

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2, 1982

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before we begin the proceedings of the day I wish to refer to a point of privilege raised by the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan), I think it was on May 26th. I have reviewed the excerpts and decided that the minister did not establish a prima facie case so, therefore, he does not have a point of privilege.

With regard to the point raised by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr.Callan) yesterday, I have read the transcripts and really there was no point of privilege, just a difference of opinion as to allegation of facts between two hon. members.

#### STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR.MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, all hon. members are aware of the recent action by the federal government to unilaterally refer the issue of offshore jurisdiction over Newfoundland's offshore resources to the Supreme Court of Canada. Members will recall that it was as the result of that arbitrary and unfortunate action that this hon. House of Assembly unanimously passed a resolution condemning the federal government's initiative. The hon. the Premier felt that Newfoundland's other representatives should join in support of this measure and subsequently, on May 24, 1982, wrote Newfoundland's five Liberal MPs and Liberal Senators requesting that they stand with the elected representatives in this hon. House on this issue. As far as our PC Members and PC Senators are concerned, we have had their hearty endorsement as good Newfoundlanders.

MR. MARSHALL: Because of the seriousness of the matter, the Premier requested the MPs and Senators to reply within twenty-four hours. To date, Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that only two of the five Newfoundland Liberal MPs have replied, and only one Liberal Senator has replied aside of course, from Senator Eric Cook, who on his own initiative condemned the federal government's action in a very clear and unequivocal manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is most regretful that three of our Newfoundland five Liberal MPs, including the Hon. William Rompkey, Mr. David Rooney and Mr. Brian Tobin, failed to even acknowledge this request by the Premier to support a resolution unanimously passed by this hon. House. It is equally regretful, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier failed to hear from two of our Liberal Senators, namely, Senators Rowe and Petten to whom, I might add, very little has been requested in the past as representatives of this Province in the Senate of Canada.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the fact that these M.P.s and Senators refused even to acknowledge the sincere and legitimate request in support of a position taken by this hon. House, speaks for itself and is demonstrative of the total lack of appreciation for what this fundamental issue means to the future of the Province, economically and socially. It is a sad day, indeed, when our own Newfoundland M.P.s and Senators refuse to stand up for the rights of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: However, Mr. Speaker, though the two Liberal M.P.s and one Liberal Senator referred to did take the trouble to reply, it should in no way be misconstrued as an indication of their condemnation of the federal government's insulting and arrogant actions. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, they were anything but supportive of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table today telexes from Mr. George Baker, M.P. for Gander - Twillingate, Mr. Roger Simmons, M.P. for Burin - St. George's and Senator Derek Lewis, in which they outlined their positions with respect to the resolution. The Premier's reply to each telex is also attached.

I should like to advise this hon. House that the reply from the M.P. from Gander - Twillingate was by far the most supportive of the three received. Mr. Baker endorses the resolution but claims, and I quote, that it is "ambiguous, contradictory and incomplete." As the Premier so aptly replied to Mr. Baker, Mr. Speaker, "If the resolution which was endorsed by the provincial Legislature is as you suggest- ambiguous, contradictory and incomplete -what is the nature of your endorsement?"

MR. MARSHALL: The reply of the M.P. for Burin - St. George's (Mr. Simmons), on the other hand, can only be described, Mr. Speaker, as contemptuous in the extreme. Unbelievably, the member asks in all seriousness, how he could possibly condemn the federal government's actions. The member then incredibly goes on to suggest that despite his position, he is on the side of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I can only repeat what the Premier said in his telex in reply to Mr. Simmons. Referring to the federal government's unilateral decision to refer the offshore issue to the Supreme Court of Canada, the Premier stated, and I quote: "It is a sad day in Newfoundland and Labrador when a Quebec newspaper shows greater sensitivity for what is at stake here, not only for Newfoundland but for all of Canada, than our own Liberal M.P.s." Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for Newfoundland.

The response by Senator Derek Lewis, I regret to say, offered no more support than those of the others referred to. Senator Lewis failed to even make mention of the federal government's unilateral action, but instead chose to make some vague general statements about the need for both levels of government to reach a negotiated settlement.

This, Mr. Speaker, then, constitutes the total support which the Newfoundland people and this hon. House have received from

MR. W. MARSHALL:

federal M.P.'s and senators, that is, I say our federal Liberal M.P.'s and our federal Liberal Senators. It just goes to show that if the government of this Province did not remain vigilant over Newfoundland's rights or failed to steadfastly defend the legitimate interests of our people in this Canadian Confederation, we have every reason to doubt that our own Liberal M.P.'s and most of our Senators would act in our defence. Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, this government will never fail to carry out its responsibility to the people of our Province. In conclusion I would like to add that it is most unfortunate that the responses from all of our Newfoundland Liberal representatives in Canada could not reflect that of Senator Eric Cook. Senator Cook needed no prodding and no requests for support from Premier Peckford or anyone else. Upon hearing the federal government's unforgivable and inexcusable actions which constituted not only an insult to Newfoundland people, but equally an effort to the Canadian judicial system, Senator Cook acted decisively and swiftly in showing where he stood on this fundamentally important issue. He demonstrated, Mr. Speaker, that the people of his Province came first and the Liberal Party of Canada second. Our own Liberal M.P.'s and Senators would do well to emulate him in the execution of their responsibilities which first and foremost should be the defence of the rights of Newfoundland and Labrador in this nation. The Newfoundland people, Mr. Speaker, deserve better from their representatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

And with this statement, Mr. Speaker,

I table the telegrams, particularly that of Mr. Simmons, and draw your attention to the observations of Mr. Simmons and also the responses of the hon. the Premier. There are copies for all hon. gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the rules of this House is that a Ministerial Statement has to be brief and factual. It has to convey information and not encourage debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my judgement the hon. gentleman broke all the rules of the House in that regard. It is not a brief statement, it is not factual, in my opinion, Sir, it is merely an attempt on the part of the administration to start the federal election campaign early, and that is what they are doing. They have taken the most important issue in Newfoundland and turned it into partisan politics. They are making a political football out of the offshore resources. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will be brief and factual. And my opinion of the statement is this; that it is the sort of thing we have come to expect from this mad-hatter administration. It is juvenile and childish and a pile of rubbish.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. W. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Health (Mr. House) a couple of questions. First of all, could the Minister of Health inform the House what is the government's latest position on the future of the Old Perlican Hospital? And at what point in time was that new position decided upon? When was the decision made? What is the latest government position? And when was that decision made?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the latest position on the Old Perlican Hospital still as in the budget procedure, that it will phase out as an in-patient facility. However, the Premier has asked myself and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) to have officials from both our departments evaluate the building. It is a building - a forty-four bed unit.

MR. CALLAN: Tell us about the -

MR. HOUSE: It is a forty-eight bed unit. It has had a fair amount of work done on it over the last couple of years because of the recommendations of the Fire Marshal. We sent people down to look at it to see if it can be put to some other use. So there has been no decision made except to get an evaluation. And that evaluation or recommendation for other use will be forthcoming presumably sometime this week.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, then that leads me to ask the question regarding the future of the Markland



MR. CALLAN: Cottage Hospital. Does the minister intend to have the same sort of re-evaluation or study conducted with regard to the possible maintenance as is of the Cottage Hospital at Markland or is the decision regarding the Markland Cottage Hospital final as per the Budget Speech?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the evaluation of the Markland Hospital has been ongoing for a number of years. And as I mentioned in the House a few days ago, two days ago, this is a ten bed unit, ten certified bed unit. It has sixteen beds but only ten of them are certified for proper use. And this particular hospital in Markland has been under study and under review for a number of years. As a matter of fact, I have met with the Committee on two occasions and the

MR. HOUSE: officials of the department have been meeting periodically over the last two or three years with a view to phasing the hospital down as an in-patient facility, based on the number of admissions and the proximity to St. John's where, incidentally, most of the people go. So what we had planned there was to have a clinic and a four bed holding unit that could do all the emergency services that is presently being done. The hospital has fallen. For instance, in the last five years in admissions, for instance, in 1977-78 there were 831 admissions, 1978-79 there were 754, 1979-80 - 637, 1980-81 - 582 and the last year was 457 which means there is more than 100

MR. HEAR:

(Inaudible)

MR. HOUSE: We evaluated that particular hospital and we do not think that that particular building has any further valuable use.

MR. CALLAN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the minister finished by saying he does not think that the building has any other further use. The minister is aware, I am sure, that many thousands of dollars have been spent on renovating and repairing the Markland Cottage Hospital in very recent years. Now, as I understand the news media reports and so on, the facility at Old Perlican will be, I suppose, for want of another expression, another word, it will be essentially almost a senior citizens home, so to speak. I am wondering has the minister or anybody in his department given any thought to maintaining the cottage hospital at Markland, the building at least, in that sort of a capacity. the capacity of a home for senior citizens?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, that particular hospital, the Markland Hospital, has been looked at with that view. The fact of the matter is it is very difficult to put any of the existing cottage hospitals, and some are a little different from others, put them in a position to be able to take adequately the chronic care people. You have to bear in mind it is just one big open space or open ward, that is all it is and you do not put people for the rest of their lives in that kind of a situation. So that has been looked at and has not been deemed adequate for that purpose.

There has been nobody either  
has said that

MR. HOUSE: the Old Perlican Hospital is being looked at in that light either. The fact is that Social Services has a fairly large number of kinds of responsibilities and they are just looking at it with a view to some of their responsibilities. And the Department of Health, which incidentally is primarily responsible for acute care and only marginally responsible for chronic care, is out there with Social Services to look at it in the light of Social Services needs. So that hospital - neither one of them I do not think, will be quite adequate for that particular function, the function of chronic care.

We have looked at several of our cottage hospitals in that respect. As a matter of fact, I had some debate on that this morning in the estimates. None of them are really suited to that. So Markland has been looked at in that light but we do not think, and I do not think anybody else can go there and say that it would be valuable for that purpose.

Markland, like Burin, for instance, last year, did receive a facelift because of the need for life safety, that is wiring and fire walls in various places. We had to do that, supposing we were going to close it out within the year. And we know, for instance, that Burin may phase out when the new hospital comes onstream in Salt Pond, but we still have to have life safety measures. So I think I have adequately answered the question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, from what I can read into the answers and the partial answers that the minister is giving, from what I can read into it, you know,

MR. CALLAN: there have been no previous studies conducted on either one of these hospitals, I am wondering if the minister would confirm or deny that by - if there have been studies would the minister table them in the House of Assembly? And I also seem to read into the minister's answers that there is no thought whatsoever given to the possibility of a second look at Markland. I am wondering if that be the case does the decision regarding the two hospitals, does it have anything to do with the politics, you know the fact that one hospital is in a PC district, and the other one in a Liberal. Would the minister care to answer that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is shocking!

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

MR. POWER: The one in Port aux Basques, give them that one.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the first hospital that this administration built, the first prime big announcement that the Premier of this Province made was the construction of a hospital in Port aux Basques.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: And that was a Liberal district, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: We do not play politics with the people.

MR. HOUSE: Of course that hospital is the one hospital, that is the one hospital this year that is receiving most money in construction.

MR. NEARY: As long as we get it we do not care who gets the credit for it?

MR. POWER: Had to please poor old Stevie, boy.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, no indeed. The fact is that, whether the hon. member wants to know it or believe it or not, there has been - you do not have to have an intense study of that particular institution, the Markland, to determine

June 2, 1982

Tape No. 807

NM - 3

MR. HOUSE:                           that it is not adequate  
for any of these purposes that he has talked about, And  
I do not think you can go and find any booklet, any  
detailed study, written study, but certainly I can get  
documentation of meetings that I personally have held  
with the board, and the medical people there, and it is  
the understanding that they knew that the hospital was  
going to close and that it would be to a clinic status.

MR. NEARY:                           Table your studies. Table  
the studies then.

MR. HOUSE: I never said that, I said I do not know if I have a written study. We have gone out there and we have gone through the building. You do not sit down to deal with this. Three or four years we have been going back and forth to that hospital, the staff and myself, and it has been deemed - and that board, and the member can say what he likes, the board and the people in that area knew that that hospital was going to phase down to a clinic with emergency holding beds for in the case of accidents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Before I recognize the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) I would like to welcome to the galleries today eight senior special education students from J.M. Olds Collegiate in Twillingate, with their teachers Mr. Gagnac and Mrs Butt. I do indeed welcome you to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is surprising to see eight Cabinet ministers absent but, however I will direct my question to the Minister of Transportation, (Mr. Dawe).

MR. STAGG: They are just doing their jobs.

MR. CALLAN: You are a secretary now.

MR. WARREN: Has the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) received any correspondence either by telephone or by letter or telegram from Coastal Labrador concerning a major food shortage in Black Tickle or any other communities in Southern Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not received any such correspondence that I know of to date.

MR. SIMMS: A good answer.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of my colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock)-

DR. COLLINS: I wonder where he is?

MR. WARREN: Well, he might be in the same place that the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Collins) is. He has been in this House more often than the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Collins) has been, so it is no good asking childish questions.

MR. HODDER: Where are the eight ministers?

MR. WARREN: And where are the eight ministers today, Mr. Speaker? And this is why I am asking the question to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the minister's department has been contacted and I am just wondering if the minister could check it out with his officials. Knowing that the minister's department is responsible for, I think it is two or three helicopters on charter from Sealand Helicopters in Goose Bay, could there be arrangements made within the next two or three days to have the essential food supplies such as flour, milk, sugar and so on that the community of Black Tickle is completely out of - and in conversation with the nurse in the community and in conversation with the town chairman there is nearly a crisis stage - could the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) look into this serious matter and see if they can alleviate this shortage?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker.



June 2, 1982

Tape No. 808

ah-3

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

My colleague the hon. member  
for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), pinch hitting for my  
colleague who is in New York at the moment, asked

MR. NEARY: some very serious questions of the minister in connection with the food shortage in Southern Labrador.

MR. DAWE: He asked me to do something.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am amazed, like my hon. colleague, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is not aware of it. His colleague, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) is certainly aware of it.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!  
On a point of order,

Mr. Speaker. The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) asked the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) a question to which he responded. This is the Question Period. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition can ask a question if he wishes, but this is not the period for reflections, comments and speeches.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
I would request the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to direct his question to a specific minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Transportation. Would the minister indicate to the House if he will undertake without delay to arrange for transportation, either by aircraft or helicopter, to alleviate the desperate shortage of food, essential food items, in Port Hope Simpson in Southern Labrador?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I will check with the officials in my department, who, I assume, if what hon. members have said is correct, have been contacted and have been informed, and as soon as the situation is assessed, as we have done in other circumstances all over this Province, we will take whatever action is necessary to alleviate the problem.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if we are losing funds on the media tax which was imposed two budgets ago.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we do not usually aim to lose funds when we impose a tax. And, of course, the media tax is no different from any other tax. We are gathering revenues through the imposition of the revenue tax.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: I might say that the revenue tax is not a tax on the media as such, the revenue tax is on those who actually "consume advertising", that is, those people who advertise goods and services for sale.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, is the minister aware of the report done by Professor Hannon at Memorial University, which said that the funds projected

June 2, 1982

Tape 809

EC - 3

MR. HODDER: in that budget were for  
\$750,000 for the first year and \$1.5 million for the

MR. HODDER:

second year, but so far only \$626,000 have been collected? Would the minister consider dropping that particular tax?

MR. NEARY:

Yes, boy it is only wasting time.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of that report. And, if I recall correctly, the report was commissioned by a group of companies who were interested in questioning the constitutionality of the tax, the imposition of tax by the Province.

