberals. They have sold out the people of Nova Scotia. They have signed their Churchill Falls agreement. If they had have got anything offshore, which the Premier doubts, and which the experts doubt, if they had anything offshore, they signed their Churchill Falls agreement. And let me tell you, that Premier John Buchannan, if they had anything offshore, he will be looked upon in the same way that Joey Smallwood is looked upon in Newfoundland, as a sellout artist.

That is what he will be looked on. I hate to say it. I hate to say it, We go under the same label, but, as far as I am concerned, that man is a Liberal.

MR. TULK: I am wondering when do we go home?

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 468

RA - 2 Evening session.

MR. STAGG: Now, why are we here tonight? Why are we here tonight?

MR. LUSH: Do not ask me.

MR. STAGG: Why are we here tonight? Between 1972 and 1975 I sat in this House of Assembly and sometimes we sat for three, six, nine, twelve, twenty-four hours. There were many times when we accomplished very little, and it became the order of the day. And I understand that between 1975 and 1979 we did much the same thing, that the debates dragged on and you had supply going through that did not really go through. You had various members up talking for hours and hours and hours and saying nothing. Well this administration, in 1979, said, 'No more night sittings. There will be no more night sittings', And I applaud that. 'There will be no more night sittings', as a rule. But tonight we are here. And why are we here tonight? We are here tonight because this is a Black Day, a Black Day. Why do you think I go around and exhibit myself with a black arm band. Do you think I am an exhibitionist? No. Are we all exhibitionists? No, we are not.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR. STAGG: No, we are not. Yes, the member for wherever he is from - the member for Labrador who lives in St. John's -

MR. WARREN: Yes you are.

MR. STAGG: The member for Labrador, who lives in St. John's - as a matter of fact, I think there are only two members of the Opposition who live outside St. John's and none of them represent St. John's districts. Well, that says something about them. They got rid of a heck of a lot of them. Why would we exhibit this insignia of mourning. Is it just to catch attention? No, it is not, it is genuine, Mr. Speaker, it is genuine. There is nothing more genuine than our feeling of mourning for this Province at this

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 468

RA - 3 Evening session.

MR. STAGG: particular time. Does that mean
that we will be pallbearers for the Province? Not on
your life. Not on your life, there are

MR. F. STAGG

no pallbearers over here. There are eight of them over there, I do not know if that has any significance or not.

MR. BARRETT:

Just enough, 'Fred'

MR. STAGG

There are just enough of them over there. But there are no pallbearers over here, Mr. Speaker, we are for the resurrection, We are for the resurrection over here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear !

MR. STAGG

And we are the people you have voted for, and I think that most of you people who turned out here tonight and the people who are hoping that we will resolve something, people who are listening in or whatever and want to hear reports on this, you are the people who want us to show the resolve that you think we have. Well, we do have it. We do have it and let there be no mistake about it, that we have the resolve, that we have the determination, we are committed to getting a fair deal for Newfoundlanders. We do not care what the costs is, too ourselves, personally, we will endure any hardship. There is nothing we will not do. And we will do it in the context of Canada. We will do it in the context of Canada, We are Canadians. In our estimation we are great Canadians. In my estimation you are all great Canadians

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear !

MR. STAGG

The Opposition, well they can talk for themselves. As a matter of fact, I think that generally speaking they have been relatively supportive, but they could not resist, they could not resist sticking in something that was spurious, I guess. Because in the Premier's resolution - the Premier's resolution, by the way, read as follows:
, BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House go on record as condemning the action of the federal government

MR. STAGG: to refer the matter directly to the Supreme Court of Canada. AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House go on record as calling upon the federal government to return to the negotiating table on the basis put forward by Newfoundland! Well, where it said, 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House go on record as condemning the action of the federal government', the opposition has put in 'and the provincial government'. And the provincial government! Now, do you expect -

MR. NEARY: No, that is not true. That is not true.

MR. STAGG: No?

MR. NEARY: No, that is wrong.

MR. PECKFORD: On the basis of the Newfoundland proposal, that is what they wanted.

MR. STAGG: There are two amendments to it.

MR. HODDER: No, No, there is one. One amendment. One.

MR. STAGG: Well, you changed it. You changed it.

MR. NEARY: You cannot even read.

MR. STAGG: You changed it. The hon. member changed it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: The hon. member changed it because that is not what he read out. But I will give him the benefit of the doubt, I will say I am wrong on that.

MR. NEARY: You fare always wrong.

MR. STAGG: Yes! Yes! The hon. member may think I am always wrong. It is a good thing I did not go down and campaign in LaPoile during the election, let me tell you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, there has been some reference to the Falkland Islands here tonight.

MR. STAGG: Well, the Falkland Islands -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: - over sixteen hundred people, the great country of Britain - as a matter of fact, we could have a third world war over the Falkland Islands. It is not something that we can just cast off and think it is funny. It is a very, very serious issue. Over sixteen hundred people on some wind-swept land down in the South Atlantic, probably not unlike Newfoundland as far as latitude is concerned, and, to some extent, as far as geography is concerned, sixteen hundred people,

MR. STAGG: and Britian has gone and sent their navy down there. They may be invading it any minute. There are matters of principle that people will stand by. There are matters of principle whereby you will stay by your principles and you will stay there until hell freezes over. The Premier (Mr. Peckford) and the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) spoke about the absence of federal money coming into the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: A tyranny.

MR. STAGG: Yes, it is a tyranny, the tyranny of the person who holds the purse strings when the people of the Province have been used to a certain regime over a period of years, money coming in for various programmes. And suddenly it is being held back, held back, held back. And hopefully-they think we are not made of the stern stuff that we are made of - and hopefully our people will rise up against us, our people will rise up and say, 'Throw them out! Throw them out! Get the money back in! Give us the baby bonus and give us the DRMC agreements and give us the roads and so on!'. But I will say to you, I will say to the people of the country, that the more you pillory us and the more you try to starve us out, the more resolved we will be. We will be here, we are here now, We came here in 1972 and we are here in 1982. Obviously, if the attitude of the Opposition is as is put forward in their amendment, if that is going to be the consistent policy of the Opposition, we, in all likelihood, will be here in 2002, in 2002 when I will be forty-five years old.

It is a time for statesmanship.

Yes, it is a time for statesmanship on the part of the Opposition. And there were times today, Mr. Speaker, when I think the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) flirted with it. He flirted with statesmanship. But unfortunately he spoke too long. The hon. Leader of the

MR. STAGG:

see in the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). And I must say I was disappointed.

I saw in the galleries today a gentleman who was defeated in the election, the former member for Grand Bank, Les Thoms. I wish Les were here tonight. I do not know if he is or not, but, Les, if you are here, if you are in the confines of the House I must say I salute you for the way that you supported the government. You supported us during trying times on the constitution, you supported us on the offshore and I say that the House of assembly deserves - we should give Les Thoms a round of applause as is our -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

- in the only way that we possibly can.

Now unfortunately Les did not have the foresight of the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout). Of course, Les thought, as a lot of Liberals thought, Liberals who would have liked to have scurried over here because the going was good, on the 15th. of March that Premier Peckford has made a terrible mistake. 'He has made a terrible mistake. We have him this time. We have him this time, he is going down the tubes and Nirvana is ours. We are going in we are going in and they are going out. Let me at it. Let me at it. Let me at all the perks of office. Let me at all of the things that I have always wanted to have, which is an expense account, and executive assistants and all this sort of thing, and a low numbered licence plate and things like that'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

That is the sort of thing that the Liberals want.

AN HON. MEMBER: And a parliamentary secretary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: And a parliamentary secretary to help me out, yes, and that sort of thing. That is what they wanted. They made a terrible error, they made a terrible error those Liberals who were wavering in their support of their then leader. So they stayed on and they fought the election. They fought the election on the offshore issue. They made a terrible mistake. They all made a terrible mistake. They thought that the offshore issue was a state secret. But the Premier released it to the press on the 16th. of March, gentlemen, and to your ten departed colleagues, well, 'Them's the breaks. Them's the breaks'.

MR. LUSH: When did you read it?

MR. STAGG: I read it, my dear man.

Here are the highlights here. It was on. I had it.

MR. LUSH: Monday morning.

MR. STAGG: The highlights -

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Well, let me tell you a little bit about it because you have not read it. And I do not know if any of you over there have read it. I expect that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has read it. I expect that he has read it.

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible) when the Premier released it. I was out campaigning. Did the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) read it?

MR. STAGG: Yes. And he has understood it, too.

"The establishment of a true partnership". These are the highlights of our proposed agreement, some of the highlights: "Both governments" -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who wrote it?

MR. STAGG:

Who wrote it? I

did not write it, but there are people I trust who did write it. I was too busy out campaigning door to door trying to counteract the Liberal propaganda that was going around my district saying the Liberals were going to win. I had to get out there and hustle. Because if you do not do it, you are liable to go down the tubes. But I trusted whoever gave me this information.

Highlights of our

proposal. Here are the highlights of Newfoundland's proposal: 'Both governments would set their resource claims

MR. STAGG:

aside and become co-owners of the resource'.

MR. LUSH: Ha, ha.

MR. STAGG: Ha, ha! The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), who has not read it and does not care about it and has already made his speech and is ready to go home, does not want to hear about it.

MR. LUSH: I said I have accepted it with blind faith.

MR. STAGG: Blind faith, I see.
Well, I guess that is how the electorate must have accepted the hon. member as well.

The establishment of a true partnership in Canada between this Province and the federal government. 'Both governments would set aside their ownership claims and become co-owners of the resource'. Can anything be more Canadian than that? Can we be more magnanimous than that? I doubt it. Both governments would be equal. Is there anything wrong with that? Both governments would be equal. Both governments would receive their share of revenues directly from a joint agency. Sounds pretty reasonable. The hon. gentleman did not know about that, of course. It might have changed his tactics. Although the hon. member got elected even though he did not know it, which is really -

MR. NEARY: He did not know he got elected?

MR. STAGG: He did not know he got elected.
Probably not. Arrangements could only be changed with the consent of both governments and the agreement could not be torn up by either party as happened in Australia. You see, the Australians went through a similar exercise, and when the federal government went to court down there and won their case, not a parallel situation, but they tore up the agreement.

MR. STAGG: What is in the major economic benefits package?

MR. PATTERSON: They are not going to

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Yes. We would use the oil activities to create jobs throughout the Province. So let me deal with this briefly because we are dealing with this in the academic, and to some extent we are dealing with it at the emotional level. But to everyone here and everyone who potentially might be unemployed, everyone here who is unemployed and everyone here who might be unemployed and everyone who knows anyone who is unemployed and has a skill, let me tell you that if the federal government would sign this most reasonable agreement-and they could have signed it an awful long time ago - there would be jobs in this Province. We would not get our unemployment rate down, well, probably dramatically, but there would be thousands of jobs in this Province within a very short period of time.

MR. BUTT: Right on!

MR. STAGG: There would be jobs in this Province within a very short period of time. So that is what Mr. Jean Chretien and Mr. Marc Lalonde, the man whom the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) could not - what was it he said? 'I would not trust him any further than I could throw him'. Then he tried to say he did not say it, but I heard it.

AN HON. MEMBER: And he cannot even pick him up.

MR. STAGG: Yes he cannot pick him up. Well, I saw him on T.V. last night. Actually he is a lot shorter than I thought he was, I only see him sitting down. So he probably could throw him a fair distance.

MR. NEARY: I thought it was Lalonde not Chretien I said that about.

MR. STAGG: Lalonde is who I am talking about.

MR. NEARY: What did you say?

MR. STAGG: Oh, you will have to read through it again, because I am talking fast and I am saying a lot. And I do not know how your mind is working, but you are probably three or four sentences behind me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on, 'Fred'.

MR. STAGG: Now let me tell you this, if this agreement were signed tomorrow, if Mr. Chretien, and Mr. Lalonde, and Mr. Trudeau, the three destroyers, as they have been humorously referred to, if they were to decide that they would do an act of great statesmanship, if they would be the George Brown of 1982 - who is George Brown? you may ask. Well, look it up!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: If you would indeed be the George Brown of 1982.

MR. HODDER: Certain Prime Minister and grow up.

MR. STAGG: Maybe so. Maybe so. If they would decide that they were going to sign this agreement, the results in the business world in this Province, the results throughout the whole of the country would be dramatic. There would be a dramatic upturn. First of all there would be the optimism. The people would be optimistic. The bankers would get off people's backs. The bankers would get off people's backs and they would say 'Well, maybe there is a chance here now, I will not send the writs out. I will not have the sheriff go in and tackle all these people', as some of the banks are doing in the Province. Maybe they would be a little more lax and maybe some of the businessmen could sit back and worry about carrying on business rather than covering their backs waiting for

MR. STAGG: the knives to go in . There would be a tremendous economic impact on this Province and on the country, so why is it not being done? Why is it not being done? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is not being done for the same reasons, for the same peculiar, perverse reasons that Mr. Trudeau, and Mr. Lalonde, and Mr. Chretien, but primarily Mr. Trudeau, unfortunately we come back to that gentleman, for the same reason that they have Quebec - they tried to get their opponents in Quebec on their knees. And what have they succeeded in doing in the past fourteen years or so? They have got a separatist government in Quebec, a government that is committed to the break-up of Canada and to their being a sovereign state in the midst of Canada. That is what they have accomplished in Quebec. And undoubtedly, undoubtedly, there has to be a problem with the personalities involved. I mean, who could believe that the man many of us voted for - I must confess that in a moment of great weakness, in 1968 when I was in Churchill Falls - and I say in 1968 I was much more naive than I am now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: In 1968 I worked in Churchill Falls.

MR. LUSH: A nice time and now it is gone!

MR. STAGG: Yes. And I voted for Andy Chatwood who

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 474 (Evening)

IB-]

MR. STAGG: was the Liberal candidate. I did do it and I confess that I did it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame on you 'Fred'.

MR. STAGG: I confess that I voted for Andy Chatwood. I did , in 1968, and I did not vote for Ambrose Peddle who is now the Ombudsman. I do not know if the hon. Minister of Fisheries was there at the time or not. I do not think he was. But in 1968 I voted - I did not vote for Andy Chatwood, I voted for Pierre Trudeau, the man who was going to give us the just society. The just society, in 1968. Do you not remember how wonderful we all felt, that we would have the just society?

MR. BUTT: The disease of Trudeaumania.

MR. STAGG: The same man who in 1970, sent the troops into private homes in Quebec during the so-called October crisis. Sent them in. And it was a day or months or weeks of infamy in that province and in the history of Canada when the War Measures Act was proclaimed. Well, he was only in power for two years then. When he talked about the exercise of power and a reporter asked him 'Would you go that far'? And he glibly and blithely and trippingly said as he pranced up the stairs, 'Just watch me'. 'Just watch me', was what he said. Well, I do not know if he has uttered any sinister words like that in his dealing with the Premier, but I am sure that he has said somewhere along the way, and he has said to the man who dared to expose him on nation-wide T.V. at the Constitutional Conference, the man who dared, the man who persevered, the man who brought about the change in the constitution - our Premier brought it about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: That is the man who did it. And do any of you think that defeat sits lightly on the shoulders of Pierre Elliott Trudeau? The answer, of course is no, defeat does not sit lightly on his shoulders.

MR. STAGG: And what immortal words did he utter when he talked about his dealings with our Premier. Well I have no doubt that there were some sinister words uttered. And we are living that out today, ladies and gentlemen. Our Premier, because he stood up for Newfoundland, because he stood up for Canada, because we have a constitution in Canada now that is a model and is done in the Canadian way-our Premier has done yeoman service to the country, he has done yeoman service to this Province.

AN. HON MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: And Mr. Trudeau, whose place in history is being daily whittled away and his place in history - he will be a footnote to history, he will be a footnote as a failure, a failure, one of the great Canadian failures.

MR. CARTER: An expensive failure.

MR. STAGG: An expensive failure, indeed, yes. That is one of the main really.

MR. STAGG: It is a complete abomination of the system. Here we are down here, 600,000 people or thereabout, we are the Kuwait of Canada. We have resources that per capita outstrip probably any other part of the world because we have resources from the whole spectrum of resources. And that is the kind of resource-base country that we are. And we are being denied it because of the personality of that man and his power, and the power he has over men like Bill Rompkey.

Now I would like for somebody else to use however much time they have dealing with Mr. Rompkey. My time is up, ladies and gentlemen, and I have only begun to speak. I wish I had two hours. May I carry on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. STAGG: No, I did not think you wanted me to carry on. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against the amendment, of course, and I am going to vote for the resolution. And it gives me a great deal of pride to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, you know, the Bible is the depository of a great part of the wisdom of this world, and I suppose it could be said the wisdom of the world beyond this world, wherever or whatever that may be. As I watched the Premier's performance on the television tonight and heard some of the debate here in the House tonight - I did not have the privilege of hearing it this afternoon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Quite a privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it would have been a privilege if I had heard it. It was a pleasure not to.

But now let me just say to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) right now, ordinarily I enjoy badinage even with the likes of him. But what I have to say tonight, Sir, I would ask that I be allowed to say in accordance with the rules of the House. I have not interrupted anybody here tonight and I would ask that all the members do me the courtesy of not interrupting me. They may not like what I have to say. That is their problem. I may not like what they have to say. That is my problem.

