

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today ninety-seven students and their teachers from Grand Falls Academy, in the district of Grand Falls, represented by the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform hon. members of an order issued on the 21st. of May, pursuant to the Newfoundland Human Rights Code. The Newfoundland Human Rights Code encourages a settlement of complaints by negotiation. It is felt that this is the most effective method of dealing with such matters. Unfortunately a settlement is not always possible.

On April 5th., 1982, following receipt of the recommendation of the Chairman of the Newfoundland Human Rights Commission, I referred a complaint alleging discrimination by the Building Committee of Burgoynes Cove to a three person commission composed of Mr. Abraham Swartz, Chairman; Mrs. Irene McGinn, Commissioner; Mr. Herbert Buckingham, Commissioner.

A commission of enquiry was held at Holiday Inn, Clarenville, on April 28th. of this year. In due course a report and recommendations were submitted to me. A copy of the report is being tabled. I should point out that the legislation says that the minister may publish the report on action taken in any way he deems fit, and it appeared to me the best way of publishing it was in tabling it in the House. A copy of the report is being tabled.

The commissioners held that the complainants had been discriminated against because of their sex in the job selection process for the position of bookkeeper with

MR. OTTENHEIMER: a community project by the Building Committee of Burgoynes Cove.

On May 21st., 1982, I signed an order requiring certain corrective measures to be taken by the Building Committee of that community to the effect, one, that on service of the order the person holding the position of bookkeeper as of April 28th. with the community project of the Building Committee of Burgoynes Cove be given immediate notice of termination and that his employment be terminated at the expiration of one week from service of the order. Two, that the Building Committee of Burgoynes Cove within five days of service of the order hold a meeting at which all referrals from the Canada Employment Centre for the position of bookkeeper were to be given consideration and appointment of a bookkeeper was to be made. Three, that in making the appointment the Committee should choose a person whose qualifications are adequate and who best met the qualifications required by community and equitable standards. Four, that in making the appointment the Committee should not discriminate against any person because of that

June 9, 1982

Tape No. 1107

ah-1

MR. OTTENHEIMER: person's race, religion, religious creed, sex, marital status, physical disability, political opinion, colour, national or social origin. Five that within one week of the appointment of the bookkeeper the committee should send a report in writing to me naming the person appointed and the reasons for the selection. I believe that these measures were necessary to carry out the recommendations of the commission. I am pleased to inform hon. members that the order has in fact been complied with. The order will be tabled and distributed to hon. members.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all thank the minister for his courtesy and his consideration in supplying me with a copy of the statement in advance. I hope that his action in this as in so many other respects will be emulated by his colleagues in the Cabinet.

Now, Sir, I think the minister's statement speaks for itself and needs little enough comment. Obviously the minister has done the right thing to issue this order, just as, I venture to suggest based on a review of the commissions's report--and it is a quick review; the report is appended to the material provided to me and I assume in due course to be provided to the House by the minister. The report is appended. I read it through quickly--but it would certainly seem that the commission heard those who had an interest in the matter and considered the types of matter they ought to consider and made what appears to be a very rational and a very proper decision. I note, and I assume it is of no concern in the legal sense but I will simply point out to the minister, that the third member of the commission, Mr. Swartz

MR. ROBERTS: was not able to sit. I do not quarrel with that but I hope this does not flaw the process. I have not looked at the act but if the minister assures us that two of the commissioners are vested with the authority of a commission under the act, then that is enough.

The important point, I think, Mr. Speaker, is that the Human Rights Act, which has been on the books since 1968 or 1969, this provision essentially and which was originally sponsored in this House by the late Hon. W.J. Keough - indeed most of the reform legislation in the labour field in this Province today dates from Bill Keough's time. It was consolidated a number of years ago in the Labour Standards Act, so-called - but this act goes back to Bill Keough's time and I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time we have seen this kind of action being taken. I hope it will not be the last because I suspect there are many such instances throughout Newfoundland, instances such as this which amount to discrimination and thus are contrary to the law of the land as enacted by this House, even though I venture to say the gentleman on the Burgoyne Cove committee did

MR. ROBERTS: not knowingly intend to discriminate. I note that the man they hired, according to the report, Mr. Speaker, was a gentleman who had a heart condition and could not carry on his previous trade as a carpenter. He obviously was physically incapacitated to some extent. The Committee obviously felt that he could carry on as a bookkeeper and there was certainly no finding that he was not qualified to do the bookkeeper's work. But it is a case where the Committee have erred, apparently, in the process or in the following of what no doubt would be considered to be a very valid principle, mainly giving a job as bookkeeper to a man who could not carry on his hitherto accepted trade as a carpenter.