When that report was received, or shortly after that report was received, the issue came up in the Supreme Court as to whether the case should be presented. And hon. members may be aware that the counsel for that group of companies, who was going to, shall we say, take the Province to court over this tax, they elected to ask that the case be postponed, and it was postponed indefinitely. At the time I believe the counsel suggested that this report was being studied by government. And we did receive the report and we have given it some study, but it was not our request that the case not go ahead. So I can only assume that the company felt the report really did not support the action that they wished to undertake.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, the report said that the tax was driving major advertisers from the Province, was discriminating between various media, and that it was hurting retail tax revenues. In light of that, Mr. Speaker, has the minister had any indication at all that we are losing revenue, particularly since the report said that

June 2, 1982

Tape 810

PK - 2

MR. HODDER: We had lost some millions  
of dollars of revenue because of the tax?

MR. NEARY: They cannot collect it.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, such remarks  
as the hon. member stated were in the report are not new. Ever  
since the tax was brought in in 1979 ,

DR. COLLINS: we have had representations from, I might say, interested parties, particularly advertising associations and so on and so forth, and they have come out with identical remarks to the ones that are stated to be in the report. When they have been made to us, and we have had a number of visitations both from such organizations here in the Province and from organizations on the mainland, we have asked these individuals to present us with factual details to support their suggestions and allegations. And to date the only receipt we have had of such factual details was the report that the hon. member has mentioned, and we are subjecting that to the study. But on a preliminary basis we can say that it really does not add anything very new to what is already known to the department.

MR. HODDER: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Final supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, since the report did say that we are losing revenue from the Province and that the Province is only collecting \$626,000, is the minister saying now that he is going to ignore that report and that he is going to continue with this stupid tax?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that we were going to ignore the report, I said we were going to study the report. What I did say was that there was no new factual information in the report that would lead us to accept the remarks and allegations that have been made to us many times.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, some time ago

I raised an important question, as are all the questions I raise, an important question, Sir, relating to the unorthodox

MR. LUSH: method used to catch rabbits in this Province and other small game.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Hon. members may laugh - this is an important matter, Mr. Speaker, destroying the rabbits in this Province and small game by this method that is against every conservation method, by this method that is most inhumane, a method, Mr. Speaker, of using gill nets in our forests to catch these rabbits and other small game. I raise the question with the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. TULK: They probably got loans from his department.

MR. LUSH: Maybe some of the environmentalists and some hunters throughout this Province can be told of how hon. members opposite are regarding this question - some of them very, very concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I raised the question, the minister said he was going to take the question under advisement and report back to the House, I wonder whether the minister has checked into this and what he has found?

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I have to agree with the hon. member that his questions are very important. Not nearly as important as the answers that are given usually. But I have checked into the matter



MR. L. SIMMS: somewhat, and I am advised that yes, indeed, there have been reports that on occasion this sort of incident has occurred. So I am aware of it.

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Now, then, that the minister has checked into to this and found out that it is going on on a large scale. I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House what action his department plans to take in this respect.

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

MR. SIMMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should point out that the difficulty is that the act itself was silent and did not address the issue specifically so, therefore, unfortunately, it was neither legal or illegal to do this. But just to indicate and give an example of the type of positive action that this government is undertaking and this particular department, instructions have gone out to the officials to have legislation drafted, hopefully it will be brought in this session, to make that particular type of incident illegal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize another member I would like to welcome to the galleries twenty grade VIII students from St. Anne's School in Dunville with their teacher Mr. Murphy. I welcome you indeed to the galleries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation

MR. G. WARREN: and Youth (Mr. L. Simms) and it does concern rabbits. We are getting prepared now for the opening of the rabbit season coming up in October.

I am just wondering if the minister considered having areas of the Province set aside for hunting rabbits by means of dogs and also by the individual snaring them? In the past there have been very close calls with hunters in the woods with the guns and dogs, while people were in there snaring at the same time. Has there been any consideration given to having different sections of the Province set aside for -

MR. W. CALLAN: Snaring.

MR. WARREN: - snaring and for the hunting of rabbits?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, in the short three week period that I have been the minister, unfortunately I cannot say that that is one of the issues

MR. SIMMS:

I have addressed, but I will look into it.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, if we can get away from the rabbits for a few minutes I would like to ask the Minister of Mines and Energy, if he or the Premier have had any representation from Labrador City protesting the policy of the Iron Ore Company of Canada in contracting out work to private contractors?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. NEARY:

I did not know that the gentleman was the Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR:

The hon. gentleman does not know what is what, does he?

MR. NEARY:

I thought I would direct my question, Mr. Speaker, to somebody who I thought might be able to answer it intelligently. So that is why my question is directed to the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

So would the Minister, whichever minister wants to answer it, Mr. Speaker, tell the House what action has been taken on these communications from the unions and other people in Labrador West in connection with contracting out?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Development

MR. WINDSOR:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I received a Telex from the union this morning, I responded immediately after consultation with my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). The meeting has been arranged for Friday afternoon, with the union, here in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

Would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House, because I think I read -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, I have got the same telegram. In the telegram, by the way, the union wanted to know, because the administration are so quick to pass a regulation barring topless waitresses in this Province, if they would act as swiftly on this matter of contracting out? Would the hon. gentleman tell the House what the position of the administration is on contracting out. This matter has been on the go now for a considerable period of time. Does the hon. gentleman intend to bring in a piece of legislation into this House to bar contracting out on behalf of that company?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the hon. gentleman is not quoting the Telex correctly. The Telex stated that the government brought in legislation dealing with topless waitresses, which of course is not accurate, we simply revised some regulations.

Secondly, indeed we will be taking some action. And in addition to arranging a meeting with the union, I have arranged at least one meeting with one of the mining companies in Labrador City and I am attempting to arrange a second with the other company in the very near future. In addition to that, we have been putting together some facts in the department and the officials have had meetings with officials of the mining companies and that has been ongoing for some time. We are putting together a full set of facts with which to sit down and discuss with the companies our present practice and whatever action needs to taken to subsequent to those meeting will be taken.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the  
hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, or Development,  
whichever minister would care to answer the question -

MR. BARRETT: It is the same one.

MR. NEARY It is the same one?

MR. BARRETT: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, would the hon. gentleman tell the House how serious the situation is in Labrador City in connection with layoffs that have taken place? I understand there are 150 people laid off as of today, I believe it is. And how serious is the situation with regard to down time, both with the Iron Ore Company of Canada and with the Wabush Mining Company. Do we have all the facts now or is the situation more serious than we are being told? And how serious are the layoffs? And what steps have this government taken to offset the social and economic impact of layoffs and down time in Labrador City and in Wabush?

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

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, obviously any layoff in the mining industry or any other industry in this Province is a serious matter and will be dealt with in that light by this government. We are very concerned about it. We have had meetings as well. My colleagues, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn), and the member for the area (Mr. Walsh) and I, with representatives from the area and have received briefs from them on some proposals which might alleviate some of the social implications from the economic implications of the problem. We are dealing with it and we will do anything that we can possibly do within the limitations of this government, and to alleviate those problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms). In the recent budget it was announced that there would be an increase in the fees for non-resident hunters, and I understand that there has been considerable concern expressed by the outfitters in the Province in that regard. And I wonder if the minister could indicate to the

MR. STAGG: House what the position of his department is with regard to the representation that has been made to him.

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker I am very pleased that the hon. member has asked the question because it has been a matter of some concern raised by hon. members in this House. But let me say that we have discussed this matter with the Outfitters Association,

MR. SIMMS: and in deciding whether or not to implement this increase in fees, we were aware of the problems that would be encountered if they were implemented for this particular season, 1982.

As members are probably aware, outfitters book their clients at least one year -

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

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to get this straightened out, Mr. Speaker. It is most improper and irregular to proceed with this kind of questioning during the half hour Question Period, but moreso, Mr. Speaker, because the question is being asked by the parliamentary assistant to the minister.

MR. SIMMS: He is not parliamentary assistant to me.

MR. NEARY: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is a blatant abuse of the rules of this House.

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. LUSH: How do you know?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, Parliamentary Assistant to a minister, I do not care what minister it is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: I think Beauchesne has something about parliamentary assistants in it.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Mr. Speaker, I would like for Your Honour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: No, we may as well get this matter -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we may as well get this matter straightened out now once and for all.



MR. NEARY: I would like for Your Honour to give a ruling on whether or not that is considered fair ball in the Oral Question Period.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on that.

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

MR. MARSHALL: First of all, the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and the other hon. members, while there has been an intention to appoint them and they have, I suppose, for all practical purposes been appointed Parliamentary Secretaries, from a legal point of view, they have, and as Your Honour is aware, first reading was given yesterday to the bill for the appointment of Parliamentary Secretaries to the ministers of the Crown. So until this act passes, the hon. gentleman is not -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - is still able to - and may I say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: I realize that the purpose of Question Period is also, surely must be, to elicit information, and I am sure this information is of interest to the outfitters and I compliment the member for asking it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I do not see why the hon. the Leader of the Opposition should object to the member for Stephenville asking the minister to bring in a matter of important information, of interest to the people of Newfoundland, and particularly the outfitters.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, Page 134, Section 370, says: "Those such as Parliamentary Secretaries who are clothed with the responsibility of answering for the Government ought not to use the time of the Question Period".

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear! Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Now, Mr. Speaker, regardless of whether the act has been passed or not, it is a fact that they have been working, and they have been working in their various duties for the past week, Mr. Speaker. Whether the act has been passed or not, they are working and acting as Parliamentary Secretaries.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

It is a very interesting point.

The time for Question Period has expired now. I will give an answer to it tomorrow.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation 1981 and the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services Limited 1980/81.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table an answer to a question asked by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) on May 14th.

The answer is nothing.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the six members of the town council of Chapel Arm. There are seven signatures on the petition including my own.

Mr. Speaker, let me read the prayer of the petition; it says: 'We, the undersigned residents of Chapel Arm and members of the town council of Chapel Arm, request that the provincial government make funding available to replace the old bridge over Western Cove Brook in Chapel Arm'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have done some inquiring about this bridge. I understand that present studies - and I notice that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is not in his seat but I hope that he is within listening distance. Because, Mr. Speaker, if I can quote from a letter that was written by the town clerk on behalf of the town council in Chapel Arm. it was written last Fall, September 15th, 1981, written to the hon. the Premier by the town clerk of Chapel Arm on behalf of the council. And the town clerk at that time said: "Dear Sir: The

MR. CALLAN:

town council of Chapel Arm

would again like to bring a matter of great concern to your attention and request your assistance. Prior to the last by-election in the district of Bellevue you met with council and one of the things discussed at that meeting was the condition of the bridge over Western Cove Brook here at Chapel Arm. At that time you informed council that you would look into this problem and see if you could help alleviate the situation." Now the town clerk goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say: "As was evident from your visit here, the present structure is an eyesore, number one; and has not been maintained properly over the past few years, number two; it is too narrow for two vehicles to cross and pass safely, simultancously, number three; and of even greater concern is the

MR. CALLAN:

safety of the people using the bridge. It is used daily by a number of school buses and council has had numerous complaints from parents who fear for the safety of their children having to cross this bridge. So, I think, Mr. Speaker, that is probably enough to read from that excerpt from that letter. Now, then, a reply to that letter from the town council last Fall, a reply was received on behalf of the Premier from the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the reply came on the 5th of October, twenty days later, and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) said to the town clerk, "I refer to your letter of the 15th of September 1981 to the attention of the Premier," and he says this, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) says, "My department has been aware for quite some time that the structure in question is in a deteriorated condition," says the minister, and secondly he says, "and needs to be replaced." That was last Fall, last October. So it is in a deteriorated condition and needs to be replaced. And that has been ongoing, that has been known by the minister's department for quite some time. Obviously that is the reason why a design for this particular bridge, for a new bridge to replace the old one has been completed for some time. "Unfortunately," the minister says, "there are a considerable number of bridges of similar vintage," and so on, "and my department is prioritizing all the bridges across the Province," and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) admitted last Fall that the bridge was in a deteriorated condition and needed to be replaced. Now, then, that was last Fall. On April 28th of this year I wrote the Premier about this bridge again,

June 2, 1982

Tape No. 817

ah-2

MR. CALLAN: following the general election.

I wrote the Premier and I reminded the Premier, of course  
Thank you! - I reminded the Premier that - one minute left -  
I reminded the Premier in this letter of April 28th of  
this year that the people who live across the bridge in  
Western Cove, they had voted for the PC candidate and  
the PC party, they had voted three to one to try and get  
this bridge replaced so the Premier could not use politics  
to keep it from them.

MR. W. CALLAN:

But the Premier in his reply says, 'An inspection of this bridge was carried out on Monday, May 10th' - that is the day that the infamous Speech from the Throne was read here - 'An inspection was carried out by my officials or officials of the department. That inspection determined that the structure is quite safe.' The minister last Fall admitted that it was in a deteriorated condition and needed to be replaced, and the Premier this Spring says, that it is quite safe. So, Mr. Speaker, that is all the time I have left. I hope as a result of the meeting that I held with the Chapel Arm Town Council last week, at which time they decided to affix their signatures to this petition and asked me to present it in the House. I hope as a result of that that the minister will be able to say when he stands that funding has been allocated for this bridge this year, and that the bridge will be constructed this year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and transported to the department to which it relates.

MR. R. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, over the past year or so since I became Minister of Transportation - I represent a district, of course, as everyone is probably aware that very prevalent to bridge collapse from time to time for the same reasons as the hon. member indicated, were the reasons why the bridge in that particular area was dilapidated or deteriorating and perhaps needs to be replaced. There are a number of such bridges. An assessment was done which shows that there are quite a number. It shows that the capital costs necessary to

MR. R. DAWK: replace the bridges that are deteriorating and need to be replaced are considerable, and it is with this in mind that government this year has allocated a significantly greater amount of funding for bridge replacement and repair in the Province, and I am pleased that it is happening. There is a difference, Mr. Speaker, in the bridge deteriorating and needing to be replaced than the bridge actually being safe, that is the bearing load of the bridge being safe and adequate to carry the vehicles and the type of traffic that is traversing over it. Department officials are continually doing safety checks on the bridges to see if they can, in fact, carry the load that they are intended to do. If it is not that, they do a stress assessment on the



MR. DAWE: bridge, and the necessary weight reductions are posted properly and supervised so that if there is that necessity to lower the weight going over the bridge, then that is done.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, that government has seen fit, and the department has seen fit to allocate additional funding towards the reconstruction and the repair of bridges in the Province and I hope this will continue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) and I want to congratulate the member, Mr. Speaker, for the excellent job that he is doing for his constituents.

Yesterday my hon. friend was asked to leave the House because he had very strong views and strong feelings in connection with another matter in his district. And, I think, Mr. Speaker, we all have to admire and respect the hon. gentleman for standing up -

MR. WARREN: He stood up to them.

MR. NEARY: and fighting for his constituents the way that he is.

MR. MARSHALL: Just like we admire (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: Just like we would admire Anarchy and Fascism.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. -

MR. CALLAN: Your colleague John Crosbie does it and is a hero.

MR. NEARY: Yes, their idol.

MR. CALLAN: The hon. John.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman again today -

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible) John did it.