But I went home at supper hour and I looked up a verse in the bible that I think perhaps tells us all what we need to know as to why we are here tonight and tells us all what we need to know as to where we go from here. It is found in the sixth chapter of Galatians, it is the seventh verse. For those of you who are not as familiar as we all ought to be, and perhaps most of us are not,

MR. E. ROBERTS: with that portion of the Scriptures, let me read the relevant words: 'For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall be also reap'. That is what happened today. That is what the reference which the government of Canada have made to the Supreme Court of Canada really represents, nothing more or nothing less. The Premier has sown and the Premier has reaped. Let it be remembered, let it be recorded and let it be remembered, there is only one reason why the Supreme Court of Canada have today been asked by the Government of Canada to decide which government owns the Hibernia oil field. And that is the question that has been put before the Court. Somebody, I know not whom, placed on my table what appears to be, and what I assume and accept is a copy of a telex from the Prime Minister's office in Ottawa to the Premier's office here. It is addressed to the Premier and it appears to be signed by the Prime Minister, I assume it is accurate. It has appended to it the wording of the question referred by the Cabinet of Canada to the Supreme Court of Canada. And that question, in summary and in non-technical language, says simply 'Who owns Hibernia? Who has the right to explore the said mineral and other natural resources, and a legislative jurisdiction to make laws in relation to the exploitation and exploration of the said mineral and other natural resources?' That is important. Many members may not have read it; many members may have read it and felt that it was just some legal language. But let me read it again, Sir. The Court is being asked to decide in respect to the mineral and other natural resources of the seabed and sub-soil of the Continental Shelf in the area in the Hibernia field, as between Canada and Newfoundland, who has - which government, which parliament to be precise - the right to explore and to exploit the said mineral and other resources and legislative jurisdiction to make laws in relation to the exportation and exploitation

MR.E. ROBERTS: of the said mineral and other natural resources. Now, that is what has been referred to the Supreme Court. That is the question that the Supreme Court in due course will answer, I assume they will answer. I once had a very learned judge tell me that 'they can ask me to opine, but it is up to me what I opine'. The Court, I suppose in fury, could refuse to answer, but it will not. The judges will give the answers to that question. It is there, Sir, it is there before the nine judges of the Supreme Court because the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador referred the ownership issue to the courts. Now, whether they were right to do so or wrong to do so is another item, and I will come to that.

MR. E. ROBERTS: But the fact remains the issue is before the Supreme Court of Canada today because the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador decided and then acted on their decision and put the matter in the legal process. They have sown and so also shall they reap. What is happening, Sir, is that they are reaping far quicker than they realized. To mix the metaphor, the chickens are coming home to roost far more quickly than the Premier and his colleagues ever realized. And that is why we are here tonight, Sir, that is why the theatrics of the histrionics of the black arm bands, a perversion of a Christian symbol of mourning, That is why we have had the histrionics of a national day of mourning, businesses closed and schools closed.

MR. NEARY: \$18 million lost.

MR. ROBERTS: I wonder they have not ordered that the church bells rung. And that is why we are here. And yet, Sir, I do not dispute the honesty with which they hold their beliefs. I do not question their faith. What I do question, Sir, is the approach and the attitude. We are in the court in Ottawa because this government put us in the court in Ottawa. That is why we are there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The moment they referred it to the - most hon. gentleman opposite may not realize this and they do not have to believe me they can go look it up in the law books of this land - the moment the issue was referred by our Cabinet in Newfoundland to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland Court of Appeal, it was destined to go to the Supreme Court of Canada for a decision, inevitably, unavoidably, without any leave or granting or anything else. Oh, somebody would have to be the appellant and somebody the respondent, of course.

MR. ROBERTS: The appellant would be whoever lost in the decision in our court here in Newfoundland, and the respondent would be whoever won in the Newfoundland Court. It does not matter who, whether it was the Government of Canada or the Government of Newfoundland. And there is an automatic right of appeal. Section 55, if memory serves me, of the Supreme Court of Canada Act, the act that has been in place since 1873 - the court is now a century and more old - 1873 or 1875? I forget - but it is a century or more old, and that section, or a variation thereof, has been in that legislation since it began. So, that is why we are in Ottawa today. We were going to go to Ottawa and all that has happened is the time frame has been compressed. That is what has happened. The Court of Appeal of this Province has not been prevented from giving its opinion - I will deal with that and show it for the false belief it is. It is not true. All that has happened is that the issue has gone to the Supreme Court of Canada more quickly than it would otherwise have gone. The question is a little different,

May 19, 1982

Evening session
Tape 478 JC - 1

MR. ROBERTS: but I agree with the Premier - I do not often agree with him; I think that he is usually wrong - I agree with him when he said on the television tonight that of course the answer to this question will in all significant ways determine the answer to the immensely longer and the immensely more complicated question which forms the basis of the Provincial reference. Now, Sir, let us recall what happened today or yesterday, whenever the order - I do not know when - was passed in Ottawa. I know when it was announced; it was announced today here in St. John's. The Federal Cabinet, using the right given them by parliament, have asked the Supreme Court of Canada to answer a question. That is exactly, Sir, what the government of this province did - whenever it was; two, three or four months ago - using the rights conferred upon them by this House, when they asked the Newfoundland Court of Appeal to answer questions put to them by the Newfoundland government. So let the records stand clear and let it stand firm, no matter what twisting or distortions. You know hon. gentlemen opposite - apparently they are going to stay here all night. I am not going to, I am going home at eleven o'clock. They can stay all night if they want to, and they can stay all morning if they want to - but hon. gentlemen opposite will doubtless get up and so they should, and let them speak as they wish, but, Mr. Speaker, let us be clear on one thing, no matter what twisting or distortions or anything else is said this night or elsewhere in this province. The record is clear; it is the government of Newfoundland and Labrador that took the matter to court, the government of Newfoundland and Labrador that took the matter to court, not the government of Canada, the government of this province and nobody else. Let us be clear again, as I have already said, that once the matter went to the Court of Appeal it was on its way to the Supreme Court of Canada. Any learned member of the House, learned in the law or learned in anything else can challenge that if he wishes, but he can not challenge it successfully. Hon. gentleman opposite may not all

MR. ROBERTS: understand that but I can tell them it is correct, and they can seek where they want, they will get the same answer. So, what happened? What happened today? Why the hysteria the histrionics. Why? The question has gone directly to the Supreme Court, to the court who would hear it anyway. All that has happened - all that has happened - is that the time for

May 19, 1982; Tape 479, Page 1 -- apb

MR. ROBERTS:

final resolution of the issue has been moved forward. It now will be settled definitively, my guess is, within twelve months. Today is the 19th. day of May, 1982. It is reasonable and prudent in every sense of the word, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that by the 19th. day of May, 1983 those of us whom God spares till that time will know what the Supreme Court of Canada says in response to that question. It will be settled within twelve months, in fact possibly a great deal less.

There seems to be some feeling that the Court will hear the matter in the fall and render a decision two, three, four months after that. All that has happened is that a year has been taken out of the process. That is what has happened. So when we get carried away with our talk - there has been talk of treason, as I recall it; and there has been talk of national aggression - was it? - and of all sorts of things - when we hear that talk let us - you know, if the boys opposite, and the girls opposite want to get into this kind of thing, if this is how they get their jollies, if they feel that their political strategy requires this, if they feel Newfoundland's interests demand it, then let them do it. But let them not forget the one clear fact, that all that has happened is the issue has gone directly to the court to which it was going to go anyway and the result will be its resolution at least a year, and probably more quickly than that, than would otherwise have been the case.

Why has it happened?

Before I talk about that let me dispose of another canard, and the Premier has voiced this. I must say this performance on the television tonight was pathetic, absolutely pathetic in a logical or rational sense.

MR. ROBERTS:

Yes, it was frightening in a very real sense. There has been much to do about short-circuiting the Newfoundland Court of Appeal. And I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) say, and too many of his colleagues have not espoused this view, that it is dispicable. And I would use his word, it is 'dispicable' for anybody to say that 'our' court and 'their' court. We are talking about a group of men, and in the case of the Supreme Court of Canada a group of men and a woman who are sworn, oath bound to make their findings according to the law as they understand it and as they believe it. And I have no doubt that any judge, any judge, will do exactly that, and it does not matter whether he or she is a member of a provincial court in Newfoundland or the appellate division of our Supreme Court, or the Supreme Court of Canada sitting in Ottawa. Maybe the Supreme Court should sit here to hear it, it has that right.

MR. ROBERTS: There has been much to-do with the short-circuiting the Newfoundland Court. Now let me just put some facts on the record for those who would listen. First of all, the matter is before our Court of Appeal, the Newfoundland reference is before our Court of Appeal. And its still there, nothing happened today to change that. My friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), who I understand has left the practice of law at least temporarily, would have to agree that nothing has changed that, it is still there. Secondly, there is no rule of law or of practice to prevent the Appellate Court in this Province hearing this question, hearing the argument and rendering their decision, and answering the questions posed to the judges by the Cabinet. No rule of law, no rule of practice, no rule of precedent. Thirdly, the question posed by the federal Cabinet is a different one, a different one than the question posed by the Cabinet here. It may or may not lead to the same affect, I think it probably will, because I think a judgement on the federal question will probably serve to answer the important part of the question posed by the Province. But the question posed by the Province would take a generation of international lawyers three lifetimes to come to grips with, it is that diffuse and that wordy and imprecise. It was not written by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) I am sure. But the Newfoundland Court could still answer it, and in my view, Sir, they should. Far be it from me to suggest to their lordships. What they will do I have no idea, the judges of the Appellate Court, the four of them, will do. But I do say, Sir, that they have the power to answer the questions posed, and I think they will be well within their rights of doing so. So let us just take care, for once and for all, of this nonsense of short-circuiting the Newfoundland Court. The Newfoundland Court of Appeal has all the powers and all the rights it had before the

MR. ROBERTS: federal reference, and whatever duties it had before, it has those same duties now and it has the same powers to carry out those duties. Now what happened today? Why did the federal government, the federal Cabinet, make this reference?

MR. STAGG: Why did they lie in the House yesterday?

MR. ROBERTS: I have no idea why they lied in the House or whether they lied in the House, Sir. And I say again to my friend from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), I ask him to extend to me the same courtesy that I had extended to him, and if he is not prepared to do that, Sir, I would ask him to leave the Chamber.

AN HON. MEMBER: He may have no choice.

MR. STAGG: A simple question.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, from a simple member.

Now Mr. Speaker, let me carry on

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am grateful for your continued support and your determination to ensure that not only the rules of the House, but the spirit and the tradition of those rules are followed. Why did the Federal Government go to the Supreme Court? I cannot answer that question. The Prime Minister apparently has given his answer, or at least an outline of it, in this Telex message. Mr. Chretien made a statement today. They can speak for themselves and I am not going to try to guess why they have done what, or whether they ought to have done it or anything else. I am going to say what they done, and what it means to this Province, as I see it. We are told that the matter was in the courts here by our government because allegedly the Federal Government would not accept preconditions, the preconditions laid down, the two preconditions laid down by this government here before they would negotiate. The Province set the preconditions, The Province said it would only negotiate if ownership was set aside during the negotiations, and permanently if an agreement was reached. And I think I have accurately reproduced it. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottemheimer) nods his acquiescence. Now let us examine that, let us look at those preconditions. On the surface it appears that the Province is being reasonable, on the surface it would seem as if they are being reasonable. But let me just gently ask, at the risk of scorn - maybe the hon. gentlemen opposite have their minds closed, maybe there is no point in even discussing it, maybe they really just closed their minds forever and a day - but let me just simply ask gently, is it not equally reasonable to say, "We will negotiate, but we will only sign an agreement that sets ownership aside?"

MR. ROBERTS:

A very different approach!

In one way there are negotiations; the other way, the way this province's government has chosen to walk, there are no negotiations.

MR. ROBERTS: And I would say that given the Province's stand, as repeated repeatedly, and indeed the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) told us that that is what passed between him and Mr. Lalonde last Friday in Montreal - I was not there, I have not spoken to anybody else who was there, but that is what the minister tells us, and I accept him - given that, Sir, the government of Canada, as I see it, has no choice, there was no other way out of it. But we could have said we will negotiate. Maybe it is the extra mile, maybe it is the extra mile-and-a-half, but we will negotiate, but we will not sign an agreement that does not resolve the ownership issue for once and for all. The Premier said tonight on the television the federal government would not negotiate. Well I say, Sir, to the Premier, it was the Province that set the preconditions, the Province that made it impossible to negotiate, and there is a world of difference between preconditions, Sir, preconditions on one hand, and on the other hand going into negotiations and saying that there are some matters that are not negotiable. You know, I am not saying anything new, I have been saying this for years. The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) called me a traitor in this House three or four years ago.

MR. CARTER: I may do it again yet.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he may do it again. And I am as proud now to stand by what I said as I was then. He called me a traitor. Why? Because I dared to suggest that we should negotiate; I dared to suggest that the government of this Province should negotiate with Ottawa. I got the Hansard out and had a look at it.

MR. CARTER: Give it all away.

MR. ROBERTS: Give it all away? No, Sir. Not what the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) would do. But let us never, to quote the words of John F. Kennedy in a different context, but applicable here, 'Let us never negotiate from fear, but let us never fear to negotiate.'

MR. ROBERTS Instead, Sir, we have taken the other road, and now we are reaping what we sowed. We have sowed and we are reaping. And that brings me squarely to this resolution night, and we are speaking on the amendment. I may not be here when the resolution comes to vote.

AN HON. MEMBER Home early?

MR. ROBERTS Mr. Speaker, I may not be here, I am going to go home at eleven, eleven-thirty, I will not miss anything because all I will miss is the same speech being said forty-four times. We have heard the Premier, he is the only man over there who speaks and thinks, and he speaks eloquently and thinks actively. How well is a matter of opinion, but, Mr. Speaker, here we are with this resolution. Tell me, I ask, what will be achieved if this resolution is passed, as it will be. My colleagues are going to support, and if I am here I will vote for it. I have no problem voting for it-

MR. CARTER: No, no.

MR. ROBERTS - no problem voting against it either, I will tell you why, Sir, This resolution will achieve nothing - zip, zilch, zero, absolutely nothing, It is not worth a tinker's damn. It is not worth anything at all; it is not worth a pound of cods heads left rotting in the moonlight for a month, It is worth nothing. It is not going to change anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

May 19, ;982

Tape No. 483

RA - 1 Evening session.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite could keep their conversations either to themselves or low.

MR. CARTER: I do not want to keep the conversation low.

MR. ROBERTS: It is difficult to speak, Sir. I am not speaking to the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), that is why I am not going low. Mr. Speaker, let me just say, Sir, -

MR. LUSH: He did not get that on. It is too subtle for him.

MR. ROBERTS: - that hon. gentlemen opposite, I would ask them please to restrain their conversations, and that includes the parliamentary secretary from Labrador West, from Menihek district (Mr. Walsh), if he could please carry on his conversation outside the House. Now, Sir, nothing is going to change with this resolution being adopted-tonight or tomorrow morning whenever it is adopted. Actually nothing is going to change. I am quite sure it is not going to change the government of Canada. I am quite sure it is not going to change the government of Newfoundland. It is not going to change the opinion of either the courts that hears the issue. Why are we here? We are here because of shameless, partisan politics. I do not say partisan politics are shameless, Sir. I am as partisan and I am as political as any man or woman in this Province, but I say what we are seeing now is shameless. It is a move, Sir, by a group of men and women, the government of this Province today, and the men and women who support them, who know not wither where they go. It is not an act of leadership. It is an abdication of leadership.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. E. ROBERTS: It is not going to solve any problems or help to reduce any problems. It is a cheap theatrical trick in my view. You know what it is, Sir? It is the reaction of a man who has been out maneuvered. The Premier has been scuppered, he has been crushed, and this is the reaction, a sheer emotional reaction. That is what has happened to him; he has been beaten, because the matter has gone directly to the Supreme Court of Canada. And why are we so worried about that? We have been saying for years that our case is solid, and I believe it is. You would think instead of a day of mourning we would have a day of jubilation. We are getting close to the final resolution. We could not do it on our own. The Newfoundland Cabinet could not have referred it directly to the Supreme Court of Canada. It could refer it to the Supreme Court, but not directly. It could refer it because the reference to our court goes automatically to Ottawa. You would think it a day of jubilation.

May 19, 1982, Tape 484, Page 1 -- apb

MR. ROBERTS: I mean, our day is coming. If our case is as solid as we believe it is, the eight men and the woman who together form the Supreme Court of Canada are bound to rule in our favour and then we will have all the aces. That is what we have been told for years. Why are we mourning? We should be welcoming this.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this government should still - we have the two references in the courts - pass our resolution, carry it up to Ottawa, emboss it, do what you want with it, wrap it around a rock and throw it through the windows of 24 Sussex Drive. Who cares? We should negotiate and say, 'No preconditions, but there is an agreement we will not sign, And the agreement we will not sign is one that does not resolve the ownership issue to our satisfaction'. We should be asking ourselves, 'What is in the national interest? What is in the provincial interest?' Are we so narrow that we do not care about the national interest? We are not so base we do not care about the provincial interest.

Mr. Speaker, both, both the national interest and the provincial interest, the interest of Canada as a whole, the country of which we are a part, although I sometimes wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite really realize that; the national interest of the country of which we are a part and the national interest of the Province which is our home, and for most of us our birthplace, both demand the same answer. Let us pass the resolution, but let us realize how it came to be, and let us then go on. Let us show some statesmanship instead of emotional chicanery, cheap trickery. Shoddy! Cheap!

MR. STAGG: Unparliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: Unparliamentary, perhaps -

MR. ROBERTS: if so I will withdraw -
but not untrue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. ROBERTS: So, Mr. Speaker, I say
now as I began, 'As ye sow so also shall ye reap'.
And I say the Premier has sown dragon's teeth and now
we are going to pay the price. Let us change before
it is too late. Let us go on. This issue is too
important to be played in this type of partisan politics.
Let us do what must be done for Newfoundland and for
Labrador and for Canada. And every man on this side,
and every man and woman on that side can agree on that,
Sir, and there we will go together and there we will go
united.

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have
heard many speeches given in this Legislature, and a
certain number have been given by the member for the
Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) based upon - he
invokes biblical quotations. As somebody has always
said, you are on a very weak basis when you invoke
biblical quotations, particularly in this forum. He
says we sow what we reap. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad
we do not sow as shallow as the hon. gentleman's speech
was tonight because we would reap very, very little.
My party right or wrong! Not my country right or wrong
but my party right or wrong, and that is what you can
call that particular speech.

May 19, 1982

Tape 485

Evening Session
JC -1

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Whatever the Liberal Party does, no matter what the Liberal Party does to this little province of Newfoundland, it is right, it is all right. If the hon. gentlemen like that so much I suggest they pack their grips and move to the mainland with their buddies, Mr. Rompkey and the like, who are trying to shove down Newfoundlanders and keep them down and put them down for four or five generations yet to come.