The important thing is that these ladies in Burgoynes Cove brought forward their complaint, that it was followed, the ruling has been made and the minister has done the right thing to implement it. I hope it will not be the last. I suspect there are many such instances throughout this Province where the act is not being followed quite as much as it ought to be. It is a very important act, Sir, and one which has a great bearing upon a number of activities of the people in this Province. So let us hope that the minister will do what needs to be done to ensure that the people are aware of the act. The educational programme is a must is something which ought to be put in train quickly and ought to be carried out much more efficiently than it has been hitherto.

Thank you, Sir.

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

ORAL QUESTIONSMR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for

Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador have been shocked in recent days by the intentions and efforts of the government to downgrade vocational educational services within the Province, as evidenced by the government's decision to lay off eighteen vocational instructors in various vocational schools throughout the Province. I wonder if the minister can indicate the circumstances surrounding the layoffs of these eighteen instructors?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the criteria which led to the notification of the eighteen instructors to lay them off, fourteen permanent people and four temporary, were set a year and a half ago by government and were at that time communicated to the vocational school principals throughout the Province. This document says that a layoff of a vocational school teacher is warranted if student enrolment in the particular programme course or a class for the past couple of years has been unacceptably low. A layoff is warranted if there already exists a surplus of qualified people seeking employment in that

MS. L. VERGE: particular area or if there are no reasonable prospects for employment of people to be trained in the programme. These criteria warranting layoffs, as I said, were set a year and a half ago and were at that time communicated. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think it has to be acknowledged that steps have been taken to introduce new programmes in vocational schools across the Province to respond to the changing nature of the job market. There are going to be introduced, in the Corner Brook and Grand Falls vocational schools this coming September, two year diploma courses in Accounting, which are new. There are also going to be introduced in the Corner Brook and Gander vocational schools, starting September, Electronics Technology programmes. And these are exciting beginnings in two and three year technology programmes in vocational schools rather than keeping those types of courses exclusively in St. John's at the colleges here. Also there is a reasonable prospect that we will be able to introduce to at least two vocational schools in our system, this coming September, courses in Computer Studies.

So, while on the one hand there have been some layoffs in courses which cannot be justified because of the changing nature of the job market, there are the addition of other courses which are relevant. And finally, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that a couple of the layoff notices were necessitated by cutbacks in CEIC, that is federal government Canada Employment and Immigration Commission funding of basic literacy courses.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good answer. Good answer.

MR. T. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon. the

member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it is indefensible

MR. T. LUSH: for any government to lay off vocational instructors at a time of high unemployment, Mr. Speaker, and at a time when we need skilled people in this Province and right throughout Canada. I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House what courses will be cancelled in these vocational schools as a result of these eighteen layoffs, and in what schools?

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

MS. L. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is fairly detailed information which might better have been supplied to the hon. member at the Estimates Committee hearing this morning, but I will go through it quickly. There are six schools affected, in alphabetical order: The Burin Vocational School, where there will be reductions in the number of students in Electrical and Welding courses, while those courses will be continued for a smaller number of students. In Carbonear

MS. VERGE: reductions in Welding, Business Education as well as academic, basic education upgrading or academic courses related to trades.

In Conception Bay South there is a reduction of a position in pre-vocational education and that is basically because the work has been done and there is no need to continue the employment of that person.

In Corner Brook there are reductions in the Millwright programme and Business Education. And in Gander, a reduction in academic courses related to trades. In Grand Falls, reductions in the Millwright programme, Electrical, Business Education and academic.