MR. NEARY: - the hon. gentleman again today has shown beyond any shadow of doubt -

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - that his number one priority is the interest of his constituents -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - and the safety of the people who drive over that bridge.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was rather disappointed with the input by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). The hon. gentleman got up and rambled on about his department having allocated more funding this year for bridge repairs and replacements. And the hon. gentleman did not address himself to the petition, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman did not say first or last if he stood in his place to support the petition or if he was just getting up to gain some little political Brownie points.

MR. WARREN: By the way, there is a new bridge going in in Grand Bank.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that this bridge in Western Cove Brook needs to be replaced.

MR. WARREN: Moreso than the one in Grand Bank.

MR. NEARY: It is not only deteriorated it is in -

MR. WARREN: I drove over it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the bridge is a safety hazard.

MR. WARREN: Political patronage, yes.

MR. NEARY: The minister himself confirmed that the bridge is unsafe and should be replaced.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he did not.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what I understood from my hon. colleague, in the letter that my hon. colleague read.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Let me see the letter.

MR. CALLAN: It is too narrow.

MR. DAWE: It is deteriorating and it needs to be replaced.

MR. NEARY: Deteriorating and it needs to be replaced.

MR. CALLAN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if a bridge is deteriorating and needs to be replaced, then the only thing that I can think about a bridge like that, I would be very careful,

MR. NEARY: I would be very reluctant to go over it. If the minister confirms that it is deteriorating and needs to be replaced then, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman does not have the courage to say it I will say it, That obviously the bridge is unsafe.

MR. WARREN: Yes. Right on.

MR. NEARY: And pretty soon somebody is going to be hurt or killed on that bridge.

MR. WARREN: But he said it in a letter sure. He said it in a letter.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. gentleman will remember that the matter was raised by my colleague in this hon. House, and I hope that we do not have to wait for a serious accident on that bridge before the hon. gentleman will take action to have it replaced. The hon. Premier says no, in his examination of the -

MR. CALLAN: My letter to the Premier, look.

MR. NEARY: The hon. the Premier says no, that his examination of the bridge shows that it is all right. But I would be more inclined, after what we heard yesterday, after what we have been hearing since the election, Mr. Speaker, I would be more inclined to believe the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) than I would to take the word of the Premier for the condition of that bridge.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what my hon. colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) said when he wrote the Premier on April 28th., he says, "Dear Premier Peckford, I write at this time concerning the condition of the bridge at Chapel Arm, Trinity Bay. The bridge in question must be used by all the residents of the

MR. NEARY: area of Chapel Arm, commonly referred to as Western Cove. The bridge has been deemed unsafe for heavy loads for several years."

MR. CALLAN: Right.

MR. MARSHALL: You are going to table that letter are you?

MR. NEARY: Pardon? Yes. Sure. Sure, Mr. Speaker, we have no hesitation in tabling anything we quote from. It is only the hon. gentlemen on the other side that refuse to table documents when they quote from them.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and I regret very much that when the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) felt compelled to rise in his place to speak on this petition that he did not tell the hon. gentleman, and now I will ask him, would he give us a list of the bridges that are going to be repaired and replaced this year? If the hon. gentleman was going to speak in support of the petition he should have addressed himself to the petition and he should have answered my colleague man fashion, straightforward, yes or no, is that bridge on the list to be repaired or replaced this year?

Mr. Speaker, that is a reasonable request and again -

MR. MARSHALL: You are going to table that letter?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CALLAN: Everyone in Chapel Arm has got it so why not.

June 2, 1982

Tape No. 820

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: - I wholeheartedly support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), to keep up the good work.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. gentleman has referred to a letter and he said he was going to table it, but he has not yet and we would like to see the letter tabled, in accordance with the rules.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It being Private Members' Day we shall carry on with motion number five.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear hear!

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

This is a motion that refers to matters that have been previously very vigorously debated in the House. It is a motion concerning the offshore situation and I will read the recitals and the proposed resolution into the record: WHEREAS the provincial government entered into offshore negotiations with the federal government on the understanding that the ownership issue had been put aside; AND WHEREAS the federal government requested and obtained an expansion of the SIU labour relations court case into the area of offshore ownership during the period of the negotiations; AND WHEREAS the provincial government subsequently referred the offshore ownership issue to the Newfoundland Supreme Court; BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House support the position of the Newfoundland Government in that it is willing to reopen negotiations on the offshore issue with the federal government as soon as the federal government agrees to set aside the ownership issue for the duration of the negotiations and permanently should an agreement be reached.

Now, Mr. Speaker, of course we have very vigorously and at some length debated a similar resolution before the House approximately two weeks ago, when the federal government unilaterally referred a partial question concerning the Hibernia oil field to the Supreme Court of Canada. And to some extent arguments that can be made today will be similar to arguments made previously. However, that is not to derogate in any way from the importance of this argument.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to generally develop my talk on three main areas. I am going to review the Clark/Peckford position in 1979, and then I am going to review the Peckford/Trudeau position in May of 1981. I am going to generally review our proposal

MR. STAGG: on the offshore, the proposal that was made in January of this year, and hopefully, if I have time, to generally review where we are at the present time. I do not know if I will have adequate time, it is a twenty minute period, believe, Mr. Speaker - is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Yes.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, in September of 1979, this is where Newfoundland and Ottawa stood: You will recall that this was during the time when Prime Minister Clark was Prime Minister of Canada and, of course, the present Premier was the then Premier. And the basic principle that was arrived at between the two parties is enunciated in an exchange of correspondence in September of that year, and I will refer to the main item in that correspondence which was an unanimous agreement between the two parties, that of the basic principles which would concern offshore mineral resources.

The main one is as follows:

'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.



MR. STAGG: 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 these resources within the boundaries of the Province. And historically, Mr. Speaker, of course what happened was in the House of Commons in December of 1979, the government was defeated and there was a subsequent election and the Trudeau government was elected in February of 1980 and then came the Peckford/Trudeau position which was enunciated in a letter by the Premier to Prime Minister Trudeau on May 19, 1981. And the Premier at that time was responding to the position put forward by Prime Minister Trudeau at a Liberal fund raising dinner at Memorial University, where he made statements concerning the federal government's very amenable and conciliatory attitude on the offshore, and there was an apparent departure from the previous inflexible attitude. And the Premier said in his letter of May 19th, 1981, "Your remarks have created the impression in the Province that you have changed your previous position with regard to Newfoundland's right of ownership of offshore minerals. Your comments have been interpreted to mean that a new federal proposal now exists with regard to the fundamental issues of revenue sharing and resource management. As you know, our position is that the resource should be treated as if it were located on land in respect to revenue sharing and resource management.

I have responded publicly to your comments and expressed my willingness to commence negotiations towards a political settlement of the offshore question. However, to this time no response has been forthcoming. The purpose of this letter therefore is to

MR. STAGG: formalize a response to the offer which it is understood you have made. In light of your expression of willingness to enter into negotiations, I would assume that your position with respect to the SIU case now before the federal court will be altered to involve only the labour relations issue. May 19, 1981, approximately one year ago, that was the position put in writing, put forward by the Premier, tabled in the House shortly afterwards. It was tabled in the House on May 21, 1981. And as we all know, negotiations subsequently commenced in approximately September

MR. STAGG:

and October of 1981. And obviously, from the Province's position, these negotiations commenced on the basis that the understanding which was implicit in the letter of the Premier of May 19th, there was an understanding that these were the ground rules that were being followed. And there is a well-known axiom with regard to negotiations, Mr. Speaker, that if you fail to register dissent in a matter, and that dissent would be critical to the carrying on of negotiations, it is generally assumed among people who are honourable in their dealings with one another that 'silence is acquiescence'. In other words, if you were asked a question which is integral to the resolution or negotiations on any matter and you demur to reply or you allow a situation to exist or events to unfold such that the other party would agree or would be of the understanding that you had accepted their pre-conditions then, of course, as honourable people, you would be governed by the principle of 'silence is acquiescence'. And that, of course, is the reason that we undertook these negotiations back in the Fall of 1981. And the position, of course, of the Newfoundland Government was and still is that the offshore ownership question should be set aside during the period of negotiations and that it would be permanently set aside if and when an agreement were reached.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG:

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon.

members opposite obviously have very little interest in the import of the matters that we are discussing here today and I would like to invoke the rule of the House that an hon. member, when speaking, be heard in silence.

June 2, 1982

Tape 823

EC - 2

MR. STAGG: If the hon. member opposite,  
the hon. the Opposition House Leader, does not  
wish to hear what I have to say, then, of course, he

MR. STAGG: can leave the Chamber and do whatever he does best.

MR. HODDER: (inaudible) House and nobody of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the Clark - Peckford position, which, of course, is the best position that Newfoundland has ever enjoyed with regard to the offshore question, and let me just say in support of that position that if that had been resolved and if the incoming government in February of 1980 had gone on that assumption, we would not have in this Province today the critical unemployment situation that we do have. You will recall that Alberta and the West during the stormy seventies when the economies of the whole world and the rest of Canada were being shaken, that Alberta had a very strong position because of their resource development. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you that if that position, the Clark - Peckford position, which was enunciated in 1979 had been followed through with, that Newfoundland would be a hub of activity today. It would be very difficult to have people in the galleries today, Mr. Speaker, it would be difficult to find anybody on the street who was idle, because Newfoundland would be humming, thousands of people would be working who are now not working because of the callous disregard for Newfoundland's position which was embodied in the Trudeau position, which was taken after the election of 1980.

However, being trusting people and wanting to do best, and being implored by all and sundry to get into negotiations, sit down at the negotiating table, do what you can, people like the various boards of trade and chambers of commerce and individual businessmen put pressure on the government to get out there, get negotiating, you cannot

MR. STAGG:                                resolve this issue unless you are talking to one another, then the government, still not having received a reply to the May 19th., 1981 letter, receiving only silence in reply, nevertheless took a calculated risk that the federal government, Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Trudeau, were men of honour, and that they would carry through with what appeared to be their stated intention, then we entered into the negotiations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened?

What happened with regard to the STU case?

MR. F. STAGG:

The SIU case is now, to some extent, old history, but it is very interesting to review this for the sake of putting into perspective the kind of problems that we have in this Province, the kind of problems that are now being epitomized by the difficulties that we are experiencing in St. Anthony and places like that. But one of the main problems that we have with the federal government is apparently you cannot trust their word. Because this Province entered into negotiations on the basis that the SIU case would be set aside. So what happens early this year? In February of this year, the federal government appears before the federal court of Canada and makes an argument of wanting to expand the SIU case to encompass the whole question of who owns the offshore. Well this, of course, is completely in disregard and opposite to the spirit with which the Province of Newfoundland entered these negotiations, looking for a speedy and honourable resolution of the problem. It just did not happen. And when, of course, the federal government appeared in court in Ottawa with their barrage of lawyers, with, I think twenty-one pounds of written material - that was their cursory brief, as it was called by them. They had twenty-one pounds of material before the court outlining their position with regard to the offshore before the court, and suggesting that his labour relations case could not be resolved unless the ownership question was resolved, - That our Newfoundland Government and our caucus and, I guess, really, the Newfoundland people, were asked to make a decision, what could and should we do? And, of course, when you are confronted with this type of situation decisions have to be made. The decision that was made was to refer the question of ownership to our own Newfoundland Court of Appeal, and this was done in February of this year. And subsequently, in a historical election in this Province, the people

MR. F. STAGG: of the Province endorsed the Province's position which had been taken and emunciated by the Premier on February 12th, I believe it was, this year, when we announced that we were going to take this case to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. We have heard subsequently, of course, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has referred this matter unilaterally to the Supreme Court of Canada, and we heard here in the House today the responses that we have received from two of the Liberal M.P.'s. Mr. George Baker, the M.P. for Gander - Twillingate, made a relatively equivocal reply, but his reply was not totally negative. The other man, who once sat in this House of Assembly, the member for Burin - St. George's, Mr. Simmons, has gotten a fair amount



MR. STAGG:

of publicity across the Province as he parades himself around and, I guess, tries to ingratiate himself with Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Trudeau by denouncing his own people and denouncing the unanimous resolution of this government. As a matter of fact, I think I might quote something from his telex to the Premier.

MR. DAWE:

Sometimes he comes down without his leash.

MR. STAGG:

Sometimes he comes down without his leash, the Minister of Transportation says. I have not seen him without his leash, but I suppose there are times when he does come without it.

This is reading partially from the telegram in which the member for Burin - St. George's (Mr. Simmons) responded to the unanimous resolution that was put forward by this House. He said, "Do you ask that I condemn the action of the federal government in referring the matter to the Supreme Court, to condemn an initiative which will serve to resolve the question of offshore jurisdiction as soon as possible? And, secondly, how can you ask me to condemn the self-same action which your administration took last February?" And so on and so on.

The member for Burin:-

St. George's, Mr. Speaker, is going to face that issue fair and square in 1984 or thereabouts and he is not going to be allowed off the hook with it. And while he has gotten some cheap publicity on the issue, very cheap publicity, the same man who jumped up and down and had the floor for five minutes on a vote when John Crosbie was being thrown out of the House of Commons for accusing the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chretien)

MR. STAGG: of lying to the House -  
and I think it has been borne out that John Chretien  
did indeed lie to the House of Commons - that man is  
going to face the issue.

The member for Humber -  
Port au Port - St. Barbe, Mr. Tobin, has been a little  
more clever on the issue. He has been sent a telegram  
by the Premier, he has been sent a telegram by the  
Minister of Education (Ms Verge), asking for his  
position. Well, he just sat back and said nothing  
hoping that the cloud will go over him and he will not  
have to face the issue. But it is not going to escape  
any of them, Mr. Speaker. The day of resolution is  
coming and, as I said before, the election campaign  
federally is beginning. Yes, I make no complaint  
about it, make no backdoors about it, it is

MR. STAGG:

starting. One of the main ways that we will resolve this issue, we will deal with the sinister attitude of the federal government with regard to this Province, is we will defeat them at the polls. It is quite simple. Some people have said to me, you should not say that. You should not tip your hand, that you are out to defeat them. Well, I tell all and sundry that I will be campaigning very vigorously, and I am sure that all members here will be campaigning very vigorously, to return seven or eight P.C. M.Ps to Ottawa in 1984 or thereabout, whenever they get the initiative -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

- whenever they get the guts to go to the polls and that is it. I make no bones about it, that is where I stand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we want off shore, we want these negotiations to recommence. We want them to recommence. I am sure that if these five Liberal members of the House of Commons were to recant, if they were to go back and say, 'Look, the unanimous resolution of our colleagues, our eight colleagues in the House of Assembly' - and obviously the eight Liberals in the House of Assembly are to be commended for the initiative that they took. I have stood many, many times - I am one of the more partisan members of the House.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible).

MR. STAGG:

It is something that I have cultivated over the years. I have never been called impartial when it comes to dealing with members of the Opposition, but in this regard I have commended them and I do commend them. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if they are able to get through to their federal colleagues that it is time for them to get back

MR. STAGG: to the negotiating table.  
to agree that the very reasonable position put forward on  
January 25, 1982, called a proposal for settlement - I commend  
it to the reading of every Newfoundlander. I guess I do not  
have time to get into the details on it, some of the things,  
but I will just deal with a couple of the highlights, if I can  
find my notes here, Mr. Speaker. I suppose you cannot find  
them when - here are some of the highlights in that agreement:

MR. STAGG: 'Both governments would set aside their ownership claims and become co-owners of the resource'. This greedy Newfoundland Government agrees that there would be joint tenancy in the offshore, it is like a marriage. In 1979 we amended the Matrimonial Property Act so that there was joint tenancy with regard to property owned by a husband and wife. Well this is like a marriage, we are proposing a marriage between the federal and provincial governments.