MR. STAGG: Hear, Hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Imagine the gentleman saying, Mr. Speaker, that the moment it was referred it was destined to go to the Supreme Court of Canada. He neglected to mention-and you can hide it all; if the Bible does not work, try to hide it through legal jargon-he neglected to mention that this is the first time that this is the first time in memory, that the government of Canada has pre-empted a reference by a provincial government on a constitutional matter by going directly to the Supreme Court of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: He neglects to mention that when the Supreme Court of Canada addresses itself to the question that has been referred by the government of Canada, it will answer the question, in essence and in substance, which has been put there before the Government of Newfoundland. He does not ask the question as to why it was given, why this reference was made. He does not ask the question as to why the federal government was prepared to argue it before their own court, the Federal Court of Canada-

PREMIER PECKFORD: In the S.I.U. case.

MR. MARSHALL: - in the S.I.U. case.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No way!

MR. MARSHALL: how it is prepared to argue it before their court, the Supreme Court of Canada, and is not prepared to appear before the Supreme Court of Appeal of Newfoundland. Oh, they say it will go ahead anyway. But what in effect they have done, they have pre-empted it. Could it be that it is because the federal government remembers the constitutional decision that was rendered -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland -

PREMIER PECKFORD: I wonder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - which forced the Government of Canada -

PREMIER PECKFORD: I wonder.

MR. MARSHALL: - to change its policy? Are the afraid of the decision of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland?

AN HON. MEMBER: A good question.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, they cannot be.

MR. MARSHALL: No, Mr. Speaker, I never heard as I say, what we reap we sow. But that was the most shallow speech, I think, that has ever been delivered, with all due respect to the hon. gentleman, in this House. What has happened here today, as has been stated,

MR. MARSHALL: what has happened has been a hostile act of aggression which one would more appropriately expect from an unfriendly, alien power than from the national government of our own country. That is what has happened here in this Province today. And it is an act of aggression, Mr. Speaker, because it constitutes a land grab by the Central Government of Canada representing all Canadians. Now I do not believe they represent the wishes of all Canadians, and I believe that eventually the court of public opinion - and there is a good sense of decency in Canadians around Canada - will supervene what has happened today. But let there be no mistake that what the federal government has done today has been to attempt to perpetrate a land grab and to have departed from the negotiations. In effect it is a land grab because what the federal government is saying is we are not interested in negotiating any more to settle the issue with a view to settling this issue of ownership. There are two ways it can be settled, obviously, as any dispute, by negotiation or by court. They have chosen to go the court route. They have indicated that they are not interested now in negotiating a reasonable joint management and revenue sharing regime.

I now believe that they were totally insincere, Mr. Speaker, in the first place when they stated they wanted to negotiate a settlement, and all they were doing merely was paying lip service to it. Really what they wanted to do is what they are attempting to do today, to grab once again one of the resources from this Province. Because, in effect, they think they can get away with it because this happens to be a smaller province, it happens to be a geographical minority. They would never do it - and let there be no mistake about it - they would never take this course of action if this resource

MR. MARSHALL: had belonged to the Province of Quebec, and the hon. gentlemen there opposite know it. Or, for that matter, the Province of Ontario. Or, for that matter, the Province of Alberta with its economic power. But it so happens that this poor little province, as it is its resources have been taken from it, we suffer daily from the great grab of resources from the Upper Churchill, and this is another one that the people of Newfoundland are asked to put up with.

They want this all themselves. Let there be no mistake about it, this action is giving up all pretense on the federal government's part that they are interested in negotiating. They are going to court. Oh yes, the hon. gentlemen there opposite will say that the people of Newfoundland put it to court, the government put it to court. Certainly the government has a reference before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, but that was only for the purpose of attempting to circumvent the avowed intent and the actions of the federal government in trying to rush it into

MR. MARSHALL: the Supreme Court of Canada anyway through the S.I.U. case. They failed to do that, but today they have decided that they are going to go ahead and do it. So it is an enormous act against the people of this Province, and the hon. gentlemen there opposite, as I say, they can say what they like and we are not interested. We are interested in support from Newfoundlanders, and we are getting support from Newfoundlanders and we will continue to get it. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not interested in mealy-mouthed support of the nature offered by the hon. gentlemen there opposite in their amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Because what they want to do is they, in effect, want to support the federal government, and they are trying to say that what we should do is we should go back and negotiate anyway on their terms. Now what are their terms, Mr. Speaker? Their terms are quite evident. They talk about preconditions. And of course the me-tooites on the other side, I heard the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and others talk about preconditions. Preconditions are mentioned in this disgraceful telex from the Prime Minister of Canada to the First Minister of this Province. Preconditions were mentioned by Mr. Lalonde, that great friend of Newfoundland. What they called preconditions are the basic foundations in the first place of the negotiations.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is right.

MR. MARSHALL: They are not preconditions. What we said to the gentlemen up in Ottawa was that in order to negotiate we want ownership and agreement that ownership be set aside and set aside permanently in the event that there is an agreement. And what does that mean?

MR. MARSHALL: We simply said by that, Mr. Speaker, that we wanted to enter into an agreement that neither side could tear up. Now, is that an unreasonable position to put before the federal government when one is negotiating? Is that an unreasonable position to put before anyone when you are negotiating and contemplating entering into an agreement, to say that I want to enter into an agreement and I want to enter into one that we say that we will not tear it up, you must not tear it up, and we must put it beyond the reach of either one of us being able to tear it up? That is what they called preconditions. And they were not preconditions, Mr. Speaker, and let this be known as well, that this was agreed by the Prime Minister of Canada when he first suggested the negotiations, and they were maintained at all times by this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Changing it again.

MR. MARSHALL: But as a result of the breach of faith, and it can be styled as nothing but a breach of faith by the federal government, they departed from this and they want us to negotiate an agreement, an agreement that can be torn up. The agreement that they want is one like in Nova Scotia. And let there be no doubt about that Nova Scotian agreement, that can be torn up at any time. As a matter of fact, there is a clause in it to the effect that if Nova Scotia happens to see an agreement that has been signed by the federal government with another province that is more favourable, it can tear it up itself and substitute the other.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: That is the way they treat the Province of Nova Scotia. The way they treat us is by a land grab by going to court. The next thing we say to them,

May 19, 1982

Tape 487 - Evening Session PS - 3

MR. MARSHALL: we say we want you to address yourself to this reasonable proposal. It is appalling. The hon. gentlemen there opposite say that they have never seen the proposal. The people of Newfoundland saw this proposal on April 6th, and the people of Newfoundland responded accordingly. In essence, what does this proposal say? The proposal says we want to have this resource

MR. MARSHALL:

administered on a joint basis. The Province of Newfoundland does not want the majority of people on it, but we will have three, the federal government will appoint three, and we will have one independent person and it will be administered under joint regulations. Now what is unreasonable about that?

The next thing we say: That we want a revenue-sharing scheme, a reasonable revenue-sharing scheme. Not one, as they signed in Nova Scotia, tagged to equalization, which, incidentally, would not this Province a paltry \$500 million for the entire resource on the offshore.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And it does not even replace equalization.

MR. MARSHALL:

It does not even replace equalization. It sounds like a lot of money, sure it does, but when you realize that our annual budget is \$1,500,000,000 each year and escalating, you will see what they are attempting to do with the Province of Newfoundland.

Our position is we want a reasonable revenue-sharing scheme, and we want it tagged too that we will receive 75 per cent - not all the money, even at the first - and you will get 25 per cent until such time as Newfoundland gets to a certain stage. And that stage is a stage that we have a dream of, and that is where the taxes are the same, the burden of taxes on the people of Newfoundland are equal to the rest of Canada; the rate of employment is equal to other Canadians, the average income is equal to other Canadians, infrastructure, that is the schools, the roads, the hospitals are equal to that enjoyed by other Canadians. Not more, but equal. And then we say, 'After that point is reached, then we will come down and we will share -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

More and more.

MR. MARSHALL:

- considerably more.

The amount that we ask in the meantime is only the same amount as Alberta got when it was a have-not province. Now, is that unreasonable?

Now, that is the proposal, and let it be known, that was put before the federal government. And today the federal government, instead of addressing this proposal, and addressing the aspirations of the people of Newfoundland and agreeing that they would enter into an agreement which would not be torn up as it has been torn up in the Commonwealth of Australia, instead of that they have elected to go to court in what amounts to be a hostile, aggressive act which amounts to a land grab, another grab of the resources of the people of this Province. And this government, nor the people of this Province, and with the support of the people of the Province are not going to countenance that.

Now, let us look at and, as I say, just get back once more briefly, because it is hard to stomach the speeches that are coming from the other side, it is really hard to stomach, and when they say that 'it was going to the Supreme Court of Canada anyway, so what difference does it make? We will have it heard earlier,' Every single constitutional issue of this type, the original court of jurisdiction is the court of the province concerned and the Supreme Court of Canada benefits then from the opinion that is rendered by the

MR. MARSHALL: the judges of that court.

That is the way it has been done, that is the Canadian way. That is the way that resolutions of this nature have been decided between Canada and Alberta or between Canada and Ontario or between Canada and Quebec. Is it too much to ask that this is the way, if it has to be resolved - we do not believe, by the way, that it has to be resolved through court action - but if it does, is this too much for the people of Newfoundland to expect?

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, no.

MR. MARSHALL: These preconditions that have been talked about, they are not preconditions, they are what the federal government styles to be preconditions, but they are not. They are the firm basis of the foundation of the negotiations in the first place. We would be shallow indeed, and we would be departing from the trust that was placed in us by the people of this Province, and we would justifiably deserve their condemnation if we entered into any agreement that could be torn up at the will of one of the parties. This we will never do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: This is what was the basis of the foundations and, God in Heaven, what really is wrong and unreasonable with requesting that? That is why we are not going to go along with the hon. gentleman's amendment, because the hon. gentleman's amendment wants us to delete the setting aside of ownership. And really what they want us to do is to delete this reasonable proposal, because if the hon. gentlemen there opposite had their way, they would be up to Ottawa now and signing that Nova Scotian agreement, that greatly touted Nova Scotian agreement -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, that is right.

MR. MARSHALL: - that greatly touted Nova Scotian agreement. Instead of having three, three and one, what do they have in the Nova Scotian agreement? They have three alright, three federal, yes, no problem there, but two provincial.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: They have a provision there that the federal decision, any decision that is made, is going to depend upon the federal government. Now, if we signed an agreement like that, what is going to happen? We hear talk about the activity going off to Nova Scotia, and what have you, but I jolly well think, by the way, of the balance in Canada, that the Marystown Shipyard would be vacant, year after year after year, while supply ships were being built in the eastern seaboard of the Province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And then when they were filled, it would be the Province of Nova Scotia. That is what we are trying to protect. The other element of the Nova Scotian agreement is equally unpalatable - now this is what the hon. gentlemen there opposite would

MR. MARSHALL: sign it in a moment. They would give it away in a moment if they had the opportunity. Thank God they will not and they never will - it is tagged to equalization, that is what the Nova Scotian agreement is. Nothing to do at all with the employment levels of the people of the province, the people of Nova Scotia. No relationship whatsoever to the average income in Nova Scotia. No relationship whatsoever to the standard of living and the taxes and the education, the health facilities in Nova Scotia at all. Absolutely none. And that is the proposal that we were asked to accept, but very arrogantly told by Mr. Lalonde that if we do not accept it within two weeks of the signing of Nova Scotia that is not even available.

So the hon. gentlemen there opposite, they would sign the Nova Scotian agreement, but they would sign anything that their masters in Ottawa poked in front of their face. And we have seen, as a result of the speeches here, the most despicable speeches - this is an act today, it is the worst act that has ever been perpetrated upon the people of Newfoundland. It is a grab for our resources. We suffer daily from the Upper Churchill fiasco. A lot has been said with respect to the Upper Churchill fiasco about the weak government, which admittedly we had at that particular time, who just wanted the short term jobs. But there were two government responsible for the people of Newfoundland in those days, as there are two governments now, and the federal government at that time had an equal duty to protect the interests of the people of Newfoundland. They did not. On the boundaries of our Province, we might just as well be bounding Soviet Russia for the good it has done us in electrical transmission. Because we have to sell

MR. MARSHALL: the power to them. We are treated as if we are a foreign country because it suits them to treat us as a foreign country and they reap and they are skimming off us between \$500 million and \$600 million a year, and it is accelerating.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And what did Mr. Lalonde say to you last week about that?

MR. MARSHALL: Well Mr. Lalonde said, 'Oh, I was not a member of the government at the time' - when I mentioned it in exactly those words to him - 'I was not a member. I was not, you know, responsible for them. I do not know anything about that.'. And I responded to him at the time, 'Well, we know plenty about it because we labour on it every year when we are trying to provide adequate clothing for foster children, when we are trying to provide adequate educational institutions for our children and adequate health services. But he, in his pristine arrogance, you know, would make a statement, 'Oh, I did not know anything about that'. But we know about it and we know what happened. And the people of this Province, as I say, labour on that because we are treated in that instance, you will note, as a foreign country. We might just as well be

MR. MARSHALL: bordering on Soviet Russia or on the United States for all the good it does us in electrical transmission, because it suits them up there to cream off \$600 million a year. But what happens when we make a find out in the offshore oil? What happens then? Are we a foreign country then? No, we are not a foreign country then. We are all one big happy family!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And the putative father in Ottawa, the surrogate father in Ottawa, happens to say, "You have got to give this all over to us and we will take control of it all and incidentally what we will do is we will dole it out to you by way of dole."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Well that is not a position that any proud people will accept. It is not a position that any government will accept. Hell will freeze over and doomsday will come before the people of Newfoundland will submit themselves once again to another grab at their resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite, what can we do, you know? The consideration of the resolution by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) is so shallow, that he says 'Oh, I will vote for it or I will not vote for it, it does not make any difference one way or the other.' This resolution means a lot to the people. That is the way in which the gentleman is looking at the situation. The gentlemen there opposite should realize that there is a lot that can be done. The only obstacle in the way of the destiny and the heritage of the people of this Province is the Liberal Party of Canada and the Liberal Party of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

We are "Represented" by five members in the caucus in the federal government, lead by Mr. Rompkey. And what do we hear from them? Is it too much to expect of these gentlemen, is it too much to expect them to at least speak up for Newfoundland? Indeed I think most people would think after today that they would expect them to depart from the caucus of the Federal Liberal Party -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- until it desists from what it is doing. This whole situation, Mr. Speaker, it is a despicable act of the federal government. It has been mentioned tonight about the Falkland Islands and all of that. I could go even further: It is a Fascist act by the Central Government of Canada against a minority province. It represents the exercise of the tyranny of the majority on the minority. It represents an attempt to take from us our rightful heritage. It represents a departure from Canadian precedent. It represents a time when all Newfoundlanders, no matter what their party - you can say 'My party right or wrong' - but you have an opportunity in this House to vote, and to vote wholeheartedly for this resolution. And to vote not for your party, but to vote and put in

MR. MARSHALL:

a vote for your province. Not just to vote for it and not just to give lip service, but to do something about it. The hon. gentlemen there opposite have some, probably have if anyone has, some rapport, although I doubt whether anyone has any rapport now with the federal Liberal Party, the way they have got the country in shambles. That is another issue, the country is in shambles. Their energy policy is in shambles and we are supposed to bail them out on the backs of Newfoundlanders. But the hon. gentlemen there opposite should have some relationship with their colleagues in the federal party. God knows they have supported them enough to have some influence with them. This is a time when every single Newfoundlander, man, woman and child, has to stand and has to make their position known on this. And it is very, very disappointing that the hon. gentlemen there opposite would support, 'support', because it is not really support, in the squeezey, weasely fashion that they do. They say they will support and go back - they want us to go back to the negotiation table and negotiate an agreement which, first of all, is the Nova Scotian agreement. And, secondly, that could be torn up afterwards if the federal government do not like it and they do want to give us absolutely nothing.

That is their position and it is extremely disappointing. This act, I repeat, I cannot conceive myself of an act that is more hostile to this Province, a more aggressive act to this Province. It is really a declaration of war in a sense, because what it amounts to is an action by a government that has the power to do it, representing a majority of Canadians, although, as I say, I do not believe it represents a majority of the will of Canadians, but they represent Canada and what they are doing really is that they are taking our

MR. MARSHALL: resource. It is a land grab. It is an act of aggression against the people of this Province. It is going to reap very bitter seeds that will be sown in the future. Most regrettable! And there could be a resolution of this by negotiation if the federal government would only not accept pre-conditions but accept the basic foundations on which the negotiations were entered into in the first place. That is to agree to set ownership aside and permanently in the event there is an agreement and to address themselves to this very reasonable proposition for resolution.

So, you know, there is not too much more that can be said. A lot has been said on this subject tonight. But, as I say, I think it is utterly and completely despicable that this has occurred. I think the hon. gentlemen there opposite, with the greatest respect to them, are despicable in the way that they are not supporting the people of Newfoundland. But I think that they are exceeded by their brethren in Ottawa who are prepared to see Newfoundland sold down the river apparently once again so that we will be on welfare for the next two centuries if they have their way.

But that is not the way of this Province and we are going to persevere.

MR. MARSHALL: We are going to fight this and we are going to fight it with every sinew that we possibly have. We are going to rely on many things, not the least of which is the good will and hopefully the political conscience of the Canadian people. Because I do not believe that in any country that the people really, the ordinary people in Ontario and Quebec and the other provinces, despite what the government does with respect to wanting to keep its own power with its seventy-five seats and it is eighty-five seats in Ontario, There must be a shred of decency in them. We will appeal to their sense of decency, Would that we saw more of a vein of decency in the other members there opposite and their colleagues in Ottawa and perhaps we would be in a much better position than we have been now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: The nastiest individual ever born.

MR. BARRY: Who is that, Trudeau?

MR. NEARY: The ultimate in nastiness.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, we have just seen the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) at his best or at his worse, chip on his shoulder and anti - Confederate feelings showing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Fighting Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, this amendment which we put forward today does only one thing. It removes a pre-condition, one pre-condition. The last part of this resolution the government has brought into this House today said,

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 493

RA - 2 Evening session.