Mr. Speaker, these courses will be continued for lesser numbers of students. But because of present year and last year's enrollment figures, and because of the nature of today's job market, it cannot be justified continuing the employment of these instructors when instead we need to change our priorities and divert the payment of salaries for positions which are more needed, which we are doing through the introduction of the new courses that I mentioned in the two year Accounting diploma course and the Electronics Technology and hopefully in Computer Science.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, there is no question that many of the courses that are being offered at the vocational schools throughout the Province are obsolete. They are not in accordance with the industrial

MR. LUSH: demands of today. But, Mr. Speaker, that should be a part of the planning of the Department of Education. And is there no plan in place whereby we can retrain those teachers whose courses are becoming obsolete and train them in courses for which there is an industrial demand today rather than laying them off?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) says, some of our courses in vocational schools are obsolete, and that is precisely why it is necessary to lay off some instructors. Instead we are trying to add courses which are relevant. There is going to be consultation between the Department of Education and NAPE, the union which represents the vocational school instructors, about possibilities for retraining some of the instructors so they will be suited for other teaching opportunities either in the vocational system or elsewhere in our education system. And a plan was made well ahead of time which led to these decisions. As I said, the criteria warranting the layoffs were laid out under a Cabinet directive a year and a half ago and were communicated to every vocational school in our system at that time.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, it is indefensible and inexcusable to be downgrading vocational educational services

MR. LUSH: in the Province at this particular time of high unemployment and when we need a lot of skilled workers in the Province and in Canada. Can the minister indicate to hon. members whether the department is contemplating any further layoffs in vocational schools in this year?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the criteria for layoffs are laid down in black and white for everyone to see. Layoffs will be necessary if the job market changes, if student interest and demand changes. That will evolve with the passage of time. At the same time I think it is clear that there is a responsibility on vocational schools to add new courses which are needed to train people for job openings which are likely to arrive with the development of our resources here in this Province.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister again indicates that if there is not a demand in the job market some of these courses will become redundant and the people laid off. But I ask again, is there some kind of pre-planning going on in relationship with industry and private enterprise to ascertain what the future demands will be, what future industrial demands will be, so that we can carry on an efficient retraining programme with the instructors who are now in place?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the member for Terra Nova seems to be disappointed that the vocational school system is finally responding to the changing nature of the job market and it is getting its priorities straight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, there has been a

MS. VERGE: lot of work already done by the Departments of Education and Labour and Manpower of the provincial government, with some input and co-operation from the federal government through Canada Employment and Immigration, to project the need for job training in our Province. In the Department of Education a few months ago we added a new position called Supervisor of Training for Resource Development to boost this ongoing effort. And with the projects that are made and the criteria laid down for layoffs, the decisions were made for the reduction of numbers in certain courses and at the same time for the addition of the new courses that I mentioned with a growing emphasis on the two and three year technology courses.

MR. LUSH: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I know there is a lot of planning going on when, in view of the tremendous demand for technical people, skilled people, here the government are laying off eighteen vocational teachers. Mr. Speaker, my question is, is the government contemplating closing any of the vocational schools throughout the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for

Bellevue

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question

for the Minister of Health (Mr. House).

MR. NEARY:

Do not say anything about

hospitals. The Premier says he is going to close them all down.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask

the Minister of Health- reading yesterday's annual report which

was tabled by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), I notice

that last year \$42,000 was spent on the Markland Cottage

Hospital in renovations, \$42,000 spent in the year 1980/81-

I want to ask the Minister of Health how does he rationalize

spending that much money as recently as last year with the

statement that he made yesterday, in yesterday's press

release, that the Markland Cottage Hospital is an obsolete

hospital structure? Now of course I do not even know, and

perhaps the minister can explain, how much money was spent in

a couple of years previous to last year, but last year alone

\$42,000 was spent and it is not for - it says renovations,

So would the minister explain the discrepancy between his

statement yesterday and the money that the government has been

spending in recent years?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised there

was not perhaps more money than that spent on Markland last year.

The fact of the matter is the Fire Marshall has been going around

inspecting all of the hospital facilities. We know a lot of

the old hospitals, the cottage hospitals in the Province, are

wooden structures, and fire safety codes have changed, and we have

a special vote in the department, every year it shows up in the

Department of Health, it shows up for these kind of repairs to

keep up with the Fire Marshall's recommendation and code. And, you

know, we did it in Burin. For instance, we just finished a

renovation to that kind of thing in Burin, fire safety,

MR. HOUSE: fire walls, even though it has been talked about when the new hospital goes up that one will be phased out completely. So it is in keeping with safety and that is the reason why we did it and we will do it in any place to ensure that there is going to be no hazard in these buildings that we have to use.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Health, could he explain why he will not be attending the public meeting at Whitbourne tonight regarding the future of the Markland Cottage Hospital? Is it because the minister has a prior commitment or what other reason does he have?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I did have a message from the people in Whitbourne, I presume it is from the committee, asking me if I would attend the rally or public meeting that they are having tonight. I replied that I would not be attending that meeting but I would be willing to sit down with the committee and discuss all the details.