MR. TULK: What about if they divorce?

MR. STAGG: No, we will outlaw divorces, because it will be put in the constitution that there can be no divorce with regard to that particular issue. 'Both governments would set aside their ownership claims and become co-owners of the resource!'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Hon. members opposite are caterwauling and they are not giving me a chance to finish, Mr. Speaker. They are supposedly the people who endorse this position. I do not know if they want their federal colleagues to forget it or not. 'Both governments would be equal under our proposal. Both governments would receive their share of revenues directly from a joint agency which would have a neutral chairman.'

MR. TULK: - vote for this one.

MR. STAGG: 'Arrangement could only be changed with the consent of both governments', and not like what happened in Australia, where the states there, which are similar to our provinces, thought they had an agreement and when the federal government there thought it was propitious, or when they had friends on the bench or whatever, they referred

MR. STAGG: it to the Supreme Court of Australia and it was - found to be in the federal domain and they tore up the agreement. And what would be the major economic benefits package of this agreement? that hon. members opposite never read during the election, by the way I must say, I have commended them on supporting us on the resolution but they will certainly reap what they sow when they did not read the proposal. They found out about it a month and a half later, obviously the election passed them by.

The major economic benefits package: There would be programmes to expand and maximize involvement of local labour and business in offshore activities: Well that is something, Mr. Speaker. Well that is something, Mr. Speaker. Employment and local labour and business, we get an awful lot of people putting pressure on this government, putting pressure on the Premier, putting pressure on all of us to get an agreement and get it going. Well, there is where these people- this is where the business community of Newfoundland should be putting their emphasis. They should not be putting it to us or to the Opposition who unanimously agree that what the federal government has done is reprehensible, they should be reading the report, reading the proposal in the first place - and I suggest an awful lot of people in the Province who think they know what they are talking about actually do not know what they are talking about, because they have us painted, they have the provincial government painted as a group of people who are uncompromising and stubborn. Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not stand up. When we say both governments would be equal, both governments would set their ownership claims aside and become co-owners of the resource, it would, in effect, be a marriage.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! I must  
inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BUTT: By leave. By leave.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that to be consistent with the position of this side of the House on this issue, we are going to support the private member's motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, again the three important issues that we support, that we as Liberals support. We support a power corridor across the Province of Quebec, and we thank the Government of Canada for having the courage to fly in the face of stiff opposition from the Tories, nationally, and from Quebec, and put this piece of legislation through the House. And I am told by Mr. Chretien, during his visit to Newfoundland recently, that the Government of Canada intend to stick by their guns. So the hon. gentleman could have stayed home from Ottawa, he could have stayed home, He did not have to appear before any committee, because Mr. Chretien said that the Government of Canada-told me and my colleagues - intend to stick by that corridor, that legislation that will give Newfoundland a corridor across Quebec, that will stay.

And we support the reopening of the power contract on the Upper Churchill. But, Mr. Speaker, let me say this, we support the reopening of that contract on the Upper Churchill but we condemn, strongly condemn, the Opposition of the day, the PC Opposition of the day, for not fighting tooth and nail against that legislation.

MR. TULK: Who was that?

MR. NEARY: We condemn the Opposition of that time, Mr. Speaker, There was a PC Opposition in the House and they did not object to that BRINCO bill. They could have, They could have voted against it, They did not vote against it, Mr. Speaker, and they are to be condemned forever



MR. NEARY: by the people of this Province for their negligence, for their being so lax in carrying out their duties and their responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Opposition to oppose and the Opposition of that day, the PC Opposition, did not oppose, they sold Newfoundland down the river, they did not do their job. The PC Opposition of that day did not do their job, Mr. Speaker, they sold Newfoundland out to Quebec. The PC Opposition of that day did not raise a finger in objection to the BRINCO bill, which eventually led to a contract between this Province and Quebec Hydro.

MR. TULK: Who were the members?

MR. STAGG: It is not logical.

MR. NEARY: It is logical, Mr. Speaker, it is just as good as the logic that we hear from the mad hatter administration. It is just as sensible as the logic we just heard from the hon. gentleman who spoke in support of his private member's resolution. There was an awful phony ring to what the hon. gentleman had to say, a phony ring. Now I am not saying that the hon. gentleman is phony, but there was a phony ring to his words of support. And, Mr. Speaker, let that go

June 2, 1982

Tapc No. 830

ah-1

MR. NEARY: on the record, that the Tory opposition, the PC opposition in this House -

MR. TULK: Did they see the power contract?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they did not even ask to see it, and that is why I am condemning the opposition.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making points that do not make sense. That he can do. That he does all the time, but he is not allowed to make points that are irrelevant. The issue that is before Your Honour today is the motion that the hon. House supports the position of the Government of Newfoundland in that  
It relates to the offshore case. I direct Your Honour to Standing Order 51 (b) which says, "Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called to the attention of the House, or of the Committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or needless repetition, may direct him to discontinue." Now, I rise on this point of order, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. gentleman is being irrelevant in the matter. This is a very important issue brought forth very seriously by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). If the hon. members of the Opposition do not choose to debate it, I know that there are people on this side of the House who are quite prepared to -

PREMIER PECKFORD: What a way to waste the time of -

MR. MARSHALL: -debate it. The hon. gentleman is talking about transmission corridors and what have you, and his impression of them and, you know, and as silly and puerile as that is I will not get into it, but he is being -

MR. HODDER: How much more time are you going to waste?

MR. MARSHALL: - irrelevant with an issue before the House.

MR. HODDER: Sit down and shut-up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order. I wish to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition of the resolution. As I read it it deals with the offshore and the offshore negotiations and I would wish to remind the Leader of the rule relevance.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the little bit of history that I was -

MR. TULK: Background.

MR. NEARY: Yes. The little bit of background and the little bit of history, I will deal with that later, Mr. Speaker. And the third issue that we support, not necessarily support the government now, Mr. Speaker, that we support, and there is a difference, is that Newfoundland owns the offshore. We have supported that principle and we continue to do so, Mr. Speaker. And hon. gentlemen can bring in all the resolutions they want in this House. They can recycle the resolutions, they can reword them, they can do what they like with them, Mr. Speaker. They must have brought in by now a score of resolutions on this subject and every time they brought them in we have supported them. And every time they continue to bring them in

MR. NEARY: in the future we will support them. But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that a government under the British parliamentary system is elected to govern. They put forth their plans and policies and their proposals before the House and before the people of this Province. That is what they are elected to do, Mr. Speaker. And then the Opposition either opposes or supports these policies and these plans and these proposals.

MR. STAGG: That is not relevant.

MR. NEARY: It is relevant. Mr. Speaker, up to now, in the last two years, this administration has refused to govern and all they do day in and day out, week in and week out in this House, is to bring in resolutions condemning this one, condemning that one, condemning the other one, condemning Ottawa, condemning Nova Scotia. That is what they spend all their time at, Mr. Speaker, bringing in resolutions and not putting forward any plans or policies or programmes of their own. And they have brought in this resolution now a score of times, and a score of times we have supported the ownership question, and we have no difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this resolution. But we are getting a bit concerned, Mr. Speaker, at the number and the variety of ways that this government has of putting this and similar resolutions before this hon. House. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the only resolutions that this government is able to generate are related to offshore and a condemnation of the federal government. And in case hon. gentlemen might think that I am exaggerating, they should read the Order Paper today and look at the resolutions that have been sponsored by government members. Every resolution is negative, every resolution is a condemnation of the Government of Canada or a

MR. NEARY:                   condemnation of somebody.  
Not one new member had the courage of his convictions  
or had the courage, period, to present a resolution  
that had something positive in it, that criticized  
his own administration, the administration that he  
is supporting, for not putting forward their plans  
and policies. Not one new member had the courage  
to do that, Mr. Speaker. And I would submit,  
Mr. Speaker, that these members are doomed to  
oblivion. They will, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG:               We have heard that before.

MR. NEARY: Hon. gentlemen should realize that getting elected is easy, getting re-elected is not so easy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRETT: You are trying to tar your own side

MR. NEARY: Well I have only got seven in a row now, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that is a record for this Province, by the way.

MR. STAGG: Joey must have had more.

MR. NEARY: No he does not. He had six and then a break and then number seven. I have seven in a row.

MR. AYLWARD: That is not what you said.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, that is what I said. I said I have seven in a row. That is a record in this Province, seven in a row.

MR. RIDEOUT: Time to apply for Senator.

MR. NEARY: Pardon.

MR. RIDEOUT: Make Senate application.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, and number eight is not too far away.

MR. WINDSOR: You are going to run federally.

MR. NEARY: Number eight, I have my eye on one seat in this House that I have not occupied yet.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear. Right on.

MR. NEARY: And I am beginning to like this job, Mr. Speaker, The job is good, I am getting excellent co-operation from my colleagues.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I put this resolution on the Order Paper for a specific purpose, that I wanted the House to debate it. The hon. member has persisted in irrelevance

MR. STAGG: throughout the whole of his speech, he does not want to direct himself to the issue, if not, he should be directed to sit down. As the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) previously indicated, the hon. member may not persist in irrelevant discussion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

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

MR. HODDER: It has been general in discussions on Private Members' Day to have some leniency in debate but the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was only provoked, Mr. Speaker, by the member who stood on the point of order. And basically, Mr. Speaker, if members on that side want to muzzle us here, or if they want to heckle - there must be some give and take in this House of Assembly. I notice, Mr. Speaker, since the Leader of the Opposition has been speaking, there have been two points of order and both times, I think, Mr. Speaker, attempts to try and muzzle and to try to interfere with him as he tries to make his speech.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: If I may, Mr. Speaker, briefly on that point of order. The hon. gentleman says that it has been tradition that on a private member's resolution there is great latitude, He is wrong on that. The rules quite clearly indicate that in the Address in Reply and in the Budget Speech is a time when there can be wide-ranging debate on all items and all matters.

Now the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has put a very serious resolution on the Order Paper here with respect to offshore activities. If the hon. gentleman wishes to, as he has for the past

MR. MARSHALL:                                   ten minutes, speak about all sorts of irrelevancies - he is not addressing himself, Mr. Speaker, to the situation, he is usurping the time of this House. And he would be better off taking his seat and allowing other members to speak who can address themselves relevantly to this important issue. After all, if the member has brought this issue up, he is entitled to have it treated seriously and with relevancy.



MR. NEARY: Sit down boy. Go back to your lily pad, boy. There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: You were irrelevant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, Oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNICHOLAS): To that point of order.

MR. NEARY: Now, look, you just keep out of this. You are not Speaker anymore, you know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMS: Be careful now. That is another thing (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: You crawled into the Cabinet, slithered in, so leave the Speaker alone.

MR. SIMMS: I am following the lead of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To that point of order my immediate predecessor ruled that the speech was getting irrelevant. I will ask the hon. member to stick to the motion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the resolution itself is irrelevant.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: And so, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman tried to give us a bit of the history, a bit of the history of offshore. Well let me remind this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier, when he was Minister of Mines in this Province, put out a glossy brochure on a policy, the energy policy of this administration. And in that brochure he said that the matter of offshore would ultimately have to be settled in the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. TULK: Did he say that?

MR. NEARY: And at that time the background for that was that they had prepared a case

MR. HODDER: He sent out a brochure.

MR. NEARY: - they had spent hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money to prepare their case. And they felt that they had such a strong case that there was no problem winning the battle before the court and they sent a brochure out to every householder in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the SIU case. The SIU case was triggered by this administration and by Crosbie's offshore. The SIU came into this Province, as they felt it was their jurisdiction, to organize the employees, the workers on the supply ships. And when the national representative of the Seafarers International Union came to Newfoundland to offer his co-operation and his help and his assistance to the government, he was insulted by the Minister of Manpower (Mr. Dinn) in this Province, who was rude to him in his office. And Mr. Speaker they had to fight tooth and nail to organize the workers on the offshore vessels. And when they did get them organized, Mr. Speaker, when they did get them organized through a secret ballot, the ballot boxes were not allowed to be opened because of the rudeness and the insulting attitude of the Minister of Labour and Manpower especially, and the arrogant attitude of the administration and the spokesman for Crosbie's Offshore.

MR. BARRETT: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Oh, well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman will have his chance to get up

MR. S. NEARY: and defend Crosbie's offshore and Mr. Spelacy whenever he wants. But, Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. The SIU were forced into the court and the former minister who got flicked out, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. L. Barry) knew that. He knew that the SIU case was going to trigger a very important case before the Supreme Court, as far as ownership was concerned. But the government were either too dense or they buried their heads in the sand and did not want to recognize this, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said a few moments ago, the federal government did not get a mandate of forty-four seats to run this Province. The members on the opposite side did, and the people did not give the hon. gentlemen a mandate to waste the precious time of this hon. House on such things as resolution after resolution on the very same thing, Mr. Speaker. There is a rule against repetition in this hon. House. Mr. Speaker, these resolutions are merely a smoke screen set up by the government to draw attention away from its other responsibilities which it is grossly neglecting, such as the fishery, the construction industry, health services in this Province and the economy in general.

MR. HOUSE: Health services are very good.

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, like it happened today.

MR. TULK: How do you know?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not even know the importance of fluoride.

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is right.

MR. NEARY: His ignorance came through today in the Committee, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: In the Committee too, by the way. Right on, right on.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want you to know and all Newfoundlanders to know -

MR. TULK: Be quite now before your foot goes in your mouth.

MR. NEARY: - that you could not imagine the speed and the enthusiasm of support that you Your Honour, would get, and members from that side of the House would get, if this government ever decides to offer a resolution in the areas that I just mentioned. To offer a resolution in the area of its own jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that this administration started governing. If this government ever decides, Mr. Speaker, to try and improve the lots of Newfoundlanders with something which is under their authority, we shall salute and applaud them far and wide, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: You will not wear out your arm saluting, do not worry about that.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about events which may be ten or twelve or fifteen years down the road, such as is included in this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, while this government plays its little political games, one-upmanship, while they are doing that, while they have their case before the Newfoundland Court and the federal government have their case before the Supreme Court, while they are doing that, Mr. Speaker, Halifax, Nova Scotia, is stealing the march.

MR. NEARY: And if we do not watch it, Mr. Speaker, the oil ship will soon pass us by if it has not already passed us by.

DR. COLLINS: Aided and abetted by the Feds.

MR. NEARY: Aided and abetted by nobody.

DR. COLLINS: Now he does not like it. Mr. Speaker, the sole

MR. NEARY: responsibility for the situation we find ourselves in in this Province today on the offshore, falls on the shoulders of the members of the administration sitting on the opposite side. And if they continue to play political games and waste -

DR. COLLINS: What would you do about it?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker. What I would do, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WINDSOR: Another Upper Churchill?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I tried to explain that. I was not allowed to talk about it, but I am going to talk about it in another debate. Mr. Speaker, the only sensible, common-sense and decent way to settle this matter is through negotiations. And, Mr. Speaker, what the administration should do is put the ultimatum to Ottawa and say, 'Look, we are prepared to withdraw -

MR. TULK: How are you going to negotiate with them? You cannot negotiate on one side.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the administration should say, 'We are prepared to withdraw our case from the Newfoundland Appeals Court if you will withdraw your case from the Supreme Court of Canada and let us sit down around the negotiating table and settle this matter to the mutual satisfaction of all concerned and in the

MR. NEARY: best interests of the people  
of this Province.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: His maiden speech.