MR. HODDER: 'Be it further resolved that this House go on record as calling upon the federal government to return to the negotiating table'. But, Mr. Speaker, the next part of the sentence says 'on the basis put forward by the government of Newfoundland'. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I am going to say is this. I am not asking the government of Newfoundland to go into negotiations without principles or without conditions in mind which they may not negotiate. But, Mr. Speaker, if you have pre-conditions that you have put forward before the negotiations start, that we will do nothing less than this, then we may as well not negotiate. What is the process of negotiation about? Mr. Speaker, the three pre-conditions were listed by the Premier this afternoon:

MR. J. HODDER: that they negotiate a settlement based upon putting the ownership aside for the length of the negotiations -

MR. TULK: A long time.

MR. HODDER: - and permanently if a settlement is reached, and third, based upon our January 25th proposal. Mr. Speaker, that does not give room for negotiations.

MR. TOBIN: You have to start somewhere.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: No response yet.

MR. HODDER: - the people of my district did not send me here to agree with the government on everything they do. I will vote for this amendment -

AN HON. MEMBER: We will watch you.

MR. HODDER: - and I may even vote for the resolution, because this government has a mandate. I am not going to stand in the way, or ever be accused that by my vote that they did not get or were hindered or impeded in any way in negotiating with the Government of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it has been amply shown that we on this side of the House have always stood for ownership of the offshore resources. We do not have to drag that out again, it has been dragged out time and time again. But, Mr. Speaker, I too wonder why we are going through this exercise tonight. I do not understand.

MR. NEARY: For the next federal election, that is what you are going through.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I think that the members in the Cabinet knew, I know they knew, because -

MR. NEARY: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) let the cat out of the bag.

May 19, 1982

Tape 494 - Evening Session MLeP - 2

MR. HODDER: - I talked with the House Leader today.

MR. STAGG: It is no secret that there will be a federal election.

MR. NEARY: No secret. I see.

MR. HODDER: I talked with the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) today, and I am quite sure he knew how we felt about this issue. But, Mr. Speaker, there is something more here. They brought us into this House of Assembly so that they could somehow - and it is true, Mr. Speaker, they do not want our support. They want to somehow - and they may be wrong all the way through; they have been wrong before - but in this emotional moment, this great feeling of euphoria or whatever they had this morning that they were going to come in with black arm bands and declare a holiday - by the way, I might say something about that.

MR. NEARY: An \$18 million holiday.

MR. HODDER: Whether it is \$18 million, there are businesses, I had a report today from a business which said, "We are staying open tomorrow. We have a \$3,000 sale on." The people are upset. The mall in the member for Stephenville's district. Because you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, today? This is one of the reasons why I very often mistrust what this government is doing. It was done in a burst of emotion. Nothing was planned -

MR. NEARY: Impulse.

MR. HODDER: - just impulse. Let us call a holiday. Now that, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever, will backfire in their faces. The school children do

MR. HODDER:

not know yet for sure whether they are having a holiday tomorrow or not. There are people in the Province who are wondering what it is all about. I mean, what did that accomplish? Just the fact that this morning in Cabinet the ministers sat around, "What are we going to do? What are we going to do to really push this home in Newfoundland? We will have a holiday."

MR. NEARY:

My kids wanted Friday off. Is there any chance of changing that to Friday because my kids want Friday off?

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. NEARY:

No, the following weekend.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, what have we seen from this government? During the constitutional -

MR. CARTER:

When are you going to rotate leaders again?

MR. HODDER:

I would ask to be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD):

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

I must say that I did listen to other members, I have not been shouting comments across the House tonight. Well, Mr. Speaker, when we were talking about the constitution and when we had the constitutional debates here in this House of Assembly, what was the first move of the Premier of this Province? He had to have an issue that could grab all Newfoundlanders because he knew that most people just did not have the legal expertise or the legal training to understand. So he put his hand down in the murk, Mr. Speaker, and pulled out the church school issue. And then he went across the Province saying, 'They will take our church schools and they will take this and they will take our boundaries'. But, Mr. Speaker, that is the

MR. HODDER: type of response we see
from this government.

Mr. Speaker, when the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) said that the government has reaped what they had sown he spoke very truly. Because, Mr. Speaker, this government, just from looking at its day to day actions and its record, its hallmark is emotionalism. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, and the Premier is on record as walking around Ottawa saying that he agreed with Mr. Levitz view of Canada rather than Mr. Trudeau's. And there was a feeling suddenly erupted in Newfoundland and he understood immediately and he withdrew. I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if Newfoundlanders had, sort of, sided with him at that particular time when he had made those well publicized comments. Because, Mr. Speaker, this is a hallmark of the government. And I distrust the way that they have been negotiating.

Mr. Speaker, I do know that a few months ago the Premier - and I think perhaps this is the problem, one of the problems that we have had with negotiating with Ottawa - the Premier looked down the road two and a half years,

MR. HODDER: the economy is getting no better, and he had no issues except this one -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) against Confederation.

MR. NEARY: Listen to the anti-Confederate over there.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, could I be heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: He had no issues, but he was looking at two and a half years of unemployment. He had to find the reason, Mr. Speaker, to break off those negotiations. It was a deliberate build up. Fight Ottawa on every DREE agreement! The members opposite, and Hansard will show, over the last year and a half in a deliberate way built towards this confrontation in this particular way. Soften up , soften up the Newfoundland people, down Ottawa. Then, Mr. Speaker, when the appropriate time came, break off the negotiations and go to the people because this is the issue that will get Newfoundlanders aroused. That is what the government did and that is what the Premier did.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, when you look at the situation and you see from this perspective how the government has behaved, we can see why they did reap what was sown and this is what has happened today. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador said in their last meeting, when the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) met with the Federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Lalonde) and when he met with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien) said, 'Take it all, the whole proposal or nothing.' I was not there, Mr. Speaker, but that is my understanding and that is what I have been told. I have no reason to disbelieve.

MR. NEARY: That is correct.

May 19, 1982

Tape 496 (Evening)

JC - 2

MR. HODDER:

Take it all or nothing.

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, is this what we have negotiating for us? Should the talks have ever been broken off? The S.I.U. case. Mr. Speaker, the S.I.U. case, the court had dispensed with it before the talks had broken off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, if the talks broke off, the S.I.U. - what did the S.I.U. case do to the government? What was decided on? What did it decide on the offshore? What did it decide? The S.I.U. case is dispensed with and finished. What did it decide?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY:

It tried to decide offshore ownership.

MR. HODDER:

But what did it do? What did it do to this government, after breaking off the talks -

AN HON. MEMBER:

What did it do, what did it do?

MR. HODDER:

- what did it do? What did it accomplish? What did it hurt? How did it hurt your negotiating position?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER:

Did it deal with the offshore?

AN HON. MEMBER: They tried. They tried. It is certainly no credit to them that they did not.

MR. DAWE: They did not deal with it because of (inaudible).

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, this was an excuse. This was at the time when the Premier was contemplating an election. And, Mr. Speaker, we would have had an election a month earlier, we would have had it a month earlier, but an unfortunate disaster happened in the Province. The Premier had to wait to get that off the front pages until such a time as he could go to the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: That is true.

MR. HODDER: Why did he come back and call the House of Assembly together for one day?

MR. NEARY: That is absolutely correct.

MR. HODDER: Why did he come back and call the House of Assembly for one day and then call the election after bringing down a Throne Speech with almost similiar wording to the Throne Speech which we have here.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) sour grapes. You lost the election.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, yes, we did lose the election. And the people of Newfoundland -

PREMIER PECKFORD: And you have not learned yet.

MR. HODDER: And the people of Newfoundland spoke clearly and we have heard their message.

MR. BARRETT: You are here by the skin of your teeth, but you have not changed any.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to walk across the floor.

MR. NEARY: It has not changed you fellows either. They gave you the mandate and what are you doing about it?

MR. HODDER: If I carry out my responsibilities as a

MR. HODDER: member of the Opposition, I will point out what I see wrong with this government. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that the negotiating stance or the methods of negotiating of this government have helped this Province in any way, shape or form. And, Mr. Speaker, the chickens will come home to roost. Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are accused of not being Newfoundlanders. Well, Mr. Speaker, if I am going to be accused of not being a Newfoundlander, pack your bags and go to Ottawa, you know, that does not bother me. Because the day the eight of us decide that we are going to totally capitulate to this government, that is the day we may as well suspend the House of Assembly, close it down and just let the Premier and the Cabinet run the Province.

MR. NEARY: Set up a dictatorship.

MR. HODDER: Set up a dictatorship!

MR. NEARY: A junta. Set up the junta like Argentina.

MR. HODDER: Is it 'junta' or 'hunta'?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hunta.

MR. TULK: 'Gerry' is not in the hunta.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, people forget in this province -

MR. TULK: You are not part of the hunta.

MR. STAGG: We have not burned all the books, you know. We can read some of these things.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) when he spoke I did not interject.

MR. NEARY: And he is out of his seat too. One of the rules of this House is you have to be in your seat when you open your mouth.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference between putting a question to the provincial Court of Appeal on the offshore issue, what is

MR. HODDER: the difference between putting it to a provincial court, which, Mr. Speaker, it is not, it is a federally appointed court; they, I suspect, will deal with the issue as fairly as they possibly can, as well as the Supreme Court of Canada - and if the provincial court decides that they are going to rule our way, which I hope they will,

MR. HODDER: I am sure that it will be appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada. If they decide to rule against the government, then I am sure that the government will take it to the Supreme Court of Canada.

No member on the other side has yet clearly explained to me the difference. But I do know one thing, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundlanders, regardless of what the decision was during the last election - during the last election, Mr. Speaker, whatever the decision was, and I want to choose my words carefully -

MR. STAGG: Heart attack and constitutionitis.

MR. HODDER: - And the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would like to stay there and provoke me. I was about to take my seat. I will sit down soon. If you want to listen to one of your own members and your own -

MR. STAGG: How about (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Toe the party line.

MR. HODDER: Toe the party line.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) over the years.

MR. HICKEY: We do not toe the party line.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, what is the difference? And, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders want a speedy resolution to this question. There are businesses going bankrupt throughout the Province, there are businessmen in trouble and, Mr. Speaker, whatever we can do on this side of the House to put a speedy end to that we will.

MR. STAGG: Read our speeches.

MR. TULLK: Call a point of order. He is out of his seat.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon.
gentleman is out of his seat and he is lipping off over
there. Either ask him to restrain himself or send him
back to his seat.

MR. SIMMS: The hon. gentleman is
out of his tree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I agree with that too,
the hon. gentleman is out of his tree.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I see a
couple of reasons for this exercise tonight. I see
a government, in all its arrogance and all its power,
who have decided that they have an issue, that
Newfoundlanders will back them. They realize that
there is an Opposition here and there is an Opposition
which is going to speak its piece. They realize that
they have not done everything they should. And they
would like to cover that, Mr. Speaker, but in the
meantime they would like to take another little crack
at us.

And another thing,
Mr. Speaker, and I am not sure -

MR. NEARY: What difference does
it make?

MR. HODDER: -I have never been
sure whether the government wants really to settle the
offshore.

MR. NEARY: You have forty-four
now. Carry out your mandate.

MR. HODDER: It has been bothering
me because I do not know why this government has lingered,
hung back. The election was won.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker,
the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was closest to
it when he said, speaking from his seat, that this is
the beginning of the federal election and that we will
be destroying the members in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: - Mr. Speaker,
could that be the second prong? Because the
first prong in the negotiations was to put the hon.
members opposite back in power. Make no mistake about
that. When the negotiations were broken off they were
deliberately broken off for selfish political purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: And if any person in
this Province would look at the whole sequence of
events, and when history, Mr. Speaker, looks at this
sequence of events: they will realize exactly what this
government has done.

And perhaps the second
prong of that attack, perhaps the second part of the
political wisdom of the government is to -

MR. SIMMS: Is this a three prong plug?

MR. HODDER: No, it is a two prong
one. The second prong would be to try to maneuver the
federal members into such a position that they can again,
in a federal election, repeat the same type of a
performance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rooney will have to go some time.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Dave will go back again, boy.

MR. HODDER: But members on that side, Mr. Speaker, may find that the people of Newfoundland in a very short time may see through them. And, Mr. Speaker, regardless if this government goes against the federal Liberals, I know in the case of the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) I do hope he campaigns aggressively. Because the last time he campaigned against a federal member he was the sole reason, one of the big reasons why the member won.

Mr. Speaker, if ever I am running in a campaign I would certainly like to have the hon. member opposite working against me.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, what have we seen from this government? We have seen emotionalism. Mr. Speaker, you look at the little things when you look at a government and that is because the big things are usually hidden from you. Mr. Speaker, we have seen emotionalism, we have seen a Premier who will stoop to anything for his own political end. Mr. Speaker, I will end my speech by merely saying that I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever that before two years, and mark my words, roll around, the arrogance will have disappeared from this government.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!
The blush is off the rose already.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not envy you your position. With the enthusiasm on this side of hon. members to rise in their place on this historic moment to make their remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to delay the House too long. But I certainly would not want to miss the opportunity to express my views on this issue on this historic occasion. I do not think any hon. member would, Mr. Speaker, because there has not been, and I doubt if there will be, certainly not in our generation, an issue which is of greater consequence and is of such great implication to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I got the impression from listening to hon. members opposite that they were not really sure what this was all about, why there was a day of mourning or, indeed, Mr. Speaker, as to why this government was so upset and stunned by this unprecedented action by the federal government. Listening to hon. gentlemen on the opposite side would almost make one conclude that really there is not very much at stake. The hon. gentleman who spoke last almost gave that impression.

MR. HICKEY: But really it was much to-do about nothing. Mr. Speaker, for record purposes let me remind hon. gentlemen opposite what is at stake. In 1962, I believe it was-and I am getting close to my 18th year in this House now. I have seen a few historic occasions come and go and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, most of them had some sadness attached. Because, we in this Province have not had, although we have had a lot to be thankful and grateful for, from an economic point of view and from the efforts by any administration of any party that has been in office since Confederation, our efforts to become a have province have not met with a great deal of success. So the historic occasions had been more sad than happy. But let us just for record purposes, Mr. Speaker, draw to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, who appear to be somewhat at a loss to know or wonder about the significance of this event by the federal government today, what is at stake. In 1962 the then Premier, Mr. Smallwood, called a day of mourning in which he draped every public building in this Province with black for \$8 million, the handsome sum of \$8 million, Mr. Speaker, because in Ottawa the then Prime Minister, the late former Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, was heard to utter that he just might, he did not say he would, he just might consider cancelling Term 29, which would pay to this Province for perpetuity \$8 million. Mr. Speaker, all hell broke loose, all hell broke loose -

MR. HISCOCK: He said he might cancel it, did he?

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), we have heard from him tonight and I will get to a couple of things he said later on. Mr. Speaker, all hell broke loose. This was a dark day

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 500

RA - 2 Evening session.

MR. HICKEY: for this Province. There was a chance, a slight chance, but only a slight one, mind you, because the Prime Minister did not say he would, they were considering cancelling Term 29, \$8 million. And I remember the hon. gentleman who was Premier of that day, Mr. Speaker, because I was a civil servant at the time and I remember it well, why he went from one part of this Province to the other, and

MR. HICKEY: called an election, Your Honour, called an election on that issue. He did not just have a day of mourning, but called an election, prepared it all, orchestrated it all. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) remembers it well because it was on that very issue that he found his way into this Chamber, I believe.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where was he running then?

MR. NEARY: Is that what you are copying now?

MR. HICKEY: Bell Island. No, we are not copying it, Mr. Speaker. There is no similiarity, Mr. Speaker, between this administration and any administration that the former, former Premier Smallwood headed. No comparison, so similarity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Because his administrations were administrations of give-away, Mr. Speaker. Those administrations since 1972 have been the opposite, have been an attempt to buy back what he had given away. And latterly to strike an agreement with the federal government. A very unselfish position to take, Mr. Speaker, this government takes, very unselfish. What do we want? Do we want some handout from Ottawa? No. We say we are sick of handouts, Mr. Speaker, we are sick of having to go to Ottawa and say, Give us some equalization payments. Give us more equalization payments. Give us some more money so that we can feed the people who cannot get a job because of the high interest rates, because of the bankruptcies that the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) talks about, the high interest rates that continue to put companies, long standing, into bankruptcy, Mr. Speaker. And I have heard three or four hon. gentlemen tonight talk about the companies and the small businesses that are about to fold and that have

MR. HICKEY:

foresight or even understanding of an issue and all that it means to this Province and its people.

What do we have, Mr. Speaker, at stake today? Do we have \$8 million, as a certain gentleman would say, or \$10 million, or \$100 million? No, Mr. Speaker, we have a resource, one part of a resource that the federal government have gone to court with in an effort to take from us to the largest extent, or certainly take the lion's share if they can get their way, worth \$100 billion. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what would the former, former Premier say if he were Premier of this Province today? Would he drape the public buildings in black? No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think he would. I think he would cover them right over.

MR. NEARY:

What are you going to do for an encore?

MR. HICKEY:

He would probably have everyone wear black suits and shorts to mourn the occasion, and maybe a lot of other things.

Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen have - someone said tonight we reap what we sow. Mr. Speaker, you know, that is really comical. They have got the sides of the House and the parties confused. It is they who reap what they sow. It is hon. gentlemen opposite who are reaping tonight what they have sown for the last three years, Mr. Speaker, a sit-on-the-fence position on the offshore, never really making it clear where they stood, always and forever supportive of the federal party, the Liberal party. And, as some of my colleagues said tonight, 'My party first'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: 'My party first and my Province second'.

MR. GOUDIE: That is jingoism.

MR. HICKEY: Yes.

Mr. Speaker, hon.

gentlemen opposite should have gotten the message from the people of this Province, not from this government. Assuming they do not listen to this government, Mr. Speaker, if from no one else they should have gotten the message loud and clear from the electorate of this Province on April 6. What was that message, Mr. Speaker? That message, Your Honour, was simply this, that the people of this Province do not want to be on their knees any longer as a have-not Province, do not wish handouts any longer, but want to determine their own destiny, want to reach a level equal to any other part of Canada, and want control of their own resources and want to preserve this unique quality of life that we have.