MR. YOUNG: Hear, hear! A good answer.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister,

MR. CALLAN:

and perhaps the minister can confirm or deny, it seems to me and perhaps seems to many people out in that general area that the fate of the Markland hospital, you know, is doomed now. The hospital will definitely go and, judging from what the minister said yesterday, there is no turning back. Let me ask the minister then, is this part of government's plan, long-term strategy? Can we assume that once the hospitals, are completed in Clarendville and on the Burin Peninsula, that the Come-by-Chance hospital will go and then the Burin and St. Lawrence etc.

MR. HODDER: What about Botwood?

MR. CALLAN: Would the minister confirm or deny that it is the intention of this administration to close down all ten cottage hospitals in this Province, similar to what is happening with Markland?

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

MR. NEARY: Close them all down

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it is no news to anybody. We have to review all the facilities we have in the Province. We are reviewing them, as I say, in Central Newfoundland now, and this was mentioned in the release, I think, yesterday. The fact of the matter is we are looking at all facilities to see what best use they can be put to. Now, we were looking at the cottage hospital in Whitbourne for some time and I do believe that where you have access to more than 50 per cent of the hospital beds in the Province forty minutes drive away, there is no rational reason in the world to keep that particular facility open. I do not believe it can be justified and there is no other use it can be put to. What we are looking at is all the hospitals in the

MR. HOUSE: Province and saying, you know, are they functional? What is the best possible use they can be put to? And this is an ongoing process.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation.

For some time now there has been some discussion between the minister and his federal counterpart (Mr. Jean-Luc Pepin) concerning the airstrip programme for coastal Labrador. Approximately two and one-half weeks ago, I asked the Premier what was the status and unfortunately he did not know too much about it. I am just wondering could the Minister of Transportation enlighten us as to what is the status at the present time on the airstrips along the coast of Labrador, in particular, Postville?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that not only on this topic, but on any other topic that is brought up in this House, the Premier knows much more than the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: On January 30th the Premier and I, in a much disputed signing of a transportation package for the Province, between this Province and the federal government, we signed a letter of intent on a Labrador airstrip programme, and this letter of intent outlined basically the principles that would be followed in the Province and the federal government working together in providing an airstrip programme for the residents of Coastal Labrador. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the Province wanted to ensure - unlike some of the support from the federal MP representing the area - wanted to ensure that not only would the air transportation of the residents of coastal Labrador be acknowledged, but also the fact that we wanted to ensure that the marine coastal service would be adequate for the years to come. And this, Mr. Speaker, we were able to do by inserting clauses in this letter of intent.

On April 13th of this year I forwarded to Mr. Pepin a draft agreement that the Province was prepared to sign asking him to sign this agreement so that we could continue with the programme that had been identified in the letter of intent, that is, the construction this Summer of three additional airstrips in Coastal Labrador, namely, Postville, Rigolet and Port Hope Simpson. Some time after that, about a month after that, I received a telex from Mr. Pepin indicating that there was something in the agreement that he found to be significantly different than the letter of intent. I have looked through the agreement and I cannot find where that significant difference is, and I telexed Mr. Pepin back indicating to him that if in his opinion

MR. DAWE: and in the opinion of his officials there was a difference, then that could be worked out. I found it sort of odd that he had waited somewhat over a month to respond and asked him, in the interest of expediency and getting on with the work that had been planned and since the design work had already been done on Postville, that we go ahead and construct the airstrip in Postville similar to four other airstrips that had been constructed in Coastal Labrador. Up to this point in time, Mr. Speaker, there has not been a response. I understand that the design and the money is available for Postville and we should go ahead with that at a moment's notice, with the tender calls, and the Province is willing and able to do that.