MR. SIMMS: No, it is not my maiden speech.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address  
myself to this resolution for a short period of time.  
Most of the comments made by the hon. the Leader of the  
Opposition, of course, were totally irrelevant, as pointed  
out throughout the course of his comments - nothing at  
all to do with the resolution. He talked about the three  
member Opposition back in the day of the Upper Churchill  
contract,

MR. SIMMS: but did not talk about the thirty-nine Liberals who formed the government of that particular day who sold this Province down the drain by signing that particular agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: And he blames that on the Opposition of the day. I ask you is that logic? Probably Liberal logic, yes, but it certainly is not logic. Then he talked about governing the Province, how you govern a province and things of that nature. Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that we know how to govern. We know how to govern the Province and that is evident and, also, that the people of this Province supported us on April 6th and they to know that we can govern the Province.

MR. HODDER: Premier Levesque told us about how he governs.

MR. SIMMS: He also throws in all kinds of silly little things like, "There is only one seat that I have not occupied ever in this Province, only one seat." And he always points over to the Premier's seat. But, of course, he forgets to mention that he has never occupied the Speaker's seat and is not ever likely to do so either. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to the resolution and try to be relevant, the resolution that has been so ably presented by my colleague the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). And it bears repeating, Mr. Speaker. It is a resolution that addresses perhaps the most important issue facing our Province today. The resolution says, "WHEREAS the provincial government entered into offshore negotiations with the federal government on the understanding that the ownership issue had been put aside; AND WHEREAS the federal government requested and obtained an expansion of the SIU labour relations court case into the area of

MR. SIMMS: offshore ownership during the period of negotiations; AND WHEREAS the provincial government subsequently referred the offshore ownership issue to the Newfoundland Supreme Court." It does not mention the other issue that has arisen since this resolution was drafted, or the fact that it has been unilaterally referred to the Federal Supreme Court by the federal government.

"BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House supports the position of the Newfoundland Government in that it is willing to reopen negotiations on the offshore issue with the federal government as soon as the federal government agrees to set aside the ownership issue for the duration of the negotiations and permanently should an agreement be reached."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to, at the outset, say that I, for one, as a Newfoundlander was totally shocked and dismayed when I heard that the federal government had unilaterally referred the question of the offshore to the Supreme Court of Canada.

MR. DINN: Shocking!

MR. SIMMS: I simply could not believe that the man responsible for justice for all Canadians, Mr. Chretien, aided and abetted, I might add, by our own federal minister, Mr. Rompkey, who sat at this side, came to Newfoundland for a few brief moments and made this announcement, that they were going to refer this question to the Supreme Court of Canada. Not the question of the offshore, by the way, but just the question on Hibernia which, itself, seems absolutely uncanny and ludicrous. In fact,



MR. SIMMS: We now know that the area referred to in the federal question, when plotted out on a map, proves to be much larger than Hibernia. Indeed, it covers some 820 square miles and the Hibernia field only comprises some 35 square miles. The area also contains the main part of the Hebron field and part of the Ben Nevis field. So the use of the Hibernia only concept is really a method to try to fool the Canadian public into thinking that the question before the Supreme Court of Canada is somehow different from the question before the Newfoundland Court of Appeal, thus justifying an unprecedented interference with the established judicial system.

So, Mr. Speaker, they have decided, therefore, to circumvent the normal judicial traditions and practices of hearing the opinion of the Newfoundland Supreme Court, which is always done, of course, on these kinds of matters. And never before has a federal government ignored the legitimate right of a Supreme Court of a province to adjudicate on a matter of such importance to that province.

There are many others, of course, who agree with us on that particular opinion. Let me just refer to some of them: Senator Eric Cook, a well-known Liberal, resigns from the Liberal Party in protest over the federal government's action; Premier Lougheed from Alberta says that his understanding has been that in the past it was implicitly accepted that by-passing the Court of Appeal in references would only be done with the concurrence of all governments involved; third, the Quebec newspaper, le Devoir,

MR. SIMMS: calling the political way in which this matter was handled 'simply heartbreaking'. And they go on to say this - just listen to this now. Hon. members opposite would be wise to listen. They say, "In the present case, one must hope that the Supreme Court of Canada, out of simple courtesy, out of respect for the good operation of the judicial system, out of respect for the institutions and to avoid being accused of prejudice, will await the decision of the Court of Appeal of Newfoundland before taking into consideration the request of the federal government."

And former Senator Forsey says, "The Dominion Government's action is, as far as I know, unprecedented. It is in marked contrast to the procedure that government itself followed on the Patriation resolutions. It is certainly irregular."

MR. SIMMS: It interferes with the normal judicial procedure by virtually removing from the Newfoundland Court of Appeal an essential part of the question placed before it. This is highly improper. It is a tactic which could undermine our whole judicial system. In editorials, Mr. Speaker, all across the country - the Cape Breton Post said in an editorial, 'If nothing else the federal government's move to the Supreme Court of Canada on the Newfoundland offshore question is provocative to a high degree. The federal timing is all wrong and so is its proposal to confine the high court to the narrow point of who owns the Hibernia only. In fact, it makes little sense at all to settle Hibernia. The Supreme Court would obviously have to go into the whole constitutional question of who owns the offshore. And assuming the court should accept the constricted reference asked by the federal government, the country would be left in the strange position of one side or another in possession of a single piece of the Continental Shelf with ownership of the remainder up in the air.'

The Edmonton Journal says:  
'Why is the Liberal Government in Ottawa attacking the people of Newfoundland? Surely it is not in the name of all Canadians.'

And so, Mr. Speaker, we are far from being alone in our opinion. Then, also, the federal government has completely ignored the election results of April 6th, 1982, in this Province, when the people gave this government a massive mandate to negotiate. In fact, that was the issue, a mandate to negotiate. And this government received at that time perhaps one of the largest and greatest victories ever recorded, over 61 per cent of the popular vote - the hon. member would not know anything about that, I am sure - and 85 per cent of the seats in the House of Assembly. The people of Newfoundland clearly supported

MR. SIMMS: our desire to negotiate on the basis of the proposal presented to the federal government back in January, 1982.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on April 6th. Newfoundlanders had spoken. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would have to agree with that. But what happened on May 19th? Newfoundlanders were ignored, their opinion was not listened to at all by the federal government, 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 a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, and was a slap in the face to all Newfoundlanders. They are obviously playing little games with us.

And here is another example,

Mr. Speaker: Whose quote is this? and I quote "We consistently maintain that ownership is not the important issue, and that reaching a negotiated settlement on shared management is the vitally important issue, I am offering the choice to negotiate". Who said that? The Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliot Trudeau said it on May 5, 1981, in St. John's, Newfoundland. So the Province decided to accept the offer to negotiate a settlement,

MR. SIMMS: notwithstanding of course, its own strength with respect to its own legal case regarding ownership, but a fundamental factor in the decision to negotiate was that the claims to exclusive ownership by both parties would be set aside permanently.

In the first negotiating meeting on October 2, 1981, these understandings were enunciated by the Province. However, at the December 14, 1981 meeting, the federal response failed to meet those basic principles. It repeatedly asserted federal ownership and jurisdiction, the setting aside of which, by both parties, was the whole basis of the negotiations in the beginning.

So we accepted the Prime Minister's offer, yet his own negotiating team did not agree to put aside claims to ownership. So let there be no mistake, Mr. Speaker, that for its part the Province and this government has repeatedly indicated that it will negotiate in good faith and attempt to reach a settlement which incorporates a few fundamental considerations such as the claim to exclusive ownership by both parties being set aside on a permanent basis, joint management, and an equitable sharing of revenues.

MR. NEARY: Any more?

MR. SIMMS: The Government of Newfoundland - yes, I have some more for the hon. member - the Government of Newfoundland has clearly put its position on the matter as he knows.

MR. NEARY: The feds have, too.

MR. SIMMS: We, as a Province, are eager to negotiate, based upon putting aside ownership during the period of negotiations, and permanently if an agreement is reached as per the offer of the Prime Minister, as per the offer of the Prime Minister on May 5, 1981.

MR. SIMMS: And we want to use as the basis for negotiations, Mr. Speaker, the proposal which was presented to the general public and presented to the federal government on January 25, 1982, a proposal which nobody yet, by the way, has said is an unreasonable one.

There are other people in this country who have indicated quite recently, in fact, that they do not see where this proposal is unreasonable. A letter to the Premier of the Province by the President and Chief Executive Officer of Dominion Securities, Aimes Limited, and a letter to the hon. Marc Lalonde by the same individual says in part, ' I have studied in detail the presentation prepared by the Province of Newfoundland, a framework of agreement, dated November 12, 1981. And a proposal for settlement dated January 25, and sincerely hope that these proposals, together with ideas and proposals from the federal government, can form the basis for immediate discussion and an early agreement. ' Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, that we in our proposal simply ask for reasonable things, like the establishment of a true partnership, a major economic benefit package, a fair split of the offshore resources and revenue - it is all here - true joint management, protection of workers, protection of the fishery, equal role for Crown corporations and permanence of arrangements. All of these matters -

MR. NEARY: Where do you get this?

MR. SIMMS: These are all contained in the proposal for settlement which was made public during the general election.

MR. L. SIMMS: The hon. member should have perhaps paid more attention to it.

MR. DOYLE: You never read that.

MR. MARSHALL: They made some (inaudible) on the electorate.

MR. SIMMS: Yes.

But, Mr. Speaker, in any event, the federal government has refused to repond to our January 25th proposal and, in fact, have not yet responded. And they even went further, Mr. Speaker, by asking a federal court, which was considering and unrelated matter in the SIU case dealing with offshore workers, to consider the broader question of offshore ownership and that left us, Mr. Speaker, with no choice but to refer the matter ourselves to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

So what did the Prime Minister of Canada say in St. John's in a speech on May 5th, 1981? He said, 'I am offering a choice to negotiate, Ownership is not the important issue.' But did they negotiate? No, Mr. Speaker. What did he say on May 19th? 'We are going to court.' So once again they are attempting to use the back door. The Prime Minister even reiterated in his telegram of May 19th to the hon. the Premier concerning the ownership issue, and I quote, "I have also believed very firmly that this could be set aside for the purpose of negotiating an agreement on management and revenue sharing." Yet the facts point to the opposite.

MR. NEARY: Is that a telegram?

MR. SIMMS: Yet the facts point to the opposite.

MR. NEARY: Is that a telegram?

MR. SIMMS: No, it is not a telegram, it is, as I said, 'In a telegram that was addressed to the Premier.'

June 2, 1982

Tape No. 840

MJ - 2

MR. L. SIMMS: When the Premier introduced the resolution condemning the federal action -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, here is the point I want to make. Now, when the Premier introduced the resolution condemning the federal action, what did our friends across the way, the Opposition do? Did they come out four square in support of Newfoundlanders and in support of Newfoundland and in support of the government? No, Mr. Speaker, as usual they were sitting on the fence, wishy-washy. The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. F. Roberts) admitted it in his own speech. He said, and I quote, "We can either vote for this resolution or we can vote against this resolution." Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, what more evidence do the people of the people of the Province need to understand the position of the Opposition on this issue and on many others? It is clear what their position is, they do not have one.

The member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder), in fact, during that great debate said that he did not understand what we were discussing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: It hurts, it hurts.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Point of order the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if I am going to be quoted by the hon. member I wish to be quoted correctly. If the hon. member has something to say - when I spoke in that debate, Mr. Speaker, I said I did not understand why we were here. Why we were here in an all night sitting, Mr. Speaker, not what



MR. HODDER:

the hon. member is trying to impute.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

That is not a point of order,

Mr. Speaker. I know the hon. gentleman does not understand why he is here. We do not understand how he is here either.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

I rule that it is not a point of order, that the hon. member just took the occasion to clarify statements attributed to him.

The hon. the Minister of Culture,  
Recreation and Youth.

MR. L. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for that ruling and so I will continue then, having said what I said, and the hon. member for Port au Port has just reiterated it.

MR. DOYLE: What did you say?

MR. SIMMS: He does not know where he is or what he is doing or anything like that, I think, or words to that extent. In any event, after saying all of that he went on to say then, 'Well, I might vote for the resolution'. So he does not understand the issue but yet he might vote for it. And one little thing that the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) drew into the debate, he ridiculed the Premier by saying that he grabbed onto the church/school issue during the constitutional process and discussions. But what the member for Port au Port did not say was that the Premier was eventually proven right, absolutely right by the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: The amendments were accepted.

MR. NEARY: No, no.

MR. SIMMS: The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I remember during his speech on that resolution, kept saying that it is important to get this issue out of the way. And it was obvious to all who were listening that they would just love to get this issue out of the way, because they would not have to then be associated with their colleagues in Ottawa, obviously. Because I know they are embarrassed by the position that their colleagues in Ottawa are taking.

MR. NEARY: Not in the least.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, sure you are. And I have no wonder, Mr. Speaker, and I am not surprised that the hon. member for Fogo would want to get the issue out of the way as quickly as possible.

MR. TULK: We would like to get the minister out of the way, out of the way of the Province.

MR. SIMMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says, 'We could not trust Lalonde. We would not trust Lalonde as far as we could throw him'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) admits that even he wants to get rid of Mr. Trudeau and perhaps even Mr. Rompkey.

MR. BARRETT: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) says he does not trust us. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, do they trust anybody or are they simply paranoid? The way they talk, you know, you would not know but it was just Newfoundland that was having difficulties getting along with Ottawa. But, Mr. Speaker, no Province in Canada can get along with Ottawa at the present time.

Let us just have a look at what they are saying about Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Lalonde by the way, in a Toronto Globe And Mail editorial. I know you will be interested in this. It is dated March 3rd.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon Your Honour was asked to rule on a point of order that was raised by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. And Your Honour, I think, ruled properly that the member, who happened to be me at the time speaking, was irrelevant. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that an hon. gentleman who should know better, by the way, an hon. gentleman who is a former Speaker of this House should know better, is completely irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, to the topic under discussion. And, not only that, but he is quoting

June 2, 1982

Tape No. 841

IB-3

MR. NEARY: a newspaper in debate, which  
has been ruled out of order since 1933.

MR. SIMMS: I am not quoting.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman  
should know that as a former Speaker of this House, and  
as a

MR. NEARY: member who pretends to know the rules of the House, but the hon. gentleman is irrelevant. Mr. Speaker, he is talking about everything except the resolution. And I would submit, Your Honour, that you direct the hon. member who is being irrelevant to this matter, to get back to -

MR. SIMMS: You are just trying to kill my time.

MR. NEARY: [ see. What did the - to get back to the subject matter of the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just briefly on that point of order, because it is obvious that the hon. gentleman is just trying to take the hon. minister's time, the fact of the matter is he is being quite relevant when he is referring to remarks made in the course of the debate on a motion that was before this House, that is similar but not exactly the same. And as to the business of not being able to quote from newspapers, the hon. gentleman cannot invent rules. Beauchesne page 117 says, ' It is in order to quote a newspaper reflecting on proceedings in the House if the quotation is followed by a privilege motion,' And then it goes on to say, ' The rule is quite clear that quoting a newspaper, an author which reflects upon the debate'. You are not allowed to quote a newspaper reflecting on the debate but anyone can quote a newspaper. I mean, the point is ludicrous and ridiculous and he is obviously just trying to consume the time of the hon. member.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I noticed when the House Leader opposite (Mr. Marshall) quotes Beauchesne, he does so for his own purpose.

MR. TULK: Very selective!

MR. HODDER: Very selective Mr. Speaker.