MR. HICKEY: Are we going to do that, Mr. Speaker, if we take the position of hon. gentlemen opposite? Certainly not! The hon. gentlemen are saying tonight, 'Oh, we support.' And one hon. gentleman said, "I just might vote for the resolution." Well, whoop-de-doo! How generous! How generous, all of a sudden, after three years of sitting on the fence. At the eleventh hour, Mr. Speaker, when the federal government sneaks in the back door, some hon. gentleman says, "I just might vote for your resolution."

Someone said, one of my colleagues when he was speaking, said something about why the hon. gentlemen opposite got back here in the election. Your Honour, I suggest that if the electorate in their district had known that some of them would be back here, they would not have been back here. Because I think that they themselves would have voted differently. Your Honour, it is a bit late for the hon. gentlemen opposite to take the position now. Even if they were prepared to make a clear-cut statement of support for this government and what we are attempting to do and achieve for this Province and our people, it is a bit late. But let us assume, Mr. Speaker, they were prepared to do that, we have never been one to refuse support or question the motives of hon. gentlemen opposite in supporting any measure taken by this government. But what we are saying tonight, Mr. Speaker, today and tonight, is, as some of my colleagues have very appropriately described, as taking two positions: Keeping in line with the Federal Party and what they have set out to do today in terms of the federal government, and at the same time come in here and try to pretend that they support what we want and

May 19, 1982

Tape 403 - Evening Session TM - 2

MR. HICKEY: what we are pushing for as well.
Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen opposite do not need me to tell them that it is very risky when you try to play two games like that. It is not going to work! You are without a doubt at great risk when hon. gentlemen have to try to tow the party line federally and at the same time try to support this government, who have been trying for an agreement for so long, could not get an agreement, sat down and negotiated in good faith and, Mr. Speaker, the most surprising piece of information of all to come to this Assembly today and tonight is the fact that this document was unknown to them, they have never seen it.

AN HON. MEMBER: They never read it.

MR. HICKEY: Well, the hon. gentlemen, I find that really strange, Mr. Speaker, because

MR. HICKEY: it was released at a press conference. There is an executive assistant of the former leader of the Opposition, executive assistant -

MR. NEARY: The leader.

MR. HICKEY: - who attends every press conference, Mr. Speaker, that this government calls. There has been a representative of the former leader of the Opposition.

MR. STAGG: At every press conference.

MR. HICKEY: Or the present leader of the Liberal Party has his executive assistant at every single press conference called by the Premier yet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Now what did he do? Did he take it home with him or did he take it to his leader, like he took every other press release?

AN HON. MEMBER: I think he took it to the leader.

MR. HICKEY: And, not only that, Mr. Speaker, I tell you, you know, that is exhibit one. Let me offer exhibit two. The Leader of the Opposition, or the former leader or the present leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Stirling.

MR. YOUNG: Outside leader, boy, and inside leader.

MR. HICKEY: I thank my colleague, he put the name the 'Outside Leader'.

MR. YOUNG: His outside colleague.

MR. HICKEY: O.K.

AN HON. MEMBER: The outside colleague.

MR. HICKEY: That gentleman, in a rather historic debate during the election campaign, was heard to say, 'I agree with your proposal. Not only do I agree with your proposal, but if I am Premier on the sixth of April, I will take that proposal to Ottawa and work out a deal.'

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 504

MLeP - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear !

MR. HICKEY

Is that any evidence to the fact that the Liberal Party did not have this document, Mr. Speaker? I suggest not, On that one I will rest my case.

AN HON. MEMBERS

To have it and understand

it.

MR. HICKEY

Yes.

So, Mr. Speaker, their support for this cause, then, is conditional, and the condition is that we start off from square one, And they say, 'No pre-conditions.' What are the pre-conditions? My colleague, the member from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), I believe went through them all. The first pre-condition, to set aside ownership, as the member from Mount Scio pointed out, was not ours. It was the Prime Minister who said that. The Premier of this Province has been heard to say repeatedly this document was a starting point. He said this was not inscribed in stone, it was not the final document, it was not a document which was going to have to be the end all and be all , but a starting point. Well, Mr. Speaker, the federal government set out on a course to negotiate, and I seriously question, Mr. Speaker, if they ever had any sincere intention of negotiating anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure even the Liberals do not trust Lalonde. They said that the other day.

MR. HICKEY

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want

to miss the opportunity too extend my sympathy to one the Honourable William Rompkey.

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Hear, hear !

MR. HICKEY

I would like to extend to

that gentleman my sympathy.

AN HON. MEMBER

He is not dead, though.

MR. HICKEY

In my business, in my department,

Mr. Hickey: I have to try to understand why people behave as they do, otherwise I would be making all kinds of judgements of human behaviour. I have tried my darrest to figure out what possessed that man to sit beside his colleague today, while his colleague the Minister of Justice for Canada (Mr. Chretien), presided over an exercise which would see the Federal Government literally rape our resource by going in the back door to the Supreme Court of Canada when they did not have guts enough to try to go in the front. They tried to save face, because it would have been an affront to the Supreme Court of this Province. As the Premier so appropriately said today, what they could not do by going through the front door, they attempted to go in the back door and said, 'Give us a decision on Hibernia, not the offshore.' That is like the province saying to the city of St. John's, 'We own LeMarchant Road and you own the rest of the city.' Mr. Speaker, if it was not so serious it would be comical.

MR. STAGG: Let us hope it does not wash.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe, I for one have enough faith in the judicial system, to believe that the Supreme Court of Canada will deal with the issue on a legal basis, will deal with the issue on no other basis, and will very quickly see through the motives of the federal government. And they will rule that they cannot hear such a case in terms of Hibernia because in so doing they would obviously be making a decision on all of the offshore. For how could they do anything else.

MR. NEARY: Go down and look after Airport Heights.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman need not worry about Airport Heights. He has enough to do to worry about LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY:

The hon. gentleman might have some unfinished business in LaPoile, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY:

So, Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a black day for this Province. And as I said when I started, Mr. Speaker, I would not want anyone - I would not want anyone - in looking through Hansard, be it a hundred years from now or ten years from now, to think that at least I sat here on this rather significant and historic occasion and did not express my views, my complete disapproval, my astonishment and everything else with the decision of the federal government today.

Mr. Speaker, you know, over the last three years this government have tried desperately, repeatedly, repeatedly, repeatedly to create jobs, through the signing of DREE agreements. Mr. Speaker, how many DREE agreements are gathering dust in Ottawa today not signed?

AN HON. MEMBER:

About nine.

MR. HICKEY:

The federal government, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to say this and make no apologies for saying it. If I do nothing else, whether I am right or wrong, I happen to believe I am right. As a member of this House I think I have a responsibility to speak my mind. I truly and honestly believe that there is a malicious, conniving attempt by the Federal Liberal Government of this country, which has been demonstrated over the last three years, to financially starve

MR. HICKEY:

this Province, a have-not Province, already poor but rich with resources, to starve us into submission from a financial point of view. And their every move, Mr. Speaker, seems to be calculated and directed to one result, submission wherein we will settle for something less than the people of this Province would want, would welcome or would agree to. And, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that I can say and know that I am not just expressing an opinion but I can say in truth on behalf of this government, which would be echoed by every single one of my colleagues and especially the Leader of this government, never, never, never will the federal government achieve their goal if that in fact is what motivates them. Because, Mr. Speaker, it would be better, far better to let the oil in Hybernia stay beneath the ocean bed than for us to surrender into submission and make an agreement that would be a noose around the necks of the children yet unborn in this Province, another Churchill Falls deal.

MR. NEARY: How much is your department getting from Ottawa every year?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not enough.

MR. DINN: No more than we should be getting.

MR. HICKEY: Fifty per cent.

MR. NEARY: Fifty per cent. You do not want any!

MR. HICKEY: No. The hon. gentleman should know, Mr. Speaker, 50 per cent of the Social Assistance Programme which is approximately \$60 million or \$70 million. If you take that in half - big deal! Does the hon. gentleman know how much taxes the people and the businesses of Newfoundland send to Ottawa?

MR. HICKEY: Does the hon. gentleman know, is the hon. gentleman aware of the figures that were put together and gathered on the whole issue of whether Confederation puts more money into this Province or whether this Province puts as much money into Canada?

MR. NEARY: Fifty per cent of the provincial budget comes from Ottawa.

MR. HICKEY: Fifty per cent, Mr. Speaker, the result of that little exercise clearly shows that this Province contributes as much to the Government of Canada as in fact it gets back.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: And as a matter of fact, I would say we have a slight edge. In other words we are contributing more even now, as a have-not province, than we get through equalization payments and cost sharing programmes of one kind and another.

Now, the hon. gentleman speaks accurately for his party, because what does he offer in defence of all the things I am saying? How much money do you get from Ottawa for my department, Welfare?

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they use the slogan, 'Make work, not war'.

AN HON. MEMBER: Make work not war.

MR. HICKEY: Make-work projects is about all the hon gentlemen across the way think about.

Now, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) before I sit down. I cannot let the opportunity go by without giving him honourable mention.

MR. YOUNG: He has gone home to bed.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman from Eagle River was prompted to say something about the fact that - he used the word racism, I believe. Now the hon. gentleman is inclined, for as long as I have known him in the House, to associate himself with various issues and subjects which might be foreign to the rest of us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any sign of racism in this Province. I have not been heard, and I will only speak for myself, I have not been heard bringing together Lalonde, LeBlanc, Trudeau, Chretien and a few more. Now they are not from Outer Cove.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think they are from Outer Space.

MR. HICKEY: Now, if I was here every day saying,

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 507

RA - 2 Evening session.

MR. HICKEY: "They are not from Outer Cove. Where are they from? They are from that great Province of Quebec, a bunch of Liberals from Quebec, that the former, former Premier gave such a wonderful, beautiful gift to as the Churchill Falls." And, you know, it is understandable, I suppose.

MR. NEARY: You were in the House. You voted for it.

MR. HICKEY: I baited the hon. gentleman hoping, Mr. Speaker, he would say that. Let the hon. gentleman - I challenge him - I heard what his leader said in the campaign, that I got honourable mention as one of the three.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) voted for it.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, yes! Voted for it, eh?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: I will tell you what we voted for, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: And I will tell you too.

MR. HICKEY: I remember the day well. I voted for the development of the Upper Churchill.

MR. NEARY: And what was that?

MR. HICKEY: 5,000 jobs, Mr. Speaker, all for Newfoundlanders except for a handful of supervisors and technical people. And I was one of the Select Committee that went up and found out what was going on at Churchill Falls. They were supervisors all right, Quebec supervisors, who fired the Newfoundlanders and brought their buddies in from the Province of Quebec.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Now, does the hon. gentleman want to open up a few more holes until he gets buried?

MR. NEARY: (inaudible) on a select committee.

MR. LUSH: I was there for five years.

MR. HICKEY: Yes.

MR. BAIRD: You should have stayed there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Let me tell the House Your Honour, what I voted for. I voted for a bill to develop the Upper Churchill to produce 5,000 jobs. 5,000 jobs. I saw no contract. There was no contract tabled in this House. When the question of contract was raised, Mr. Speaker, when the question of agreement was raised, what did the gentleman who sat right there say, the Premier of the Province? 'No, we will not table any contract. Of course not. Nor will we table any agreement. Of course not. That is what the people of this Province elected a government for'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Who said that? Who was that?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Smallwood.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. POWER: Is that what he actually said?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, that is what he said.

May 19, 1982, Tape 508, Page 2 -- apb

MR. POWER: Oh, shame! Shame!

MR. HICKEY: 'The hon. gentleman from East Extern need not worry', he said, 'he need not worry. I knew he would support in principle any measure which would create 5,000 jobs in a day of unemployment like we are in right now'. I can hear him now saying it. And I nodded my head and said, 'Of course I would. Why would I not support the creation of 5,000 jobs when so many of my fellow Newfoundlanders were unemployed? But did that give the Premier of the Province the licence to give it away for 3.5 mils so that Quebecers could sell it for 46? Did that give the Premier of the day the licence to light up Montreal and part of New York State while his own fellow Labradorians in Labrador were paying high prices for diesel fuel to light their trailers? Now, there is a good Liberal policy for you if you ever heard one, Your Honour.

MR. NEARY: Did you raise these matters during the debate?

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman should have really thought twice before raising that issue, as, indeed, the former leader, present outside leader of the Liberal party, should have thought twice before he raised it in the election campaign. Because that issue got that gentleman about as far as the position he took on the offshore, the very issue we are talking about tonight. It got him defeated, Mr. Speaker. It got him defeated.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude. The hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) also mentioned the fact that when the Liberals

MR. HICKEY:

got out of office in 1972, he said, there was something like 9 per cent unemployment. And then he makes reference to what it is today. And let me add something else, for he stopped short, Mr. Speaker. It is strange that he stopped short. He did not give the rest of the scenario. He did not say that there was 9 per cent unemployment and 33,000 families on social assistance. No, he did not say that. And he did not say that although the unemployment figure today, through no fault of this government or any other administration, for that matter, for the last ten years, is almost double what it was then. Yet we have a 20,000 figures of families on social assistance. I wonder how did that come about?

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty thousand?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, 20,000. Down 13,000 even though the unemployment rate went up.

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible) U.I.C.

MR. HICKEY: Is that right? The very kind of programme that the hon. gentleman supports, U.I.C.

AN HON. MEMBER: "Standing in the long line".

MR. HICKEY: That is right. That is about their style, Mr. Speaker. Keep the people on unemployment insurance, keep them down on the farm, keep them on unemployment insurance. Just feed them a little bit now and then but do not let them rise to their full potential or develop it. Oh no, no, do not do that. Do not let them develop to the extent where they can stand as proud Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and say, 'Yes, this Province makes a contribution to the rest of the country and I am proud of it because I am a proud Canadian'. No, no, no, do not have any of that. Just keep them eating out of your hand, keep them on their knees. That is about what the Liberal Party in this Province stands for today,

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 509

IB-2

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker. And it is too bad because there is a lot of history attached to that party. And there is a need for a two party sytem and a strong two party system in this Province. And it is that sad as well, it is almost as sad, Mr. Speaker, as the issue we are on because hon. gentlemen have been blinded by a few facts. And one of the facts is they have lost complete touch with what the people of this Province want. And even, Mr. Speaker, at the eleventh hour, having been told in such drastic terms on April 6th., having almost been wiped out, Mr. Speaker, have they learned their lesson? No. They are still supporting Mr. Rompkey, who has

MR. HICKEY: to save his own hide, because he lacks the intestinal fortitude to say to the federal government, "I am not supporting this, and if you do this, I have to part company with you. I am a Newfoundlander first, and a Canadian second, if it means you rape the resource and you take away the chance, and the only chance, for my people to be uplifted and to reach their full potential, and have somewhere close to full employment."

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I would like to inform the hon. the minister that his time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to start with my few remarks on this resolution by agreeing, I think, with the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) and perhaps with the Premier as well, when they say that this is a sad and a tragic day for Newfoundland. All the dramatics aside, Mr. Speaker, that we have seen in this House this afternoon and tonight, it is a tragic day for Newfoundland in more ways than one, Sir. It is sad what has happened in Ottawa today, but I want to suggest to you that it is equally as sad when you look at the government side of this House, and when they are offered the whole-hearted support of the other political party in Newfoundland, and instead of accepting it like statesmen, Mr. Speaker, instead of saying yes, we welcome your support, we get the kind of thing that we heard from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) a few minutes ago -

MR. STAGG: Why did you amend the resolution?

MR. TULK: - and the kind of thing that we just got from the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) just now. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), the House Leader, President of the Council,

MR. TULK: second strongest man in Newfoundland, stood up and practically again, although he never used the words, practically called every person on this side of this House a non-Newfoundlander and a traitor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, after the words that have come from this side of the House today and tonight, surely that indicates to all Newfoundland that this man and this government does not want our support. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into name calling, I am not going to call any of the gentlemen on the other side traitors, I am not going to call them non-Newfoundlanders. Because they are like everyone in this House, Mr. Speaker, every person, they are all Newfoundlanders. They want the best things for Newfoundland, make no mistake about that. It is too bad that their partisan politics interfere with their sound judgement, and that is what is happening. Mr. Speaker, let me make one point clear, let me repeat it, and I do not want to have to repeat it again, and I do not intend to, because I do not intend to be baited

MR. TULK: by that side, hooked on and hear, 'Now say it to us again'. Not at all. On this side, Mr. Speaker, they will find support for the resolution. We support the resolution. We will support it without the amendment because we regard the unilateral action that the federal government took today of referring the question of the ownership of Hybernia, hence the offshore issue to a large degree, we regard that as unjust and in the worst interests of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Make no mistake about that. In the same way, Mr. Speaker, as the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) pointed out in his speech just now, we regarded that kind of action as unjust in 1975. And I want to read once more what the member for Terra Nova read into the record. I want to read it too. Let us put it aside that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador does not support our claim to a just settlement on our offshore. Let us put it aside. And I want to read into the record a resolution by Mr. F. Rowe of Trinity-Bay de Verde again, to move:

"BE IT RESOLVED that this House reaffirms that Newfoundland and Labrador owns and possesses jurisdiction in respect of the resources of the seabed including minerals and hydrocarbons in the area extending to the edge of the Continental Shelf and the margin adjacent to Newfoundland and Labrador or to a limit extending 200 miles from the inner limit of the Canadian territorial sea, whichever is the greatest; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House direct the government to try to achieve recognition by the Government of Canada of Newfoundland and Labrador's ownership and jurisdiction by negotiation in the first instance." By negotiation.

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 511

IB-2

MR. TOLK:

So, Mr. Speaker, that should put it to rest for the minds of the hon. gentlemen on the other side. It should put it to rest once and for all, that we support ownership of our resources and we support an negotiated settlement. Let us put that to rest.