As it relates to the other two airstrips that were proposed for this present summer, we understand from Transport Canada's air administration office in Moncton

MR. DAWE: that the design work, the necessary design work is not yet completed on those two airstrips, and it is very doubtful if they can get it prepared in time for this construction season. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that again one branch of the federal government does not know what the other one is doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. With all that rambling, can I gather from the minister that when he wrote back to the Federal Minister, Jean-Luc Pepin, on April 13 that in his response to the letter of intent that he did put in some stipulations? We understand that it is 100 per cent financed from the federal government. Were there other stipulations put in the minister's letter that he wrote to the Federal Minister on April 13?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Let me see if I can try and decipher a question out of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: The letter of intent, Mr. Speaker, which has been made public outlined a number of factors involved in the Coastal Labrador airstrip programme which -

AN HON. MEMBER: Good work.

MR. DAWE: - essentially, yes, the federal government is to pay 100 per cent of the capital cost of building the airstrips.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Part of that agreement also calls, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most onerous part of that whole programme is for the Province to maintain and operate those airstrips, pay the necessary staff and look after

MR. DAWE: them 100 per cent from now for all time. And whereas I suppose the capital cost in the eyes of the federal government initially was to be garnered from not supplying new coastal boats for Labrador, they now find themselves, through hard bargaining on behalf of this government, finding themselves in a position where it is going to be very difficult for them to trade off, if you will, the coastal boat programme for an airstrip programme. So we have them in a bit of a bind, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that this is the reason they are starting to squirm and back off on their agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. WARREN: Follow your Premier!

MR. DAWE: You want us to sit there and say nothing, I suppose.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it looks as if the cottage hospital programme in Newfoundland, it looks like the days for that programme are numbered. The hon. gentleman made some very interesting comments there when he was answering my colleague, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). The hon. gentleman mentioned that a study was being done on the Central Newfoundland area. Would the hon. gentleman care to tell the House what particular aspect of the medical facilities in Central Newfoundland he is looking at? For instance, is the hon. gentleman now - does he have the Botwood Hospital high on his list to get the axe? Is that the next one to go?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, we are not looking at any particular hospital to give an axe to. That is not our policy. Our policy is to try to

MR. HOUSE:

operate a health system and try to make that as efficient as possible.

MR. YOUNG:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE:

The fact of the matter

is we are looking at the Central Newfoundland hospital system now, the system totally as it pertains from Springdale to Fogo Island down to Brookfield, and it is in relationship to our five year plan and our relationship to an announced construction to go ahead, say, for instance, on the Grand Falls Hospital. So it is done in that particular light.

One of the things we have been looking at for some time is to what best use all our hospital beds can be put. The fact of the matter is, with the advances in modern medicine, changes do come about, and we are looking at it in that light.

For you to ask me if I am going to give this one the axe or that one the axe, I think nobody can say that. That is not our purpose. Our purpose is to utilize our buildings to the best advantage.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon.

the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Well, let me put the question to the hon. gentleman another way. If he does not have the courage to come out and tell the people what the plans are concerning hospitals in their area, would the hon. gentleman care to tell the House and the people of Central Newfoundland, especially the people in Botwood, that their hospital will not be closed? Would

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman undertake to give that commitment to the House?

MR. HODDER: A good question.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there is no intention of closing any hospitals. That is not the purpose of the study. The purpose of the study is to see all hospitals in relation to the needs of health care delivery in the Province.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: That is a very vague and general answer which has no meaning. That answer does not have any meaning. I asked the hon. gentleman a point-blank question about the Botwood hospital. Now let me ask him about the hospital in Come By Chance. Can the hon. gentleman make a commitment to the House that the hospital in Come By Chance will not get the axe?

MR. BAIRD: That is a hypothetical question.

MR. NEARY: It is not a hypothetical question.

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am not giving anybody any information that I do not have. We are not talking about closing any hospitals now, we are reassessing our hospital beds in the Province.

This is a continuous process, and I think as a Department of Health, and as

MR. HOUSE: a government, we have that obligation to reassess and utilize all the buildings we have to the best advantage.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the question I am putting to the hon. gentleman - he seems somehow or other to be avoiding the question. A simple yes or no answer, that is all I want. Can the hon. gentleman assure this House and the people of this Province, make a commitment here in the House, that no further hospitals, no more hospitals will be closed? Well, could the hon. gentleman make that commitment?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am making no such commitment. I cannot make that kind of commitment because, as I said, there is a continual reassessing

MR. W. HOUSE: and it would be irresponsible for any minister to stand up here and say nothing will happen, nothing will be closed.