MR. HODDER: But section 332 says,  
' A member quoting a newspaper in debate was ruled out  
of order by the Deputy Speaker who said', and this was  
on March 17, 1933,' that the rule was quite clear that the -

MR. SIMMS: 1933?

MR. HODDER: This is Beauchesne, and  
these are the rules which we follow in this House. ' The rule  
is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author  
or a book which reflects upon debate before the House, either  
directly or indirectly is entirely out of order', Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Right on man. The hon.  
gentleman should know better.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): To that point of order,  
the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation, and Youth  
(Mr. Simms) had the opportunity to read what he said he was  
going to be quoting. I have to inform the member right  
now that his time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave, by leave!

MR. NEARY: You have enough manure on  
the floor over there now.

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

MR. NEARY: There is enough manure  
on that side now. I hope nobody steps in that manure.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, while the  
hon. member the Minister of Culture, Recreation, and Youth  
was speaking, I did not interrupt him during his speech and  
I hope members on that side will give me the same courtesy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised,  
to start off with, how the Speaker of the House could allow  
such resolutions to be even discussed today. The reason I  
say that Mr. Speaker, I

MR. WARREN: think on May 20th, we had almost an all night session here debating practically the same resolution. So, all we are doing, Mr. Speaker, is debating the same thing over again. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did not speak during the all night debate on May 20th, because I was hoping that the speaker would rule this resolution in order and I would have the opportunity to speak on it today and I was surprised that he did. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have one concern about this resolution besides about who presented it, that is a concern that everybody has. But, there is one concern in the whole resolution and that is that, 'ownership be put aside permanently.' The issue put aside permanently. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we can sit in this House, and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador could listen to the government of the day, gawking about the Upper Churchill contract -

MR. STAGG: Gawking?

MR. WARREN: Gawking, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: - and listen to those members, shooting the breeze we call it, about the Upper Churchill contract, and here they are saying that ownership be put aside on a permanent basis. So, there is something not connecting. There is either a wire not connected to the vital parts of the body, or there is something wrong. Because the reason that this government is so upset or so tied up about the Upper Churchill contract, is that there has been a settlement put in place for 99 years, or something like that, and it cannot be moved sort of thing. So, they are so concerned about this that, look, now we having trouble - and I agree, I agree, that Quebec is getting more out of the Upper Churchill than they deserve. I agree, so does everyone else in Newfoundland and Labrador. However, at the same time,

June 2, 1982

Tape No. 843

PS - 2

MR. WARREN:

they are tied into a contract that is permanent for  
number of years. And now here we want to have a negotiated  
settlement settled,



MR. WARREN: but we want it settled on a permanent basis. How do we know, maybe ten or fifteen or twenty years down the road, or five years down the road, that this negotiated settlement may not be, what the Premier of this Province want. Because, I will tell you now that the Premier of this Province will not be leading the government after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: What!

MR. WARREN: That is right. That is a prediction now. The same thing will happen to the Premier of this Province in the next election, as happened to the Premiers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba and as happened to the previous Premier in Quebec. They go up to the top of the hill and all of a sudden there is a big cliff there and over they go. And this is what is going to happen to this Premier, he is going to go over. Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. BUTT: Particularly the hon. member.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, on this resolution I want to say something else, Mr. Speaker, that is probably going to, it is not going to shock too many people because it has been in the people's minds so often. Lets call a spade a spade. This government, this Premier is leading Newfoundland out of Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. WARREN: Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Premier and this government has conceived the idea of leading Newfoundland from Confederation. I think, Mr. Speaker, if we go back to only just last week, the hon. John Crosbie, out in Calgary, announced that Newfoundland - announced that he had

MR. WARREN: the intuition, he had the feeling that Newfoundland is going to separate from Canada. He left that impression in the minds of Canadians from coast to coast. Mr. Speaker, the right-hand man for Mr. Crosbie, or Mr. Crosbie's right-hand man is the Premier of this Province. And they are going hand in hand, foot in foot, toe in toe, head to head -

MR. NEARY: Jowl to jowl

MR. WARREN: Jowl to jowl. And Mr. Speaker, they have their compass set, in what we call a Northeast direction, and away we are going to go.

MR. WARREN:

So we are going to separate from Canada, and I will bet you, Mr. Speaker, I will bet you any money that the next election, in fact before the next election, there will be a referendum, probably, held in the Province of Newfoundland, and, furthermore, the next election will be fought on separatism. And, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the government has been acting - look we can go to the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal, but Ottawa, 'Do not you go to the Supreme Court of Canada'.

Mr. Speaker, every budget that we have seen the government bring down since 1979 has been anti-Ottawa. So, Mr. Speaker, let us look at that resolution. That resolution, as I said, other than the word 'permanently' - I really think that we should not look for a permanent settlement. And forever, another forever! Well, there it is, there is where your separatist mood is seen, and it is tied permanently there. Okay, Canada, bye, bye, we have this one permanently now. That is it!

You know, Mr. Speaker, every - I would not say every member, Mr. Speaker, I will not say every member on that side is a Separatist, no. I will not go that far, Mr. Speaker. But I would say that the Premier, in my opinion, is definitely, and in the opinion, I would venture to say, in the opinion of many Newfoundlanders today, is taking the road to being a separatist. Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand in the Moores administration, Mr. Moores resigned indignantly. And why did he resign? He resigned, Mr. Speaker, because he knew that there was a clique in that party who were going to stay in that party, and they, at that time, were on the road to separatism. And Mr. Moores, knowing what kind of a gentleman he was, he did not want any part of it because he was too good a Newfoundlander and too good a Canadian to think otherwise.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I know you are not allowed to quote from newspapers. However, Mr. Speaker, while I was in Halifax during the past weekend I happened to pick up the Chronicle Herald and one of the top stories on page 3 of the Chronicle Herald was, "Me First Attitude Threatens Canada's Future".

MR. G. WARREN: Now, where do we often hear those words my government, me, me, me ? From the Premier of this Province - me too, me first attitude. And, Mr. Speaker, there is another indication and, I might add, it come from a really popular, high profile Canadian in Canada by the name of Senator Al Graham,

MR. BARRETT: Oh, wonderful.

MR. WARREN: Well, now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BARRETT: ( inaudible ) the Liberal Party in Canada.

MR. WARREN: Now, I know, Mr. Speaker, Ah !

MR. STAGG: What is his political persuasion ?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, here are some comments that he did make, Mr. Speaker: 'It is sad to say that we live in the most selfish society known in the history of mankind'. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say, listening to this government ever since 1979, they want all the fish in the water and they do not know how to split it.

MR. CALLAN: What about the Markland Hospital?

MR. WARREN: They want the Upper and Lower Churchill, they want to take care of the sick people and they do not know how to do it, they close down hospitals instead of opening them up. The Minister of Health ( Mr. House ), instead of giving the children three flouride treatments a year he cuts it back to one. And he does not know - the Minister of Health in Committee today could not even tell us how long a flouride treatment is good for. The other night when I was here sitting down listening to everybody when they were in the all night debate, I sat there and I tried to - because the big word in our debate was the word negotiate, the word negotiate. So, Mr. Speaker, what I did is this I took the word negotiate and I put in what each letter stood for and I want to run down through it, and have a look at the word negotiate, in the minds of this government, means.

MR. STAGG: The N stands for Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN: Okay, N stands for Newfoundland and Labrador, I think, as one member in this House, I am quite proud to be a Newfoundlander and a Labradorian. Now, Mr. Speaker, E stands for energy for energy. Energy right? Yes, Sir. So that is two out of two. Mr. Speaker, we have the highest, we have the best energy in Labrador and in Newfoundland than anywhere else in Canada. All Canadians want our energy.

MR. STAGG: G stands for government.

MR. WARREN: G stands for government. Now, Mr.

Speaker -

MR. STAGG: O stands for offshore.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if

MR. WARREN: the hon. member has been over to my desk looking at my notes.

MR. STAGG: No, no!

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, G stands for government. It stands government, and Mr. Speaker, it is a government for the people by the people and, Mr. Speaker, this government is a government by a person. That is the unfortunate thing, Mr. Speaker, one person, and come hell or high water, that person is a one man government, and is a one man government toward separatism in Canada. O stands for Ottawa.

MR. STAGG: O stands for oil.

MR. WARREN: You missed that one. You missed that one. Now, Mr. Speaker, O stands for Ottawa, the big enemy of Newfoundland. How much money last year came into Newfoundland from Ottawa, one dollar, two dollars, three dollars?

MR. NEARY: \$650 million.

MR. WARREN: Around \$650 million. Oh, well, I thought, by the way that this government was talking, it would be about \$1.98 or something, you know. But \$650 million dollars. Now, what does T stand for, I wonder?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Tory!

MR. WARREN: No, no!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Tories, tories!

MR. WARREN: Here we go, T stands for - I have two of them here, T stands for Trudeau and for the tories.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: You know what, because the Tories hates Trudeau. Now, I might add too, Mr. Speaker, I have no love for the man at the present time, I think he should resign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. WARREN: I stands for intimidate. Now, Mr. Speaker, and this Mr. Speaker, does really fit in with this government, because this government has intimidated Ottawa so that they had no alternative but to put this offshore jurisdiction case right to the Supreme Court of Canada. It was intimidation that did it, Mr. Speaker. It was intimidation. Now, Mr. Speaker, A

SOME HON. MEMBERS: A

MR. STAGG: Is it apple?

MR. WARREN: Is it apple? No, no. A stands for attitude.

MR. STAGG: Attitude.

MR. WARREN: There we go see. The government members are not even thinking today. A stands for attitude, attitude of this government.

MR. STAGG: Arbitrate.

MR. WARREN: This government's attitude -

MR. STAGG: Arbitrate.

MR. WARREN: This governments attitude, Mr. Speaker, towards every issue, and I would like to be serious for a second, towards the issue of health, towards the issue of offshore oil, towards the issue, Mr. Speaker, of roads in the Province that have been neglected, the fishery. Their attitude, Mr. Speaker, has really irritated the people in the Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are getting close to the end and there are only two more letters left. T, Mr. Speaker,



MR. WARREN: I know that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is definitely going to agree with this one. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the key to this government since 1979. 'T' stands for talk and no action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues agree, that this government since 1979 has talked and talked and talked and talked but where is the action. Hospitals closing down, that is the action.

MR. NEARY: And jails opening up.

MR. WARREN: And jails opening up, Mr. Speaker. Little children in the Province only being allowed to see a dentist once a year instead of twice a year. So, Mr. Speaker, this is the talk but there is no action, Mr. Speaker, I am going to clue up on this one. 'E' stands for -

MR. NEARY: By leave.

MR. WARREN: 'E' stands for enjoyment and that is enjoyment that all Newfoundlanders and all Canadians should enjoy and should be one family together. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately this government does not enjoy being part of Canada.

MR. NEARY: Well said.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, the only enjoyment that this government gets is fighting Ottawa. That is the biggest enjoyment that this governments gets, is continually fighting Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: That is how they get their jollies over there.

MR. WARREN: It is too bad, Mr. Speaker, there was no letter 'F' in negotiate because I am sure the 'F' would stand for fighting.

MR. NEARY: I thought the 'T' was for topless.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this resolution - I believe that we should get back to the negotiating table but not to settle for something permanent, because if we do - and I have to say this is what the government is saying - we may be stuck with the same circumstances as we have now surrounding the Upper Churchill. And no one in Newfoundland and Labrador wants a second Upper Churchill.

---

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if we want to negotiate, if we want to negotiate, I believe the first thing that should be done, the first thing that should be done -

AN HON. MEMBER: Get rid of Trudeau.

MR. WARREN: Well that could help.

MR. NEARY: If we could get rid of the Minister of Northern Development.

MR. WARREN: But the first thing that should be done is for the Premier - he is not here today, but I am sure that some of his colleagues will get the message through to him that my colleague the Leader of the Opposition said earlier and I will say again now that the first thing tomorrow that I hope that the Premier can come in or the minister who fills in in his absence could come in tomorrow and make his daily Ministerial Statement. And we are expecting tomorrow a Ministerial Statement from the Premier. And I hope that he can come in tomorrow and he will say, 'I want to release to the hon. House a telex that we just sent off to the Minister of Finance (Mr. MacEachen) and the Prime Minister'. And we will be sitting back - I hope now this will happen tomorrow, I am hoping that it will be happening. That we will sit back and when the minister or the Premier reads off the telegram, saying 'We will withdraw our case from the Newfoundland Supreme Court of Appeal, if you will withdraw your case from the Supreme of Canada'. Now, would that not be a good move on the Premier's part?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. WARREN: Do you know what? If the Premier does that tomorrow, you know, I would be almost tempted to go over and sit on that side. I would be almost tempted.

MR. NEARY: Would you kiss his picture?

MR. WARREN: Yes. I would almost kiss his

MR. WARREN: picture.

MR. NEARY: Would you be like the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), would you kiss his picture?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Yes, Sir. You know what I would do?

MR. NEARY: He would not go as far as to kiss his picture though.

MR. WARREN: I would do like the member from Stephenville now, I will even get down on my knees and kiss his picture, yes, I would almost do that.

MR. RIDEOUT: The member for Stephenville turns it around.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: But, Mr. Speaker, I got a funny feeling that neither the Premier nor one of his ministers will have the intestinal fortitude -

MR. RIDEOUT: Eat your heart out.

MR. NEARY: How many times did you kiss his picture today?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the Premier nor the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) would have the intestinal fortitude, tomorrow, to come into the hon. House with such a telegram. Because, Mr. Speaker, if you would do that my colleague here, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would immediately, before he responds to the telegram, he would go out in the common room and call up to the secretary and say, 'Send a telegram off to this minister telling him to do the same thing. We will do it

MR. WARREN: right away we are ready for it. Mr. Speaker, but then again we might have a problem, we might have a problem. I wonder would Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Chretien withdraw it from the Supreme Court? That is our problem, here we have two - what word could I say without being out of order, I wonder?

MR. NEARY: Unparliamentary.

MR. WARREN: Two leaders,

MR. NEARY: Two stooges.

MR. WARREN: Two stooges in common, okay. We got two stooges, one in Ottawa and one here in Newfoundland. The Premier of Newfoundland and the Prime Minister in Ottawa, two stooges on Parliament Hill. Two stooges, acting like little babies and will not give an inch. That is what is wrong with our society, that is what is wrong with Newfoundland and Labrador. That is what is wrong with Canada. We have a Premier here that - 'I know everything, no one is going to change my mind', and a Prime Minister up in Ottawa - 'Whatever I say goes'. And Mr. Speaker, the best thing for Newfoundland and the best thing for Canada - the best thing for Newfoundland, naturally, is for the Premier to walk out and resign, and the best thing for Canada is for the Prime Minister to resign. Mr. Speaker, I think if those two gentlemen, were removed from the scene, plus the Minister of Energy -

MR. NEARY: What? Mr. Nasty himself?

MR. WARREN: - if those three, and - oh yes, and probably the gentleman whom my colleague, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), would trust no further than he could throw him, probably if he was removed too -

DR. COLLINS: And Jean Chretien.

MR. WARREN: Okay that is five. And the

MR. WARREN: Minister of Finance, we may as well put him in too, that is the six of them. So, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you counting.

MR. WARREN: No, Mr. Speaker, let us not get too far down in the barrel. Let us look at the two leaders, Mr. Speaker, the leader in the Province of Newfoundland and the Leader in Canada. Remove those two guys, Mr. Speaker, remove those two guys from power for twenty four hours only, for twenty four hours only and I will bet there will be inroads made on a negotiated settlement. Now, Mr. Speaker, my goodness, here I just began and I only have three or four minutes left. You know, it is ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, it would really make you mad.