Mr. Speaker, I said that we regard the actions of the federal government as unjust for Newfoundland. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we can regard the actions of the Premier of this Province by putting this very case into court and as was ably pointed

MR. TULK:

out by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) once it was in the court in Newfoundland it was destined to go to the central courts anyway.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) your House Leader.

MR. TULK: No, Mr. Speaker.

No, that is not the issue. In this particular case two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. Speaker, if there is going to be a reference to the Supreme Court it should obviously be a joint action. That is the Canadian way, as the Premier says again. But, Mr. Speaker, what really should happen here is we should have a negotiated settlement. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we should have a negotiated settlement with the proper revenue sharing and joint management. That was the Liberal position on this side since I have been in this House, Mr. Speaker, and, I might say, before I came to this House. I can clearly remember, Mr. Speaker, coming to this House in 1979, clearly remember it, hearing and seeing the Premier one seat back, dancing, almost dancing about total ownership, total control. And you could point out to him that he could have total control without total ownership and he would not hear talk of it. 'Nonsense! Nonsense! Otherwise', the Premier said, 'we will never settle, we will never settle unless we have total ownership, total control of that offshore resource'. That was his position in 1979.

Mr. Speaker, in August, I believe, of 19 - I believe it was 1981 -

MR. STAGG: Yes, last August.

MR. TULK: Last August, in 1981, I heard the Premier-and I read his little propaganda sheet, his propogande newspaper that he sent around this Province. I could not believe my eyes and I could not believe my ears to hear the Premier say, 'We want joint management and revenue sharing and we can set the ownership question aside'. Why could I not believe it? Because I never believed that the Premier of this Province would come around to the Liberal position. But that is what he had done. He had come around, Mr. Speaker, to a position that we on this side of the House, - like the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr, Roberts) - had been called traitors for expressing. Anti-Newfoundlanders.

MR. LUSH: He is a real swinger, swinging from one position to the next.

MR. TULK: We were non-Newfoundlanders on this side because we suggested a negotiated settlement.

MR. SIMMS: We never said that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, they did.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member -

MR. NEARY: St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

MR. TULK: I would tell the minister that he knows full well the rules of this House as well as anybody and I would ask him to be quiet and let me say my piece.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

- MR. LUSH: He is the last one I thought would do that.
- MR. TULK: He should be the last one, Mr. Speaker, in this House to act in that manner.
- SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
- MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, we welcome that position of the Premier, we welcome it.
- MR. NEARY: It is our position.
- MR. TULK: It is our position, and not only that but we believe we would have a settlement -
- MR. NEARY: We converted him.
- MR. TULK: - in this whole fiasco. We believe that we will see the offshore resources in this Province become a reality and perhaps provide some of the much needed employment and services in this Province. As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said this evening we have seen instead a complete deterioration of relations on both sides. There has been pettiness on the part of the federal government and there has been pettiness certainly on the side of the provincial government. The result, Mr. Speaker, is that the inflexibility has led to nothing happening in this Province, nothing happening with our offshore resources, and this government is as much to blame as is the federal government. I want, Mr. Speaker, in those few words I am going to say -
- MR. CARTER: Sit down.
- MR. TULK: I would like to tell the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) I will sit down either when my time expires or either when I am ready.
- MR. MARSHALL: At least your speech could be appropriate.
- MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest -
- MR. HODDER: It is far better than yours.
- MR. TULK: - that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was right this evening.
- MR. NEARY: Listen and you might learn something.

MR. TULK: He was dead on. He gave away the real secret on that side -

MR. LUSH: Yes, he did.

MR. TULK - when he said, 'We are starting the federal election.'

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. TULK That is right. 'We are starting the federal election.' He told us, Mr. Speaker, that the real issue as far as this government is concerned is scoring political points.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear !

MR. TULK That is their real issue. He even went so far, Mr. Speaker, as to say that a Nova Scotian PC is a Liberal.

MR. STAGG: Yes, I call them Liberals.

MR. TULK A Nova Scotian PC is a Liberal, because he does not agree with him.

MR. STAGG: They are Liberals as far as I am concerned.

MR. TULK Because he does not agree with him.

MR. STAGG: They signed their Churchill Falls.

MR. TULK Mr. Speaker, the question for that side is - I would ask them the question. Are there any other Canadians, are there any other good Newfoundlanders, are there any other good Nova Scotians, except what sits on that side of the House? Obviously, Mr. Speaker, they believe not. And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I want to mention a very good personal friend of mine, a fellow that I have agreed with on occasion, and I have disagreed with on other occasions: That is the hon. V. William Rompkey. He was mentioned.

MR. TULK: this evening by my friend from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). And I am not going to defend either Mr. Rompkey's or Mr. Trudeau's actions today. Not at all!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: But I will not ask the people on the other side of this House, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BARRETT: There is always a but.

MR. TULK: - indeed there is a but! -
who was responsible last week -

PREMIER PECKFORD: For getting Baie Verte open.

MR. TULK: - perhaps a more important resource to this Province, perhaps a resource that is far more important to this Province than offshore oil and gas are the hydro-electric resources in Labrador. And again the government - we told them last year we will tell them again this year, we will tell them again next year, they have our support for that corridor across Quebec.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. TULK: But who got the support, who went out on a limb last week, who got the support of fifty-four M.P.s from the Province of Quebec?

MR. NEARY: Seventy-four.

MR. TULK: Yes, seventy-four. That is what he is up there for and he did an admirable job!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Who got Baie Verte open last week?

MR. TULK: Who got Baie Verte open?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The provincial government.

MR. TULK: Oh, the provincial government!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ask the people of Baie Verte!

MR. NEARY: Who got the fish plant in Grand Bank open?

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. DINN: One thousand and thirty-four
people in Baie Verte -

MR. TULK: Keep the yahoo quiet,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Who got the fish plant in Grand Bank
open, and Baie Verte open?

PREMIER PECKFORD: He is looking at the next federal
election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Who got the support of seventy-four
M.P.s in Quebec for that transmission corridor? And I think
in that respect, Mr. Speaker, we owe a vote of thanks in
that one respect to William Rompkey. Let me ask another
question. Who voted against that energy package? Who
were they? Who were they? They were J.C. and J.M.
abstaining. The Tories voted against it. J.C. and J.M.,
the fish and chip boys, John Crosbie and Jim McGrath
abstained from voting.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, if they are going to look across at this side of the House, if they are going to do that kind of thing, look across at this side of the House and say, 'Come on, be Newfoundlanders' -

MR. STAGG: We have no choice.

MR. TULK: You have a choice, you can leave. If they are to look across at this side of the House and say, 'Give us your support. Be Newfoundlanders', then let us ask JC and JM, let us ask them to ask their friends in Ottawa, the two Tory MPs in Ottawa, to be friends of Newfoundland, to be good Newfoundlanders and not to be anti-Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate again that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is a nuisance. And I want to reiterate again one other thing, that we agree with this resolution even if there is no amendment. We will vote for this resolution even if there is no amendment.

The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Carter) says, 'What do they disagree with on the other side?'

MR. CARTER: What?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Here it comes.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, we do not disagree with one thing that is in that package.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Just hold on. Keep it down.
Keep it down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: 'Barbie' should be quiet.

We do not, Mr. Speaker. We want as much as is in that package for Newfoundland as does that side and more. That was the reason for the amendment.

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 515

IB-2

MR. TULK:

What was the reason for the amendment? The reason for the amendment, Mr. Speaker, was to remove any barriers,

MR. TULK: any barriers or preconditions that there might be to the negotiations.

MR. NEARY: Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Surely one of the goals of the negotiating package should be to have ownership put aside. That should be one of the goals, the end result. But what is the point? What is the point of putting that in there to block you from negotiating?

MR. LUSH: No point at all.

MR. TULK: No point at all.

MR. LUSH: That is what you call putting the cart before the horse.

MR. TULK: The amendment said, 'Let us take out that we have to accept the Newfoundland proposal, the Newfoundland Government's proposal. I think it was the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who told my friend from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) that that was not a precondition. Where is that resolution? It has to be here somewhere. Oh, there it is. There it is.

"AND WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland is eager to negotiate a settlement based upon putting the ownership aside for the length of the negotiations, and permanently if a settlement is reached, and based upon our January 25th. proposal which is fair and reasonable;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House go on record as calling upon the federal government to return to the negotiating table on the basis put forward by the Government of Newfoundland".

Now, if that is not a precondition, Mr. Speaker, then this House is not even here. And I suggest to you that this House is here.

MR. LUSH: (inaudible) sentence as the other two.

MR. TULK:

Sure.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to you and to this House, as the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said, again, that that side does not want the support of this side. Not at all.

The Premier said last week, 'Oh, it is too late. You cannot jump on the bandwagon. You are splitting hairs'.

MR. STAGG:

That is true. You cannot jump on.

MR. TULK:

'You are splitting hairs'. Mr. Speaker, that is one bandwagon, over there, that I do not want to be on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

That, Mr. Speaker, is a bandwagon that is going downhill with a pile of rocks at the end of the hill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

And the forty-four of them are on it.

MR. LUSH:

It is more like a bandaid.

MR. TULK:

But, Mr. Speaker, we are going to support this resolution because -

MR. LUSH:

Right on, brother.

MR. TULK:

- we are going to try to take the politics out of this and support the people, the people, Mr. Speaker, of Newfoundland. That is what we intend to do. That is what we intend to do.

DR. COLLINS:

Do not fudge now.

Leave it like that, Do not fudge it now.

MR. LUSH:

He is just getting there now.

MR. TULK: The master of fudging is asking me not to fudge something. The master of fudging. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we will vote for the resolution, amendment or not. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is important. It is important that we get this thing out of the way, it is important that it never be brought on the floor of this House again to say will you give us your support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Why waste the time of this House? The support is there, now go do your job.

MR. DINN: \$100 billion!

MR. TULK: It is important, Mr. Speaker, for the businesses in this Province.

MR. NEARY: You have our support, now go do your job.

MR. CARTER: Yes, throw it aside.

MR. TULK: It is important for the businesses in this Province. The Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) said, and I think I quote him accurately, said that we were the unemployment insurance crowd. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Minister of Social Services something; he is as guilty as anybody in this Province of using his department to put people in this Province on the U.I.C. rolls. He is as guilty as anybody of that. But let me tell him something else, if there is not much else besides unemployment, then you have to take it. That is the symptom, that is the symptom, created largely by this government. It is important, Mr. Speaker, it is important that we get this issue out of the way. It is important for business, the small businesses in this Province, who provide perhaps the greatest deal of employment. Mr. Speaker, we may well see in this Province, if we let this government go on

MR. TULK: its way and stay as it is now, just holding back, Mr. Speaker, because that, I feel, is what they are doing, their wait and see attitude, wait it out, we may well see a group of elite businessmen in this Province, because the rest, unless they have huge financial sources, may go bankrupt. Do they want to negotiate? No, Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) put that quite accurately when he said that all that this government wanted was to get an election out of the offshore issue. They got it, they won it - great for them, bully for them! And now they want a federal election on this issue which they hope to win as well. How did they do that? How did they do that? They find issues, Mr. Speaker, they find issues, they try to find issues in this Province that in many cases defy logic, there is very little sense to what they say, but it appeals to the emotions of the Newfoundlanders. They try to raise up our red

MR. B. TULK: blood against somebody, it does not matter who. It does not matter who. But their biggest target in this Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: This Province is a lot more than St. John's

MR. TULK: - the biggest target of this government in this Province is a Frenchman. Mr. Speaker, that is their biggest target.

MR. RIDEOUT: Shameful! shameful!

MR. TULK: The hon. gentleman should not remind anybody of what something shameful is. He crossed the floor of this House on a principle -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: -and let me tell you something: It is gone. Your total ownership, your total control is gone. You have none.

MR. RIDEOUT: You are the one who stated (inaudible) tried to talk to the boss about it, though.

MR. NEARY: You could not even crawl into the Cabinet.

MR. TULK: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: You could not weasle your way into the Cabinet.

MR. TULK: What did you say? You never did speak to the boss about it. You did not have the common decency.

MR. RIDEOUT: You talked to this boss about it.

MR. TULK: Who? I did.

MR. DINN: Yes, you did.

MR. TULK: Do not be silly, boy. I would not come over on the same side of the House with you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Go down to see the Lieutenant-Governor and get a dissolution.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let us ask the question again. It has been asked before tonight, but let us ask it again. Who initiated the court action in this case? Who started the war? The war was started by that side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: They did it. The Premier somehow feels, or it seems that he feels, that somehow or other the judicial system of Newfoundland is different from the judicial system in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland courts will no more rule for Newfoundland than they will rule for Canada. They will rule on the legalities of this case and not on the emotional feelings of the Premier. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come to something that the Premier said this evening. I want to come to something that the Premier said this evening when he talked about the great inequalities in education in this Province. He was dead on.

MR. LUSH: There are none, are there?

MR. TULK: He was dead on. There are great inequalities in this Province. I think he mentioned a Grade IV test which is administered regularly by the Department of Education. Mr. Speaker, he somehow went on to say that the Prime Minister of this country is trying to foster

MR. TULK: that inequality. Mr. Speaker, the Premier (Mr. Peckford) is fond of saying that he who lives in glass houses should not throw stones. He was trying to say today that the Prime Minister of this country (Mr. Trudeau), because he dared to oppose him, was keeping some funds from him or was keeping the offshore resources from him to punish him. Mr. Speaker, the Premier has a reputation in this Province, the one reputation that he has, his own actions in elections. The word is you vote Tory or you get nothing. Well, Mr. Speaker, the principle is the same. If you oppose me, you get nothing. He who lives in glass houses should not throw stones, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: He who lives in a glass house should not take a bath either.

MR. TULK: No, he should not take a bath either.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Ask the member for -

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

MR. TULK: Two wrongs do not make a right.

MR. HICKEY: No, of course not. That is why the present Premier does not involve himself in such things.

MR. TULK: Do not talk such nonsense.

MR. NEARY: Control yourself. Control yourself.

MR. TULK: You know he does as well as I do.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could you get the hon. member to control himself.

MR. HICKEY: We do not have an illiterate people today.

MR. TULK: Pardon?

MR. HICKEY: Our people are not illiterate today. They would not buy that.

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 519

IB-2

MR. TULK: Oh, they would not?

MR. NEARY: Control yourself.

MR. TULK: You treat them as illiterates.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so arrogant.

MR. TULK: Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HICKEY: The old blue slip at election time.

MR. TULK: Yes, your blue slip at election time, trying to buy their vote. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we are having a holiday.

MR. NEARY: They are more interested now in the topless waitress than they are in the economy of the Province.

MR. LUSH: Today.

MR. TULK: Today. We are on holiday, Mr. Speaker, it is twenty after twelve.

MR. HICKEY: Right at the witching hour.

MR. TULK: It is a holiday or a day of mourning. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is another

MR. TULK: inconsistency on the part of this government.

MR. HISCOCK: The Board of Trade says \$60 million lost.

MR. TULK: Another inconsistency on the part of this government. I have heard for years - I think the first gentleman was a member - oh, yes, a fellow by the - J.C., big old J.C. up in Ottawa was the first fellow who stood up in this House, I believe -

DR. COLLINS: Who?

MR. HODDER: Mutton chops.

MR. TULK: What?

MR. HODDER: Mutton chops.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Who?

MR. TULK: J.C. And he was talking about the infallibility of the court case of Newfoundland regarding the offshore. I believe it was. The next fellow that I heard sits down there representing Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). Totally, totally, Mr. Speaker, totally infallible was our case. The Premier has said it.

MR. NEARY: We could not lose, they told us, we could not lose.

MR. TULK: We could not lose. The present Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) tells us we

MR. TULK:

Let us rejoice.

Mr. Speaker, I want

to summarize by saying again, again, again, again, that we are going to support the resolution put forward by the government regardless of whether they amend it or not, and, Mr. Speaker, we do that not to toe the line with hon. gentlemen opposite, but, Mr. Speaker, we do it for the people of Newfoundland.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister

of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I have

listened to all the members opposite and without exception they are definitely for and they are definitely against Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

They are finding it

difficult to be for and against, but that is what they are.

Mr. Speaker, they are

for Newfoundland much like the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Simmons now in Ottawa, the Member of Parliament. I remember Mr. Simmons stand up in this House - Mr. Speaker, he is throwing in the towel - and say,

MR. DINN: 'We own the offshore and nobody better touch it,' much like all the hon. members said tonight, and now he is in Ottawa.

MR. HICKEY: He has changed his mind now.

MR. DINN: You know what he is saying now in Ottawa? He said, 'Let us take Newfoundland to court. We own it, no question about that, but let us take them to court.' And poor old Mr. Crosbie got dragged out of the House of Commons tonight - I do not know if hon. members know this - and on the T.V. who is snickering in the background but Mr. Simmons. Roger the Dodger, was at his desk tonight with his grin on, snickering at the only man up there standing up for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: The fickle five, said nothing.

As a matter of fact -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: - Mr. Rompkey came down and washed his hands while Mr. Chretien did his trick. I did not know who was the monkey and who was the fiddler today, and who was carrying the tin cup. Well, Mr. Speaker, they are going to wait a long day. I thought they would have gotten the message now. I thought that April 6, 1982, would have taught them something, but no, they are still trying. The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) was up. You know, he still has the old politics in him, the old Smallwood politics I call it because I never heard anybody else use it, but it is the townie against-the urban against the rural, religion against religion, all this kind of foolishness they are getting on with. It is gone. He got up and he said Mr. Rowe stood up in this House, much as Mr. Simmons stood up in this House, and said we own the resource. Well, I heard Mr. Rowe say that. Sure I heard the member for

May 19, 1982

Tape 521 (Evening)

JC - 2

MR. DINN: Fogo (Mr. Tulk) say we own the resource, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), who is leaving the Chamber now, say we own the resource.

But, boys, the people know you are saying that but you are mealy-mouthed about it. You see, you are for our resolution but you are against it. The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) said every hon. member over there today without a man, every man said, 'I never saw your proposal before.' Eight would-be leaders of this Province looked across at us today and said, 'We never saw your proposal before.' Sixty one per cent of the population of this Province saw that proposal or understood it and hon. members opposite did not know about it.

MR. BARRETT: The Torngat Terror did not.

MR. DINN: The Torngat Terror did not know about it.