MR. NEARY: The Premier would start the third world war.

MR. WARREN: I got a funny feeling that tomorrow we are going, in fact - maybe not tomorrow, but at least next wednesday when we finish off this debate, we are going to see - you call him Mr. Nasty, I do not like to call him that - but the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) -

MR. NEARY: I do not think that it is unparliamentary.

MR. WARREN: Well, the Minister of Energy, you are going to see him coming in tomorrow with his typical daily press release. And his press release tomorrow will be, we have another telegram from such a member or we

MR. WARREN: have an editorial here from the Toronto Globe And Mail. So he will come in with another Ministerial Statement tomorrow bashing Ottawa. 'Let us give it to them, baby. Let us give it to them.' That is his attitude, 'Let us give it to them'. But I want to tell the minister that the people out in Wonderland, the people out there, they are getting the message loud and clear, that, 'We gave this government a majority, we gave this government 66 or 67 per cent or 60 per cent, whatever the case may be, but we expect this government to treat us as Newfoundlanders and as Canadians at the same time'. And they know -

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

I have to inform the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN: Okay, Mr. Speaker, thank you. They know, Mr. Speaker, that this government has to produce in order to stay on. Because when the next election is called, Mr. Speaker - I mention this, Mr. Speaker, because I can see myself over on that side. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. STAGG: All right now 'Tom', tell us why you are over here.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just took his seat, it is unfortunate for him that the letter 'B' is not in negotiations either because I am sure some of us on this side of the House would have been able to tell him what that stands for because that was about -

MR. STAGG: Balderdash.

MR. RIDEOUT: Balderdash, that is it. That was about the extent of the speech that we just heard.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity that I have had since this new session began to participate in debate. Before I get into the text of my remarks, I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate Your Honour, the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker and the Chairman of Committees. And I know that you will do these positions well as this session and other sessions of the House continue. I suppose too, Mr. Speaker, that I would be pardoned if I took the opportunity, as I begin debate on this resolution today to, sort of, gloat a little bit, Sir,



MR. T. RIDEOUT: because this resolution means very much to me personally. This resolution is, in essence, why I, for a couple of years was called a traitor. This resolution is, in essence, why I, for a couple of years was termed as betraying the people who elected me. This resolution is why I, for a couple of years, was called Benedict Arnold.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Never.

MR. RIDEOUT: And many of the people who said that, Sir, are no longer there but I am here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: The people, Mr. Speaker, I did not run away from the district as I said I would not when I made the move I did, I did not run away I said I would be back and I would test the will of the people, and the people in that district, not by forty-one votes, Mr. Speaker, or twenty-five votes or anything of that nature, but by a solid whopping majority of almost a thousand votes said; You did the right thing'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear !

MR. RIDEOUT: And, Mr. Speaker, it is not because the other party did not do there best to see that it did not happen. They had a lot of difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in finding campaign workers in the district, because 90 or 95 per cent of them who had worked on my previous two campaigns worked for me again on the 6th of April. They had to bring in the imports from Mr. Rompkey's office, they had to bring in the imports from Grand Falls and a few of the other district offices that he has around, but even with the imports and us on our local legs, even with the imports, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Ah, they cannot stand it Sir, it is getting to them.

MR. SPEAKER ( RUSSELL ): A point of Order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition

MR. G. NIARY: No, Mr. Speaker, he is not getting to us, I would just like for the hon. gentleman to be relevant. Because there are rules in this House, Mr. Speaker, that were enforced earlier this afternoon. The hon. gentleman, if your Honour has been paying any attention- I doubt if anybody in the House has been paying any attention to the hon. gentleman - is completely irrelevant. Mr. Speaker, I would like for the hon. gentleman to talk about the resolution. This is Private Members Day and the hon. gentleman, if he is going to address the House, should address himself to the resolution.

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. the President of the council

MR. MARSHALL: I cannot conceive of anything that would be more relevant to this resolution than the re-election of the hon. gentleman, who, with consummate courage crossed the House in the face of the abuse of his colleague's on the offshore matter. The very fact that the hon. gentleman has been re-elected on the basis of a courageous stand, for standing for Newfoundland on the offshore, which is what this resolution is all about, is very, very relevant to the thing. As I say, his election, more than any other member's in this House, is relevant to this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please! As all hon. members know the rule of reverency is perhaps one of the most difficult ones any Speaker has to rule on. I feel that the hon. member was straying a little from the relevant portions of the resolution, maybe he can get on with his Speech.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I am in your hands and, as always, never disobey your rulings. Because the hon. leader of the Opposition,

MR. RIDEOUT:

speaking - the in House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) speaking only a couple of hours ago in this very same debate got on with the same kind of baloney, Mr. Speaker, we heard in this House only a couple of minutes ago.

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

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, they do not want to hear it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It must be obvious to Your Honour that the member who is on his feet speaking, Mr. Speaker, is defying Your Honour's ruling, is continuing to be irrelevant, is not paying any attention to the ruling given by Your Honour. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. gentleman continues this flagrant abuse of the rules of this House and Your Honour's ruling that Your Honour name the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair rules that that is not a valid point of order.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and as I was about to say - because it was the hon. gentleman who started it today. He got up, uproaring and blowing off about all of us who were not going to be here. Remember he did that today. If what I am saying is irrelevant certainly he was irrelevant.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: There you are, look.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman continues to be irrelevant and ignoring Your Honour's ruling -

MR. RIDEOUT: Shut up, boy, and sit down.

MR. NEARY: The statements that the hon. gentleman have made in the last two or three minutes, Mr. Speaker, are completely irrelevant and have nothing to do with the resolution before the House.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The hon. member to my left was reminded that he was straying a bit from the relevancy of this motion and perhaps he should be a little more relevant than he was.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Your Honour. And that is exactly what I was about to lead into because certainly talking about how many of us were not going to be here was certainly very irrelevant.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, the in House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) made a few comments not very relevant, as you ruled at the time, on this motion today. And they finally, very reluctantly, as they have done a couple of times now in this session, Mr. Speaker, finally very reluctantly said after all the rhetoric was put aside that they would support this motion. Because, Mr. Speaker, they have begun to face the political reality. After the decimation on April 6th. they have begun to face the political reality that it is political dynamite for those particular gentlemen on the other side not to support this kind of motion. It was the kind of weak-kneed, half support that we got on the motion only a week or so ago and that we are getting on this motion again today. Talk about blaming things, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition in the House today blamed the Conservative Opposition of, I do not know - what? - ten or a dozen years ago for the sell-out on the Upper Churchill. Somebody told me that it was a government

MR. RIDEOUT: motion that they voted on Mr. Speaker, Now, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that is irrelevant too, when the hon. gentleman brought it up. That is irrelevant, I suppose.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, when that matter was raised earlier in the debate, that the government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) raised a point of order which was upheld by the Chair. I would suggest Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is continuing to be irrelevant. If he does not intend to speak on the resolution, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he could remain in his seat and let somebody else enter the debate. But the hon. gentleman is irrelevant and getting carried away, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. In the opinion of the Chair the hon. member was being relevant to the motion.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you your Honour. Right again as usual. So, you know, if the opposition of ten or twelve years ago can be blamed for the sell-out on the Upper Churchill as we were told here today, right from the mouth of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) himself, of course, the other question has to be asked, what about the government of the day? What kind of blame should sit on the shoulders of those people? You know, that is the kind of -

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Here we go again, Mr. Speaker. Well I do not mind getting up and down sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we already had a ruling this afternoon when that matter was introduced

MR. NEARY: into the debate, That it was irrelevant and out of order. And I would submit that that ruling should apply now.

MR. HODDER: What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

MR. NEARY: That is right. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. The hon. gentleman is irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, he is not speaking the resolution.

MR. RIDGOUT: So you say.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Chair feels that this is not really a good way to occupy twenty minutes of the House's time, and maybe, when hon. members decide to rise on points of order, they should be relevant points of order. The hon. member may continue with his speech.

MR. RIDGOUT: Mr. Speaker, it is excellent exercise sir, getting up and down and I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) for helping me to get my exercise of the day that I was too busy to get in a gymnasium. I also want to make a reference of two to a couple of remarks made by the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). I hope they will not be irrelevant, because I am just making some remarks to remarks that he has already made.

He indicated sir, that as part of this motion the real thing that he was worried about was the permanency of any agreement. The position that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador is taking, that if there could be a negotiated solution happened to be reached. The hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains

MR. RIDEOUT: thought that that was very dangerous, and referred of course, again, to the famous Upper Churchill contract as an example of permanency that is very dangerous. Well, again, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen had taken time to read the highlights, even the highlights, of Newfoundland's proposal that was put forth in early 1982, he would have seen that this administration, Mr. Speaker, was not about to enter into any permanent solution that was going to sell out the rights of this Province forever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: That is spelled out beyond any doubt, Mr. Speaker, on page 4 of the highlights, which says, "Certain matters, such as wellhead prices." It would have been nice to put into the Upper Churchill contract, Mr. Speaker, certain matters like the price of electricity, instead of going down will escalate. But this government proposed that certain matters, such as wellhead prices would of necessity, be subject to periodic renegotiation, as with the Western provinces. Now, is there any reason to fear permanency of the settlement, Mr. Speaker, with that kind of built-in -

MR. WARREN: I know that.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, the hon. gentlemen conveniently has a short memory, because he did not mention it in his speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has no memory.

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, the problem is, has no memory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on, right on!

MR. RIDEOUT: Because he gets up in his debate, he gets up in the debate, Mr. Speaker, and says "I would not go for that, no I would not go for that because it is permanent." I would not go for that because it is permanent. And then he got on to the separatist kick, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT: The hon. gentlemen then got on to separatist kick. I do not know if it is relevant or not, Your Honour, but there were certainly no points of order coming from the other side while he was talking about it. Well, let me remind the hon. gentlemen, that I heard more than once in this House, just before the dissolution of this House for the April 6th election, I heard more than once the then in-house leader of the Opposition, who is today the out-house leader of the Opposition, I heard more than once him say that the next election would be fought on the separatist issue.

MR. SIMMS: Right on!

MR. RIDEOUT: How wrong he was, Mr. Speaker. And how wrong he was has been proven. And how wrong the hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)



MR. RIDEOUT: is was and will be proven.

MR. SIMMS: His memory is all tangled up in his hair.

MR. RIDEOUT: This is the rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, that you get in the sort of weak-kneed approach to support for this kind of very important resolution. Now they talk about negotiations. They say, Mr. Speaker, 'Go back to the bargaining table. Go back to the negotiating table'. Well, Mr. Speaker, it takes two to negotiate. We were not, the government of this Province was not lacking when the olive branch was laid out. The government of this Province did not hesitate, Mr. Speaker, when there appeared to be a change in the federal position. As a matter of fact, the government of this Province gave a lot, the government of this Province gave a great deal in going to the bargaining table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Because they had been telling us - the provincial Liberal Party supported it - they had been telling us from time to time that they were prepared to negotiate. But yet, when we finally sat down at the bargaining table, when we finally put this kind of proposal before the federal authorities, what did we get, Mr. Speaker? What did we get? There has been no reaction to it yet. And they blame us then, blame this Province, as being the reason why negotiations could not continue. Mr. Speaker, there could be nothing further from the truth, nothing.

So, you cannot have negotiations unless there is going to be an atmosphere of trust between both sides. This Province said that we were prepared to put aside something that was very important to us. We were prepared to set aside the ownership question which I had felt very strongly about for some time. But for the sake of sitting down and trying to get a negotiated settlement we will put it aside and require that it be put

MR. RIDGOUT:                   aside permanently if we could  
strike a deal. But, Mr. Speaker, everything we put on  
the table, a well documented position on behalf of this  
Province, has never been referred to. And then they have  
the gall to say that we are the reason why there are  
no negotiations going on today.

                                  This particular resolution again,  
Mr. Speaker, refers to the SIU case.

MR. RIDEOUT: How, Convenient it is, Mr. Speaker, for people to say that the case is in court because of this Province. How convenient it is, Mr. Speaker, for people to say that, too try to lay the blame at the doorstep of this Province for the case has been before court. Well, it was not this Province, Mr. Speaker, who asked for an expanded question before the Federal Court of Canada on the SIU case. It was not the government of Newfoundland and Labrador that asked for that, it was the government of Canada. Were we supposed to sit back and do nothing, Were we supposed to take the chance, Mr. Speaker, that the federal court may well agree to hear that expanded question, and then have it heard and go from there into the Supreme Court of Canada without having the benefit of the Provincial Supreme Court Hear it! My heavens, know, it a fraught with so much danger that with there was no other choice, we were pushed and bullied, we had to do something to protect the rights of this Province. And of course, Mr. Speaker, the final, the final insult, is what came only two or three weeks ago with the Federal Government, whild the question is still before the Supreme Court the highest Court in this Province, with the federal government deciding unilaterally to put the Hibernia question only. Mr. Speaker, how silly. I wonder where the Hibernia is located? What happens if something is discovered in the structure next to it in a short time? Do we have another separate reference on that? It is just so foolish

Mr. Speaker,

AN. HON. MEMBER: It is just the Hibernia though, itself, that they are looking for, is it not.

MR. RIDEOUT: So, you know, Mr. Speaker, this is what has happened, and this is why that this particular resolution-

MR. RIDEOUT: that was put on the Order Paper  
by my friend from Stephenville is so important. This resolution  
Mr. Speaker, deserves the support of all members in this  
House. It is right and proper that it be debated and it is  
right and proper that it be voted on. Mr. Speaker, I can only  
say that I will be voting for this resolution with pleasure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Hon. member for Terra Nova

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I will not address  
much of what the hon. member said other than to say the reason

MR. LUSH: for which he resigned has changed immensely. The reason that he resigned was - the position that we took, Mr. Speaker, on this was the proposal that we are now looking at today. So the hon. member has done a complete flip flop. But anyway, I will not get into that.

MR. TULK: It was the energy first.

MR. LUSH: Yes. I will not get into that, Mr. Speaker. But I want to say -

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman realizes that he gave a bad speech and now he is upset.

MR. LUSH: Yes. I would also remind him that if Benedict Arnold had run in the last election he would probably have gotten elected on the government side. But anyway, the theme of what I want to say, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon is that we are discussing this resolution today - we are in the position we are today with respect to the offshore negotiations because of the fumbling of the provincial government. That is why we are discussing this resolution and that is why we are in the position that we are in today, because of the fumbling of the provincial government. But, Mr. Speaker, I find it strange that hon. members are so inconsistent. We have said on this side that we agree with the proposal. I can now say that I have read it. Let it be known, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government did not want us to read the proposal. The proposal was issued during the election.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. LUSH: I was out in my district, Mr. Speaker, campaigning. I did not have time to read a letter from my wife let alone to read this proposal. So let us brush that aside. The government members did not want us to read that proposal. It was their issue for the election and they wanted us to know so very little about it.

MR. TULK: You do not even know what it is yet.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I said that they should be consistent. I agree with the proposal. As a matter of fact I find the proposal inadequate. There are many things that we would put into this proposal to strengthen it. But I will not get into that today, Mr. Speaker. The only thing I question here is the relationship with respect to ownership here, and we talk about - 'The question', it says, 'of exclusive ownership by either party must be set aside if there is to be a negotiated settlement because there cannot be a true partnership where one of the parties has ultimate authority based on the ownership of the resource'. I have always thought, Mr. Speaker, that in institutions and in organizations that there should be one party with authority. I have always thought that. As a matter of fact, members opposite get a great charge out of the way our leadership is, the in-House and the out-House leader they are

MR. T. LUSH: talking about, sort of thing.  
Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, we better be consistent. Here we are carrying along- we may, as a matter of fact, give them the example of how this can operate. We believe in the shared ownership, we believe this, but hon. members do not believe in it. They do not believe in shared power, they do not believe in shared authority, because they keep talking about it all the time on this side. We are the living examples of how that can be done. So you cannot have it both ways. If you do not believe in it, if you do not believe in it, the way our Party is structured, you cannot believe in it with respect to the management the offshore oil. So, they do not believe in it. Again they are subscribing to something which they do not believe in. And again, Mr. Speaker, it shows how they have been fumbling, it shows how they have been fumbling, swinging from one idea to the next, swinging from one position to the next on this offshore.

MR. TULK: Swinging from one tree  
to the next.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, we are where we are today, with respect to the offshore because of the intransigence of the government. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the government wanted this to go to the Supreme Court, but they bungled it. It is because of their failure now, it is their failure to negotiate that we are where we are today, that we have reached this impasse. And the reason for it, Mr. Speaker, was that they wanted to make it a political issue, they wanted to win an election on it. And they have won two elections, they have won two elections on it, now they are trying to win a third. they are trying to win a federal election on this issue.

MR. LUSH: And, Mr. Speaker, if they were as good at negotiating as they are at winning elections, this would be all solved.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, they are trying to make a political football out of this issue consistently. And if they were as concerned about the benefits Newfoundlander's will get from this offshore as they are concerned about their own political interest, again we would have this negotiated.



MR. T. LUSH: They are concerned, Mr. Speaker, more about their own political interests -

MR. NEARY: Shame on them, shame, shame!

MR. LUSH: - their own self political interests, at the expense, at the expense -

MR. TULK: Shame on the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), shame!

MR. LUSH: - of the people of this Province. And that is what has happened, Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened. Won two elections, won two elections on it and now, Mr. Speaker, they have been trying for the past two years to pit us against the federal Liberals. That is what they have been trying to do, Mr. Speaker. They do not want us to agree with them. I have noticed, I have noticed hon. members who have spoken on the other side this afternoon trying to isolate statements, trying to pinpoint statements that showed that we were not on their side.

MR. NEARY: Very true.

MR. WARREN: They do not want us to be on their side.

MR. TULK: They can do no wrong.

MR. WARREN: They do not want us to support them. They do not want us to support them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Shame!

MR. WARREN: They do not want us because then they lose their issue.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: They lose the political issue, they lose the political significance of it, they lose the political impact, if we agree.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have news for them. I have news for them. They are not going to pit us against our federal counterparts. We are a provincial party and we are going to take a stand.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) we have our own identity.

MR. WARREN: And, we are not changing, Mr. Speaker, because these issues we have asserted ourselves on. But we are going to assert ourselves in the future more emphatically and more dramatically -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. WARREN: - so that there will be no misunderstanding with the people of Newfoundland where we stand on those issues.

MR. FULK: We have plans and strategy.

MR. WARREN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are always some benefits -

MR. NEARY: New party, new leader and new plans

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: - there are always some benefits, Mr. Speaker, I suppose, when you are, as the member who just spoke said, when you are decimated. There are always some benefits. We are now a more tightly knit group. You can always hold together a more tightly-knit group, and we are now a tightly-knit group. Not so much divergence of opinion, not so much divergence of an idea. We are more solid, we are more unified, -

MR. NEARY: At a boy.

MR. LUSH: - we are together like never before, cheek to cheek, jowl to jowl on all of those issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: So you can forget about it, you can forget about trying to pit us against the federal Liberals.

MR. LUSH: Where we believe that it is going to be of the most advantage to the people of Newfoundland, we are going to stand up. We are going to stand up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: Boy, that is going to be some (inaudible) leadership race.

MR. LUSH: We are going to stand up, Mr. Speaker, and no more, no more, no more, Mr. Speaker, no more will the members on the other side get away with this political nonsense, and appearing to jam us into a corner, appearing to make us look like we are against some of those motherhood issues, No more, no more, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Certainly (inaudible)

MR. LUSH: But, hon. members are going to be disappointed. They do not want us to support this issue. They do not want us to support them on the offshore. They do not want us to support them with the corridor in Quebec. They do not want the five federal MP's to support them. See how gleefully and how delightfully and how ecstatically, how ecstatically that the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) presented that nonsense here today, saying that the MP's did not support them.

MR. TULK: Pure manure.

MR. LUSH: How gleefully, how ecstatically he presented that today, He was delighted that they were not favouring his position, he was delighted.

MR. LUSH: He was delighted. How sadistic, Mr. Speaker, can you become, how perverted? Now, Mr. Speaker, the end is in sight for that. No more! So the government can stop playing their silly, foolish, political games. They can stop it. Because the people of Newfoundland are beginning to see how this government have been using this issue of the offshore oil. They have seen it for what it is, nothing but for political purposes.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, if we were concerned about the benefits that will accrue to the people of this Province as a result of getting this negotiated, then it would be negotiated. Mr. Speaker, their only concern is about their own self-preservation. That is what they are concerned about, Mr. Speaker. Hanging on by their nails. Hanging on by their toenails. They will use this, Mr. Speaker, right to the end.

Mr. Speaker, I expect that now they are going to get on to the corridor through Quebec. And I expect they will try and pin us in a corner on that one. But they will not, Mr. Speaker, they will not pin us in a corner on that one. As a matter of fact, I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has really told them where they are on that one, with respect to the corridor.

MR. NEARY: You were there when they had the Minister of Justice for Canada (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: That is right! That is right!

MR. NEARY: That remains. There is no way. It remains.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason why we are here, the reason why we are debating this resolution today, the reason why we are in the position that we are with respect to the offshore negotiations is that the dominating

MR. LUSH: theme - and I want all hon. members to hear it - the reason why we are here today, Mr. Speaker, debating this resolution, the reason why we are where we are with respect to the offshore negotiations is that hon. members opposite, the government, they were governed by one theme, they were governed by one line in all of this, one line, governed by a sentence and maybe a phrase, one sentence, a question, they were governed by who will get the most political advantage out of this settlement? That is what it was, Mr. Speaker, who will get the best political advantage out of this settlement? That is what they were concerned about. They were not concerned about the economic benefits that will accrue to the people of this Province as a result of a settlement, they were

MR. LUSH:

concerned about, Mr. Speaker, whether or not they would get political advantage. They were concerned about whether or not they would get sufficient political brownie point, that is what they were concerned about it. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, that is why -

MR. TULK: We set our (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: - that is why we are debating this resolution today. That is why we are going to be debating various kinds of resolutions related to the Federal Government.

MR. CARTER: That is why we are (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is strange. I was into the Nova Scotia legislature last week -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) announced (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: - spent two days there. What a difference in the legislature. What a difference in legislature.

MR. STAGG: Not very good, is it?

MR. LUSH: You go in there, you hear them talking about the problems of their province, you hear them talking about the needs of their people, you hear the government presenting developmental plans.

MR. BARRETT: Who?

MR. LUSH: Opposition members reacting to it.

MR. STAGG: Where?

MR. LUSH: Talking about their province.

MR. STAGG: Where?

MR. LUSH: The federal government, the name was never mentioned. The name was never mentioned. You come here, Mr. Speaker, and you would think, you would think it was a town council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. LUSH: That we have eroded, we have the eroded the authority and the influence of a Provincial Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh. oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, being the Premier of this

MR. LUSH: Province is like being the mayor of some rural municipality. Mr. Speaker, they have eroded the authority of government, the influence of government, they have reduced it to a municipality. Because, Mr. Speaker, they have done nothing.

MR. WARREN: That is exactly the point.

MR. LUSH: They have done nothing. But, Mr. Speaker, this is why we have this resolution today. But, Mr. Speaker, again, because this is our position, Mr. Speaker, it has been our position on negotiated settlement, it has been our position, but because there is a fumbling, because they failed with respect to their strategies, we have reached an impasse and it has gone to the courts. And that is where they did not want to do it, but they forced the federal government to take them to the court. They forced them, Mr. Speaker. It was the provincial government. They did not mean to do that but they fumbled it and now they know it and now they are, Mr. Speaker, with their weasle words, trying to get out of it, squirming. They do not know what they can do now. They have an election and the people of Newfoundland have given them a mandate to get it settled, but now they do not know what to do.

MR. DINN: Do not be a (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Because they failed, they have failed to abysmally, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH:

with respect to negotiating for the offshore oil and gas. They failed, they fumbled, a complete failure. Their strategies have backfired because of their intransigence because of their intransigent attitude, because they would not compromise. Nowhere along the line, Mr. Speaker, would they compromise. Because, it was not that they did not want to compromise-

MR. TULK: The Premier loves a fight, sure.

MR. LUSH: - it was not that they did not want to compromise. The federal government was willing to negotiate a long, long time ago. But they did not want to compromise, they did not want to compromise, as I have said, they wanted to take some political advantage out of this, they wanted to win an election. Mr. Speaker, they won the election. They won the election. I am doubtful that they will win another one on it, but I would not put any money on it. I could not do that, of course. I could not do that, but I would think that the people of Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not that you would not either.

MR. LUSH: - but I think that the people of Newfoundland are beginning to see, are beginning to see now the bottom line. They are beginning to see the bottom line by which this administration has been negotiating for the offshore. They are beginning to see the bottom line. Who? Who, will get the best political advantage? Who will get the best political advantage? They see the bottom line, they are beginning to see through it, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TULK: The Premier loves a fight.



MR. LUSH: Well, the resolution, Mr. Speaker, again I just want to read that just to show again, the kind of way that this government is trying to indoctrinate the people still, on this. Not to inform them, mind you, to indoctrinate them. 'WHERE AS the provincial government entered into offshore negotiations with the federal government on the understanding that the ownership issue had been put aside'. Mr. Speaker, on whose understanding, hose understanding,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: I am just - no, Mr. Speaker,

I just want to know whose understanding

AN HON. MEMBER: The Prime Minister's?

MR. LUSH: The prime Minister's? Where did they get the Prime Ministers understanding? Where?

AN HON. MEMBER: When he spoke down here, apparently.

MR. LUSH: Oh, no. No, no.

no. They keep thinking that a negotiated settlement - hon. members again are trying to, are trying to equate

MR. LUSH:

a negotiated settlement with dismissing the ownership. Now, I am not suggesting that is not the way I would not want it to go. But the Prime Minister never ever said it. The Prime Minister said, and I heard him on both occasions, that the ownership is irrelevant. Let us have a negotiated settlement, but sometime in the future we might want to settle the ownership, might want to do it. For whatever reason, I do not know. I do not know. I am not suggesting that it got to be that way, I am easy on it. I still think ownership is irrelevant, what we want to do is to get the maximum benefits from that development, the offshore oil and gas, and let us get about and do it. I can support the proposal by the government. I can accept that. Except that I think it is a new departure in Federalism. A new departure in Federalism. And I am just wondering - it is fine, again it is a great political thing for this Province. It is a great political thing to say that we want shared ownership. That is great! You cannot be wrong on it. It is a great political thing. But, Mr. Speaker, it is a departure from the way that the Federal Government has operated.. Maybe it is a good departure. I am not suggesting - but maybe from here on in now we will just do away with the divisions, the break-up of federal and provincial powers. We will do away with that and we will operate shared the whole way through. Maybe we can nullify Alberta's right to their oil and gas and ask that it be done that way. Maybe we can do that.

MR. MARSHALL: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. LUSH: Yes, sure.

MR. MARSHALL: Is the hon. member advocating then that the, you know, provinces be abolished?

MR. LUSH: Pardon?

MR. MARSHALL: Is the hon. member advocating that provinces be abolished? You said that maybe it is a

MR. MARSHALL: good thing that the Federal Government take it all over.

MR. LUSH: I said that it is a new idea of Federalism.

MR. MARSHALL: Is this your new Liberal concept?

MR. LUSH: A new idea of Federalism.

MR. MARSHALL: I see!

MR. LUSH: A new idea. Maybe we can go back to shared everything.

MR. RIDEOUT: civilized state.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LUSH: I wish hon. members would give me a chance to finish this most important point. Mr. Speaker, maybe on the basis of this recommendation we can now go to Alberta and say, okay - and Saskatchewan - we will do all of this this way, we will do it together, and thereby give all of Canada more of the revenues that come from the oil wells of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Maybe we should do that. All I am saying is that it is a new departure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you in favour of concept ?)

MR. LUSH: Can hon. members tell me whether this kind of agreement is in place anywhere

MR. LUSH:

else in Canada, anywhere else in the world, where both governments are going along jointly owning something? Maybe it is a great idea, a novel idea, a new concept in federalism.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible). Confederation.

MR. LUSH: I am just pointing out, Mr. Speaker, that there is certainly some novelty to this idea, and I could support it.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - took up almost the whole time for today but he did leave about a minute. I would just like to make one little remark here before I propose to adjourn the debate.

I think the hon. member was talking about the Nova Scotia House of Assembly there for a bit, and I thought -

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought you were adjourning the House.

DR. COLLINS: Well, we have a minute yet. There are thirty seconds anyway. I think that typifies the Opposition attitude. They are so nostalgic for the giveaway that Nova Scotia went through, they think that is such a great thing, you know, they think that we should do the same thing. Nova Scotia gave things away but they added that little rider saying that if Newfoundland gets

DR. COLLINS: anything better we want to come in on those coattails. But, nevertheless, the Opposition are so enamoured and so nostalgic for the sell-out that the Nova Scotians did, that they think we should go along with it.

Mr. Speaker, I will come back to the debate next day if I may. I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): It is noted that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) adjourned the debate.

The hon. President of the Council,

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, just before the House adjourns automatically until tomorrow, I would like to advise the House, and particularly the Opposition, of the Estimates Committee tomorrow. The government Services Committee will meet at nine-thirty in the Colonial Building to review the estimates of the Department of Labour and Manpower. The Resource Committee will meet at nine-thirty here in the House of Assembly to review the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs. And I should advise the House too, Mr. Speaker, that tomorrow and Thursday -

MR. WINDSOR: Development tomorrow morning here in the House.

MR. MARSHALL: Is it Development?

MR. STAGG: Tomorrow and Friday, 'Bill'.

MR. MARSHALL: I am sorry then, Mr. Speaker, the note I was given was in error. It said the Department of Municipal Affairs which it cannot be with the Resource Committee, it must be the Department of Development.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also -

MR. TULK: It could be Municipal Affairs.

MR. MARSHALL: No, I do not think so. It is not even before the Resource Committee.

MR. MARSHALL: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, in conformity with our policy of advising the Opposition of everything that they can anticipate, tomorrow we will be going into Committee of the Whole and on Friday we will be going into Committee of the Whole to consider the estimates that are before the Committee of the House, the non-referred -

MR. STIMMS: Legislative and all those.

MR. MARSHALL: Consolidated revenue, legislative.

MR. NEARY: You are not going back to Budget Speech?

MR. MARSHALL: Oh we will come back to it eventually but we want to get -

MR. TULK: What about the Throne Speech?

MR. MARSHALL: Everything in its time.

MR. LUSH: But last year we did not even get to the Throne Speech.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, we have all the time in the world.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

It now being six o'clock I do leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow, Thursday.