MR. BARRETT: He did not see it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He (inaudible) got it now.

MR. DINN: So the only guy got up, the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), he said, 'Your proposal, I will agree with everything

MR. DINN: that is in your proposal, but I am going to vote for this resolution.' Now he agrees with that. That proposal is perfect. That is what we want, Uncle Ottawa. We want that proposal, but he wants to vote for an amendment to the resolution which says -

AN HON. MEMBER: Strike out the proposal.

MR. DINN: - strike out the proposal. He proposed striking out the proposal that he agrees with.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: You see, boys, that is mealy-mouthed, you know, that is flip-flop.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is flip-flop.

MR. DINN: That is not in, not out, not up, not down. The people of this Province heard you say we own the resource but they believe you, like the people of Canada believe Lalonde. Sure, you do not even trust Lalonde, and you say go in and negotiate. You told us the other day, your leader of the Opposition in the House - the leader in, the leader out.

AN HON. MEMBER: In House, out House.

AN HON. MEMBER: The out House leader.

MR. DINN: That is a good line. He said he does not trust Lalonde and you all agreed with that. Then you say go in and negotiate with Lalonde. And you say you agree now. After today a little light went on somewhere and the hon. the member for Pogo (Mr. Tulk) got up and he said, 'I agree with that proposal, but I am going to vote for this amendment that says strike out the proposal.' I have been listening now for a few days in this House. I have heard the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), you know, he stood up on the basis that he read the Bible tonight.

MR. DINN: God, how can he read the Bible? How can he read the Bible and come up with the balderdash that he comes up with? What kind of a crazy man is he? Balderdash he comes up with. The boys came down from Ottawa and because he had to genuflect to Mr. Rompkey for his fish plant in St. Anthony -

MR. HICKEY: His patron.

MR. DINN: Yes, his patron - he had to come in then tonight and mealy-mouth, that is what he did. Well, I am going to tell the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) that he would not have to do that if Mr. Rompkey had stood up for Newfoundland last year.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. DINN: If he just had to stand up and say, 'Mr. LeBlanc, I do not want you to give away all of our fish,' St. Anthony would have fish. A hundred and fifty nine thousand three hundred and some-odd metric tons of fish was given away last year, given away to Russia and Poland and Cuba, and a little to the Japanese, and the St. Anthony fish plant is starving for fish, and he is up there negotiating for a few pounds of turbot. 'Mr. Rompkey, would you tell Mr. LeBlanc

MR. DINN: to give me a few pounds of turbot so that my plant can open. And Mr. Rompkey said, 'Well, I will think about that. We will talk to Mr. LeBlanc and see what we can do about that. I do not know if I can pull that off. That is a big one.' I mean, we are giving away 159,000 metric tons. Anybody know what a ton of fish is? Well, it is a week's work for me.

MR. HICKEY: A lot of fish.

MR. DINN: A lot of fish. 159,000 metric tons of fish.

MR. HICKEY: How many jobs?

MR. DINN: How many jobs? Last year our unemployment rate for a year - one of the best in Canada, by the way, still, with all the disasters going on in this country - our unemployment rate went up last year by point six per cent. Okay? That amounts to about 4,000 jobs. Now, I have not got it broken down as to what 159,000 metric tons of fish amounts to in jobs, total. I have not gone through it in its entirety. I mean, I do not know how long it takes to process fish but it is a lot of jobs. Hon. members know that that is a lot of jobs.

Well, let us see what has happened in the last couple of years with respect to jobs. We went down last year. The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) got up in his glee last week. He said, 'The unemployment rate is going up'.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was some glad.

MR. DINN: Oh, yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was delighted.

MR. DINN: I thought he was having a - I cannot say that in the House of Assembly - but he got excited, we will say, last week. The hon. member got right

MR. DINN: excited because our unemployment - well, how in the name of heavens. Look, just in October, just on policy alone, not dollars, forget about your few dollars that they send down here for the cemetery fences. Now some of the projects are good, do not get me wrong, And we need them, God love them, the \$20 million a year that they send down here for the make work not war projects. But, God Almighty, I mean just in offshore alone because of a national energy programme in October of 1980, a few months after they got elected they came out with a great big plan. You saw Mr. Lalonde and all the boys up there display this great big plan. Oh my, was it good! God, we were going to be rolling in oil; 1990, self-sufficiency; the mega-projects out in Alberta, everything was going to go great.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the year before that, 1979, we had seven rigs off our coast. And I had been talking to a few of the people with the oil companies and they have said, 'Well, we are not sure if we can get all of them but we are going to have twelve to fifteen rigs out there next year'. This was August, September, around that time. And, lo and behold, out comes the master plan, the national energy programme. Well the companies got cold feet. They looked at it. Well 330 rigs from Alberta - I mean that is fairly easy drilling compared to what we have out here - but 330 rigs from Alberta picked up and left. And the seven rigs that we have had since 1979 that were going to be twelve to fifteen the next year went back down to six. They said,

MR. DINN: 'We got a little at Hibernia, and Petro-Canada will do three up in of the Labrador, and that is about as far as we can go. You know we cannot take to many chances. This National Energy Program is not that enticing. We are not going to make a lot of money on it. So if we are not going to make money, we are private enterprise and they pulled out. Well, if you figure it out each rig you are talking about 200 jobs. Now there are not 200 on the rig, there are about 90 on the rig, and the rest are onshore or directly related to that offshore rig, You are talking about your supply vessels and so on. Well, whilst we had in that year 950 jobs for Newfoundlanders offshore, we could have had somewhere close to 3000, if that National Energy Program had not of been brought in, just for one year. So that is not a lot of work.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a lot of hard work.

MR. DINN: It is 3,000 jobs. It is about, I would say, nearly six Come By Chances.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. DINN: It just about went down the drain. Just on that one little program alone, this great self-sufficiently by 1990 drove 330 rigs out of Alberta, and it drove our program down from 15 down to 6. And now tonight, when Mr. Chretien comes down with a face like a robber's - I could say like inside the overpass or outside the overpass. Comes down and takes us to court and hon. members opposite get up and they are still mealy-mouthed about it, 'We own it, we do not agree with what Mr. Chretien did, but we will genuflect to Uncle Bill, because you know he will get us a few things, a few little projects out in the distance now this Summer in the Canada Works and stuff when it comes along.' But give it all away, do not worry about it, 159,000 metric tons of fish is not much and

MR. BARRETT: A few more stamps.

MR. DINN: five or ten rigs here and there is not very much, it is only a few jobs, you know, and we will get a few more sympathy fences built. Gentlemen, look -

MR. BARRETT: A few more stamps.

MR. DINN: - do you realize what you are doing? Do you realize what you are doing is putting the people into the grave earlier than they should go. Will you not for once in your lives-have you not learned anything from April 6th? Mr. Speaker, can these people learn anything? They just went through an election and nearly got wiped out. I venture to guess that if the election was 30 days instead of 21 there would not be a member over there. The hon. the Premier would have to appoint an Opposition. God bless us, I probably would be one of them. They would not do that to me, I suppose. But I would not be able to take that anyway. But, Mr. Speaker, hon. members have

MR. DINN: got to wisen up,
and that goes for the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush).
Another few days and he would have had a hard time, a
hard row to hoe. And he is going to have it harder
next time if he does not come out straight. Because
the people, you see, the people can figure out when
you are mealy-mouthed, when you do not make decisions,
when you do not come out, straight out and say it.

I am not going to say
you are not a good Newfoundlander; you are as good a
Newfoundlander as I am.

MR. LUSH: You have done too
far now.

MR. DINN: Yes. You are as good
a Newfoundlander as I am, but you cannot be on both sides
of the fence. You cannot sit on the fence, you have to
come out for or against an issue. We have an issue here
now -

MR. LUSH: You have gone too far.
That is too far.

MR. DINN: The hon. member is
getting a little bit excited now.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. DINN: Yes, the hon. member is
getting a little excited now. Watch his blood pressure.
The fact of the matter is you have to make decisions,
you see, are you for or are you against?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes. Yes.

MR. DINN: Are you for or are you
against? The answer is yes. That is what the hon. member -
see, the people know when you are like that. You cannot
fool the people any more like that. Mr. Speaker, you
cannot fool the people any more.

MR. LUSH: What about the
unemployment rate.

MR. DINN: The unemployment rate went up, yes. The unemployment rate went up all over Canada. Here it went up .6, Mr. Speaker, and I listened to a half hour - the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) talked about what it was like in '72 and what it was like in '81, and we were supposed to take that hook, line and sinker and lay down like dogs because the unemployment rate went up.

Well, you see, what you have to look at is the overall picture. In 1972 we had 335,000 people fifteen years of age and over. All of these people were probably, we would say, could be in the labour force. Now we have some people who are old and cannot work, people who are going to university and so on, so you are never going to get 100 per cent of that population working. Okay? In 1972 of that population the employment rate was 41 per cent.

MR. SIMMS: What year?

MR. DINN: 1972.

MR. SIMMS: Forty-one per cent.

MR. DINN: The employment rate now. That is how many people were working versus how many people were in the age group from fifteen - I do not want to go too fast for the hon. member - and over. Fifteen years of age and over. The employment rate was 41 per cent. The employment rate in 1981 is 45 per cent. That indicates progress, gentlemen. Not as much as we would have had if we had not sold out all our resources in the past, but it is progress. Not

MR. DINN: a lot of progress, not as much progress as we would like to have, not as much progress if we did not have the National Energy Program, not as much progress if we did not give away 159,000 metric tons of fish, but progress. And, Mr. Speaker, with the Premier we have now, with the guys that I know I have on this side -

AN HON. MEMBER: And the girls.

MR. DINN: - and girls - that will improve one hell of a lot more because we are done giving away!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: That day is over! Fini! And it has got nothing to do with whether the people in Ottawa are French or English. As a matter of fact, I was a member of the R.C.A.F. for ten years. I lived in many of the provinces in Canada, some of my best friends were French Canadian. They are as good as any other Canadian!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: They certainly are! They are as good as any other. And it is not because of French or English. Not with me, Mr. Speaker, it is not with me! It is not what religion you are or what colour you are, or whether you are French or English, Mr. Speaker. What it is with me is are you straight? You people on the other side of this House agree that you do not trust Mr. Lalonde. You said it the other day to a man.

MR. TULK: No!

MR. DINN: The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) - who is interrupting right now, knows the rules. He should know, he has been here since 1979 - he is for our proposal but he wants it out of the resolution. I say to the hon. the member for Fogo, get your act together! Come out straight! If you are for the proposal leave it in, leave it in the resolution!

MR. DINN: Do not bring in stupid amendments because the people can see through them, gentlemen. And the next time, if you continue the way you are going, it will not be eight it will be that - look. Now, Mr. Speaker, with that - I had to get up and say a few words on this resolution because it is probably the most important resolution that we will have in this session. And, Mr. Speaker, it behooves us all, it behooves us all to put it on the record as to what your thoughts are at this moment because the people of Newfoundland elected you to do it. And by doing it you serve them, and that is our will. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Shall the amendment carry?

All in favour, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary minded, 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is declared defeated.

Shall the resolution carry?

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if there are no

other speakers from the other side.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. the Premier speaks now he closes the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have the floor, I am sorry.

I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier has been recognized.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does not have to force me

PREMIER PECKFORD: to my feet, Mr. Speaker,
I tell the hon. gentleman that. Well, we have had
a pretty wide-ranging debate, Mr. Speaker, this evening,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

a very interesting debate. I think from my own point of view, and from what I have heard, and I think the consensus among most of our caucus is, as I guess the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) just put it, that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, albeit we have just come from an election and they have seen their numbers diminish, are continuing to take essentially the same position that they took before the election on this very important issue -

MR. MARSHALL:

That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

- that they want to be on both sides of the issue and, obviously, that is an impossibility, that they want to have their cake and eat it too, somehow or another show some support for what the Government of Newfoundland is saying, and at the same time not let their brethren down in Ottawa when they come down and offer them this or that or something else.

It is quite clear, and I think most of the people here in the galleries, and the people in the House, can recognize that the Liberal Opposition has not clearly put, or has not clearly focused their position on this issue.

I was most disappointed, as the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) pointed out in his speech, in the approach taken by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), the former, former, former leader once removed, or whatever, of the Liberal Party, in his presentation because I did expect better. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle is a very learned gentleman and has been around politics

PREMIER PECKFORD: for quite some time and is quite well versed in the issue. I found his arguments extremely deficient and he really did not enthusiastically or with conviction present any points of view which were anyway defensible, in my view. I think that is unfortunate. They are on extremely shallow and fragile ground.

The long and short of it, Mr. Speaker, is simply this, and different members of this side of the House have put it in different ways. And I got a great, strange feeling out of what - I think the National News, the CBC National News tonight carried it, carried it as a question, 'Has the Government of Newfoundland been outmaneuvered?' I like the way the national press, I suppose you could even say CBC, but at least the national press, how they see things differently than we do, how they take a story of what has happened today in this country and in this Province and the kind of colour and shade and perspective they put on it. It is not a question of whether the federal government outmaneuvered the provincial government, or the provincial government outmaneuvered the federal government. One would think that a responsible press

PREMIER PECKFORD:

like that would say, 'Here is a very historic act. Here is a federal government, the national government, for the first time in the history of Canada referring a matter directly to the Supreme Court of Canada when it is already being considered by one of the provincial supreme courts. That the first time, a precedent setting action by a national government to a small province which is a have-not province,' and doing this after a proposal of this substance has been put on the table since January 25th. of this year. You know, a shameful display of the way we are so perceived by other people. Why is there any wonder, then, that we would argue for joint management in this large country? How can people from other places with other vested interests really reflect that provincial point of view unless the province itself has some say over it.'

But in any case, Mr. Speaker, CBC notwithstanding in the way they want to misconstrue, or the way they want to put a perspective on it, the long and short of this whole debate is simply this: If the Federal Government of Canada, if the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, if they are so eager to see development go ahead and to pursue once again that crazy notion of industrialize or perish, or whatever it is that set them on their merry way back in the 1960's, or if we take them on their word and talk about the legitimate desire to begin development of Canada's energy resources and those in Newfoundland and Labrador, if that is their desire, then here is the proposal through which this development can occur faster than any reference to the Supreme Court of Canada or to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland or any other court, here it is. And we have just got to flog this proposal, Mr. Speaker, all across Canada. A lot of people

PREMIER PECKFORD: still want to ignore this proposal. Members of the press, members of the Opposition, all over the place they want to ignore this proposal. And I get asked questions, as I did tonight on television and on The Journal tonight, about, well, you know, you really want to get on with Hibernia and get it developed for Canada, do you not? And, you know, this is perhaps the quickest way to do it. Now, nobody is asking me, 'Well, have you ever received a reply?'. Or, 'This proposal that you have presented, we have studied it and it is a very good Canadian proposal'. 'And why does the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) not - a nice question - why does the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Premier, not give you a response to this very reasonable proposal which in two or three months can see the development offshore of Newfoundland go ahead?'

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: What is wrong with it?
What is unCanadian? What is

PREMIER PECKFORD

selfish about this proposal that you put on the table on January 25th? That is the question that each member of the Opposition has to ask himself.. No answer. The Minister for Energy (Mr. Lalonde) in Ottawa requests a meeting with the minister responsible for energy (Mr. Marshall) in Newfoundland after the April 6th, election. And the minister responsible for energy in Newfoundland travels to Montreal to meet the minister of energy for Canada. And they sit down. He requested the meeting and we were prepared to co-operate and sit down and see. And our minister said, well, today, Sir, sit down. We have a meeting. Yes, Sir, you requested the meeting, I take it you have something to say. 'Oh, no! I do not have anything to say. I was just wondering whether you changed your position or not.' That was the extent of the opening of the meeting. Changed our position! The nerve, the audacity, the unmitigated gall for Mr. Lalonde to ask the minister of energy for Newfoundland whether we have changed our position when we are still waiting for an answer to a document that we put on the table on January 25th, and after an election had been fought on the issue, when the Liberal Party of Newfoundland almost got decimated because they aligned themselves with the Liberal Party of Canada and their position on the offshore. That is the mentality, that is the attitude that you are dealing with on this fantastically important issue in Newfoundland and for Canada. That is the kind of attitude you have, And then somebody can still say -I find it absolutely incredible that I am living in the real world, when I keep hearing people posing questions to me, as a Newfoundlander and as a member of the government of Newfoundland, when we have put this proposal on the table. What is wrong with going to the

PREMIER PECKFORD Court on Hibernia, the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, and quickening the pace for development to begin, when this is sitting there ready to be negotiated and signed, long before any other Court resolution could come about. Absolutely incredible! And yet just about everybody is still ignoring this proposal, And somehow the message has got to go out loud and clear across Canada that what is happening today, as the minister the government House leader has indicated, is a devious act, a devious act, to try to on the backs of Newfoundlander and Labradorians that neither—I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that if Canada was not in as much trouble, that if Mr. Trudeau and the Liberal Party of Canada and the Liberal Government of Canada had not put Canada in such a bad mess as it is in today, that we would not be finding this Hibernia field being asked to be decided by the Supreme Court of Canada. We would not see it at all. Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Trudeau are desperate, they are desperate men, trying to grasp on to power at a time when they see all of their aims and objectives and their National Energy Program falling down around their ears. And now they can pick on tiny Newfoundland and get away with it in good style, and to use the trickery of instead of having it least even though they were wrong, at least to have the nerve to come out and say we are referring all the offshore issue to the Supreme Court of Canada, which we would have condemned, they go through the back door and define Hibernia and no more. And then try to say somehow or another and everybody is asking questions as if this was a given, Well this is no problem to

PREMIER PECKFORD:

do. You hear people asking you questions. What is wrong with them referring Hybernia to the Supreme Court of Canada? How can you decide on Hybernia without deciding upon the whole question of the offshore? How can you do it, Mr. Speaker? How can it be done? It is a slight of hand, as I said this afternoon, and it is not in the best interests of Canada or in the best interests of Newfoundland. And we sit here, you know, 550,000 strong and decreasing in the last year and a half or two years. I guess now with the economic downturn in the rest of Canada it will start to increase again as our people come back not able to find jobs up there either. Five hundred and fifty thousand strong, 43,000 square miles, plus 110,000 square miles of Labrador claimed by another province. Transmission of electricity still up in the air. Hopefully it will be passed after argument and argument.

As I said in my opening statement today, what other Canadians have by right we have to fight for. Fish being sold and traded away secretly. DREE agreements being held up. I have been calling Mr. Herb Grey now for three days straight, every morning, afternoon and night, trying to get him on the phone, and he is too busy to speak to me. I cannot get to speak to the man. I wrote him a letter three weeks ago requesting that we get together sometime in the week of the seventeenth, anytime within those seven days, anywhere in Canada at his beck and call and I would be there to talk about the agreements outstanding for three years. I cannot get an answer to my letter. I cannot get him to respond to my phone calls. Calling every single day. I have it logged down in my office. I have to log it because if I get up in the House as

PREMIER PECKFORD: Premier of Newfoundland and say, 'I called Mr. Gray,' my word is questioned. So now I have got to log it all so I can table it in the House so that then I will not be laughed at as Premier of the Province for stating that I have been trying to get hold of a federal minister to try to negotiate an agreement. Then we have the audacity and we have to get our noses rubbed in it when we go to sign a Trans-Canada Agreement, that Mr. Rompkey holds it over our head, that he wanted to build a road from Main Brook to St. Anthony, he and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

MR. TULK: You do not agree with a road up there?

PREMIER PECKFORD: That was not the point. Mr. Speaker, it was the T.C.H. Agreement. It was supposed to be done under the DREE secondary roads agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Sure they need the road up there, they need a lot of roads, and a lot of other things. But here they were using it, Mr. Speaker - this is what we have to put up with - holding us the agreement. And then what do we do, Mr. Speaker? We force Mr. Rompkey to desert his colleague and say, 'You can not go building a road from Main Brook to St. Anthony, a new road, when the road across the country from Plum Point is only a cow path.' If you are going to broak the T.C.H. Agreement to include other secondary roads, well for God's sake at least do one that is there, that is a cow path. And we had to concede, in order to get an agreement at all on the T.C.H., to put \$20 million or \$30 million in Mr. Rompkey's district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Blackmail tactics it was.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And then he told us that there was no way that you could get no more than fifty-fifty on the Coastal Labrador agreement, until we hung tough for a year and a half to get ninety-ten because they had promised ninety-ten earlier. And somehow it is wrong, Mr. Speaker, somehow it is wrong to stand up for Newfoundland and say as a small province, because they are getting us both ways, 'You have got to be like Ontario and have fifty-fifty. But we will not give you the money from your resources, so that you can pay your 50 per cent.' They do not want to give us any money through resource development and they do not want to give us any better than fifty-fifty like the wealthy provinces. Now one or the other has to go. Either you give us more money through your resources

PREMIER PECKFORD:

and pay 100 per cent of the projects, or you give us some money from our resources and then we will go 50/50.

DR. COLLINS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And somehow then we

are pictured as being somehow less than Canadians because we stand up and say to our fellow Canadians, "We cannot afford any more than 25 per cent, or 10 per cent. We cannot afford it. The money is not there." And then the ultimate insult of all is to then totally ignore the legitimate government of the Province of Newfoundland - whether they hate me or hate everybody over here - in Ottawa, to officially insult the institution of government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. HISCOCK:

That was a private meeting.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A signing of a federal/provincial agreement it was, it was not a private meeting. Go hide your head in shame, boy. Hide your head in shame.

MR. RIDEOUT:

He went to Nova Scotia the next day and signed on in the legislature.

MR. HISCOCK:

Let me tell you something -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, you know it all. Yes, sure you do.

MR. HISCOCK:

- about the airstrips.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Airstrips .

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So here we are then, here we are, 550,000 strong trying to eke out an existence, trying to respond to the legitimate need of our people for equal opportunities, and now suddenly we are told, and thrust upon us, as the minister said

PREMIER PECKFORD: earlier, 'Take Nova Scotia's agreement. If you do not take it within two weeks, you will not even get that'. That is a nice way to be treated within the Canadian family. That is the kind of negotiations we had. And what did they put on the table? I do not know if anybody has the copy there now. What was the only document they put on the table during all those negotiations?

MR. BARRY: Only a colony.
What did they call it, the only document they put on the table? It was titled 'Draft' so they could always squirm behind the word 'Draft' if we went ahead and published it on them. What did they say in that document? We are nothing only a colony, that is all, and hardly that. It is a scurrilous document here. Throughout it all a colonial -

AN HON. MEMBER: A colony of (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, a colony. A document that must have been written by somebody -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Disgusting!

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the only document in all the negotiations we had on the offshore. Promises! Promises! We would go to a meeting and sit down in honesty and straightforwardness and say, 'Okay, we will go through the various concepts'. So we go through them all and the Minister of Energy for Newfoundland says, 'Well, how about now on these points if you will come back to us in the next meeting in writing on those concerns that you have - what I said - and I will come back in writing on the concerns we have and then we can exchange and move it from there, after our officials get at it.' 'Yes. Yes. Yes.' We go back to the next meeting three weeks later, or five weeks later, we sit down with our written answers and, like honest people,

PREMIER PECKFORD: pass it over and say,
'Here is what we promised to do from the last meeting,
Mr. Chairman'. 'Oh, thank you very much'.
'You were going to answer some of our concerns.'

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'I am very sorry, I have not any authority to say anything more than we said in the last meeting.' Over and over and over again -

MR. BARRY: That is exactly what happened.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And when we put this proposal on the table, they were supposed to respond with a proposal at that meeting. We put ours on the table and made concessions in it, the trigger point as the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) mentioned today, a very big concession this trigger point is. And when we reach a certain point of wealth equal to other Canadians we will get less and the federal government will get more. Their 25 per cent will go up to 50 and our 75 per cent will come down to less than 50. And then people try to meander, intellectually meander and perform verbal and conceptual gymnastics over there to somehow justify their position, to somehow justify their position that we are being, well, you know, you have got to get on with the development or we are going to end up in court anyway. No, Mr. Speaker, it was not going to end up in court anyway. The Prime Minister came down here. I was away at the time, I do not know where I was, I was away at the time, when the Prime Minister came down here and the golden tongue issued his statements threw the crumbs of truth on the multitudes then yanked his anatomy back to Ottawa, And the papers - The Daily News of course and everybody on our side of the House and the other side - and I would walk down the street, 'You heard what the Prime Minister said, You got to go back now. He is going to put ownership aside, He said it, He said it!'. And as I said then, 'Well, was it in writing?' 'Come on now Brian, 'Come on now, Premier, what do you mean 'in writing? You have to take a man's word, He is the Prime Minister of Canada, Come on now, You are just being stubborn now. You

PREMIER PECKFORD: are just being stubborn'. And so we take the man at his word and we do not try to dissect the way he said the words or how he said the words. We took him on his word, that he was going to put ownership aside. The Prime Minister of Canada said that, And now the Prime Minister of Canada in a telegram to Newfoundland says, 'Newfoundland, you got pre-conditions'. 'What is one of the pre-conditions Prime Minister?' Oh, that you want ownership put aside. Accusing us of having a pre-condition of putting

PREMIER PECKFORD:

putting ownership aside. Who raised it? The Prime Minister of Canada raised it, and raised the hopes of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that he was a reasonable man, and a statesman and wanted this thorny issue of ownership of mineral resources on the Continental Shelf resolved for the good of Canada and the good of Newfoundland, as he always says when he comes down here and graces us with his presence for an hour or two. And now all of a sudden we are accused of putting preconditions on it because we want ownership put aside, and permanently if an agreement is reached so nobody can tear it up in the future. And because we are holding out for some form of joint management so that we will have a real say in the direction of development, so we will get some of the jobs, so we will get some of the spin-off industries, and so the rate of the development will be consistent with the environment and with our fisheries. And they keep mealy-mouthing - the words in the telegram today, the nerve of the man to say it - 'co-operative management' -

MR. SIMMS: Like Nova Scotia.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - instead of 'joint management'. Fuzz it up for the people! Fuzz it up for the people! Who knows the difference between joint and co-operative unless they think about it for a while. It sounds good on television, we can get away with saying with 'co-operative management.' It does not mean the same as joint management though, Mr. Speaker, where both sides together have some real say in it. Co-operative management means 'from time to time we will consult

PREMIER PECKFORD: with Newfoundland see what they all think about this' - after it is a fait accompli.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like everything else.

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'We would like to inform you that we just gave 5000 metric tons to the Japanese in squid.' That is their meaningful consultation that they talk about on the fishery. That is their meaningful consultation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Fairness, equity, balance, sharing, that is what Canada is all about, Mr. Speaker, if you look up Canadian history. It is not this intellectual, dogmatic view or vision of a Canada which grabs unto itself more and more power, so that then everybody is always subservient, and that then they can always stay in power, because you have to be thankful for getting another \$200 million. Because that is what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, that is what is going to happen, so sure as the sun shines above, that if the federal government gets away with this ploy and they have complete

PREMIER PECKFORD:

ownership of the offshore, then we will be in just a consultation role on management. They will have the final say on it all, and we will get a certain share of revenues which will not even equal equalization. So what happens then, Mr. Speaker? We are still on equalization then. And we get in trouble, the budget. I know, I have been around here long enough to know now. We are going down the drain under that proposal. And the way we will never completely go down the drain, you see, Mr. Speaker, is insidious and sinister because as we get into trouble and the sales tax cannot go up anymore and the income tax cannot go up anymore and the gas tax cannot go up anymore and we are still way down on per capita earned income, we are still way down on employment, still way down on everything else - highest taxes, lowest standard of living - where have we got to turn? To big Uncle Ottawa. Negotiating a different arrangement on equalization in almost desperation. And they know we are desperate then. That is not too far down the road. That is not a threat. That is spoken as one Newfoundlander who happens to know a little bit about it through hard experience.

Then how is the special deal done? Almost like it was today. A big announcement. Swing down in the jet from Ottawa and make this big announcement about this fantastic amendment to the equalization formula for certain have not provinces, which happen to include Newfoundland. 'Here is your \$200 million. Shut up!'

That is the long and short of it, Mr. Speaker. You will get

PREMIER PECKFORD: no opportunity. The proof is in the pudding. It is there now in the fishery. It is there now in what is supposed to be co-operative federalism in DREE agreements which they have just changed. The evidence is all around you, it is overwhelming. All you have to do is open your eyes and you will see it. It is that kind of Canada that we will experience forever. And there is only one way to break out of it, where there is the pool of revenue with a fair deal like other Canadians have gotten by right because their land happened to be above the salt water. How lucky are they at all! I wish the Ice Age, as I used to say during the campaign, I only wish, if I had one prayer that could be answered, I only wish that when that Ice Age started to recede back to the pole that it stayed a couple of days longer and hauled a bit more of our land out of the water. Then there would be no question because it would be above the salt water and it would be owned by the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and we would be like Alberta and Saskatchewan and B.C. and all the rest of them.

What an unlucky break it was for us! That is the only pool, the pool of revenue which will be more than equalization. And it is only after you get more than equalization that it is any good to you, you see. If we are making \$600 million, or getting or receiving \$600 million this year in equalization from Ottawa, and if we only make \$600 million from our development we lose the \$600 million in equalization and take the \$600 million we got, how much better off are we? How many more dollars are there in the bucket? Same number.

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 537

IB-1

PREMIER PECKFORD: We are at exactly the same place as before we started drawing a dollar. So you have got to go \$601 million, \$602 million, \$700 million, \$800 million, \$1 billion. And then when you start to go above that \$600 million you start to make improvements. And you need to do that for about fifteen or twenty years at somewhere \$300 million to \$500 million more than the \$600 million. You need to do that for about ten to twenty years constantly every year, go get your opportunities and your services that will then equal the rest of Canada on an average. And there is nowhere else to do it. And at the same time have some say over management so your fishery is still there. There is no other way.

Why can the Liberal Opposition not, why can the Liberal Government in Ottawa not see the sense of that idea and, at the same time, save themselves \$600 million. I cannot understand it. I honestly cannot understand it. It defies any logic and any reason that I know about, it defies it. And, as I said today, I respect the Prime Minister's right of vision in the same way as I hope he respects my right to have my vision for Canada. I respect that. But I also reserve the right to disagree with him. And I disagreed with him violently. See, there is no secret here. It is not that he is - it is just his concept which is so wrong no matter how much he believes it. He believed it on the Constitution. He believed it fervently. I spent nine and ten hours at a stretch without even getting up out of my chair arguing with the Prime Minister of Canada on that matter of that Constitution. And he was not going to back down regardless because he believed in that concept.

PREMIER PECKFORD: But he was wrong. And it took seven or eight people to prove that he was wrong, and a number of courts around Canada. And he is wrong, dead wrong, as are all the Liberal Opposition on this question of the offshore. The same kind of thing that the Prime Minister is doing on the offshore in this small area is the same kind of thing that he wanted to do to the constitution and was unable to do it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The same thing. Exactly the same thing. If he could have his way, if Canada was not so diverse that he could have his way, we would be a republic within five years, no problem whatsoever, and they would decree what was good for Newfoundland, or what was good for British Columbia, or the Yukon, or the Northwest Territories. That is the way they want to do business. And so we will remain permanently poor, as defined in the Canadian way of equalization and lower services, forever more unless we can, over the next few months, effectively demonstrate to the Canadian people and the Canadian political process that what is happening here is, as the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) said, a land grab, the idea that we will look after Newfoundland when they get in trouble, but, in the meantime, we have to make sure our national energy programme succeeds by 1990. Because that is what they are doing. And for the sake of those who come after us, and for having a viable prosperous society here, we have to stop that. This is not Canadian, this is as unCanadian as anything that the Prime Minister of the Canadian Government ever did. And we have pledged here today, and we are going to

PREMIER PECKFORD: pledge to the
Newfoundland people, that the last breath that we
will draw will be to fight this federal government
off this position until Newfoundland has a chance
to be free.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is no backing
down, Mr. Speaker, because right is on our side. And
right is more powerful than the member for LaPoile
(Mr. Neary), or the member for the Strait of Belle
Isle (Mr. Roberts), or the Liberal Party, or the P.C.
Party, or the Premier of Newfoundland or anybody
else. Right is all powerful. And when you are on the
side of right, you win. It might take a while, it
might take a while, but we will win.

As the member for
Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) said, he might be in power
for a long while but his day of reckoning will come
too. And what can I say about the fickle five?
What can you say? We have not heard from them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where are they?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Where are they?
What an insult to Newfoundland. What a blatant insult
to Newfoundland those five people are. Those people have
never stood up. You cannot hear them. Whenever anything
comes up that is either bit controversial, they are
not on the radio. Then all of a sudden, when there is

PREMIER PECKFORD:

nothing controversial, they will try to get their dart in with a \$5,000 Canada Works Grant for the second fence around somebody's cemetery. Oh, Mr. Speaker, what a sell-out, what a sell-out those five people have been. How Mr. Rompkey maneuvers in his district is incredible, absolutely incredible.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The weakest minister that Newfoundland has ever had representing it in the Cabinet of Canada. The weakest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Perhaps he cannot help it. Perhaps he cannot help it. He seems to be a nice guy personally as a person. Somebody should tell him or give him a job, I do not care, you know. Mr. Jamieson is supposed to be over in London long and merrv ago. He is not over there.

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible) a job.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, put Mr. Jamieson over in London because I believe he deserves that, he should have it. I got no problems with that at all. And if you want to put Mr. Rompkey as ambassador to Ireland or somewhere, give it to him. Put him somewhere -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - but for God's sake put us all out of our misery, put us all out of our misery -

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) own soul.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - And let us get somebody in that Cabinet of Canada who is not afraid to say to the Prime Minister - because I know, I can tell what is going on, I mean, I do not know if he even, you know, records an objection. I mean if you are a strong person and a strong character, you can do a lot. You really can, I mean, I know it in my own Cabinet. You got

May 19, 1982

Tape No. 539

RA - 2

Evening session.

PREMIER PECKFORD: strong ministers and strong individuals who are going to argue strongly for their point of view. Well, boy, I will guarantee you right now, more times than not they are going to get their way. They are going to get their way if it is reasonable, if it is rational, if they stick up for their departments and for the programme that they want to introduce. We might have a freeze on all programmes and the minister got the nerve then to come up for this new programme. And if he or she argues strongly and strenuously and rationally, reasonably - because you cannot get very far unreasonably very long, everybody else catches up on you and you are no good - you would be surprised, all of a sudden there is not a freeze on all the programmes, they got you convinced and persuaded and another \$300,000 or \$400,000 are gone down the drain or gone to a good programme, we hope, seeing we were persuaded. And the other MP's the same way, they are just not doing their job. That does not mean they have got to have blinkers on and only be MP's for Newfoundland in the strict sense, they are part of the Canadian Parliament too. But if there is a leaning, seeing you cannot get a perfect 50/50, it has to be towards the Province surely, on those matters. Not to the exclusion of everything else.

MR. HICKEY: One would think the odd time, anyway.

PREMIER PECKFORD : You know, I write them, you send stuff to them, I mean, they do not answer, Incredible situation!

MR. SIMMS: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains
(Mr. Warren) agrees.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In any case, Mr. Speaker, the day is young the night is old and we have had a long debate. I can only say and reiterate again, as all the other members have, that we have gone through what I consider to be perhaps the most important day in our history on a very important issue. And whether we really will be anything or not depends in large measure on how this issue resolves itself over the next few months and years.

For our part, as a party, as individual Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, we intend to leave no stone unturned until we can get a better deal for Newfoundland, as good Canadians and as good Newfoundlanders.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

All those in favour of the resolution, 'Aye'.

All those in favour

HON. MEMBERS:

'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division. Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER:

Those in favour of the motion please rise.

The Hon. the Premier,

The hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn),

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Barry, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Cross, Mr. Barrett, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Rideout, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Butt, Mr. Staqq, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Osmond.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), Mr. Warren, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Lush.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Those against the motion please rise.

I declare the motion carried unanimously.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 25, 1982, at 3:00 p.m.