MR. NEARY: Would you resign if they were?

MR. HOUSE: I am not going to make that commitment.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of Health and this government will continually be assessing and reassessing our health care system and use the system that we have to the best advantage.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman explain to the House what guidelines are being used in this study that he keeps referring to? And what hospitals now in Central Newfoundland is the hon. gentleman looking at? Is he looking at the medical facilities in Central Newfoundland vis-à-vis the Botwood Hospital?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Is the study to determine whether or not hospital beds can be eliminated or hospitals can be shut down? As the Minister of Education (MS. L. Verge) says so often, 'Is that the criteria the hon. gentleman is using?'

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

MR. HOUSE: That is right, Mr. Speaker, we will not be closing the one in Port aux Basque.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. You would not dare.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is trying to put words in my mouth. He is not going to succeed.

MR. W. HOUSE: I told him what the study in Central Newfoundland was. It was all the system right from Brookfield through to Springdale looking at the total bed situation we have there and how best we can deliver the health care systems.

And, you know, there is a lot of programmes involved in health care delivery. There is senior citizens, there is a kind of programme that we talked about in Old Perlican, the maximization units for development of retarded children and so. So it is being assessed in that light. It is not being assessed in any light of what we can close down or what we cannot.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's colleague, the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. J. Reid), made a statement there about a week and a half ago that Old Perlican would not lose any beds. That was a commitment, publically. I saw the hon. gentleman on television. I saw his own physique, his own words. He told the people of Trinity-Bay de Verde, I presume he was repeating what the hon. gentleman had told him, that there would be no loss of beds in the Old Perlican Hospital. Now would the hon. gentleman indicate if the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde has reprimanded the hon. gentleman for now reducing the number of beds in Old Perlican Hospital, or does the hon. gentleman intend to pass in his resignation for deceiving the people the way he did?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde was very clear; it was there, it was on, it was shown on television. But I think what was not shown was what he stated before.

MR. HOUSE: He is with us, in total agreement with the plans we have for the Old Perlican Hospital. The fact of the matter is the number of beds that are going to be retained as acute care beds in the Old Perlican Hospital is about the same number as has been used there for the last number of years. Old Perlican Hospital has been like a lot of other facilities, has been under-utilized, and we could not justify keeping it open for one-third of the beds that were used, although there were 800 to 900 people admitted to that hospital last year.

MR. NEARY: Stand up for your constituents, boy.

MR. HOUSE: Now it is being used, or going to be used, for another purpose in conjunction with the ten or twelve bed in-patient care that we are going to retain. So the member is onside, because what we have done now is we are going to keep the service that was there plus the fact that we are taking care of another problem that the Social Services Department had.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
Time for Question Period has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table answers to questions Number 71 and 72 asked on May 14th by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question raised by the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), the cost of renovations to the minister's offices in the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981, none. But in that period of time, Mr. Speaker, my office did move from the Gorman Butler Building

MR. DINN: to the Beothuck Building. In that move the only thing we did not move from the Gorman Butler Building to the Beothuck Building was the carpet, I do not think we were allowed to do that, but the furniture is the same, the pictures on the wall are the same and so on. So there were no renovations to offices.

MR. NEARY: Do you have a coloured picture of the Premier on the wall?

MR. SIMMS: Certainly, why not.

MR. DINN: Absolutely! I have two.

MR. NEARY: How many times a day do you kiss the hon. Premier's picture?

MR. DINN: That is not necessary, Mr. Speaker.

In answer to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), that is not a necessary part of being in this government, to kiss the hon. member's picture, unlike the government that the hon. member served in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, we shall continue with Motion No. 6. The debate was adjourned last day by the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

The hon. Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the Private Member's motion relates to negotiations with the federal government over the offshore issue and the resolution part asks this hon. House to support the position of Newfoundland in its willingness to re-open these negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly like to support that motion, and I would like to make a point straight off that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has absolutely no problem, none whatsoever, in reaching agreements with the federal government. We can do it. We have done it. I would just like to recall to hon. members' minds a letter that was written to the hon. the Premier by the Prime Minister of Canada on September 14th., 1979, when the Prime Minister of Canada stated in part:

"In Ottawa on September 5th., we talked about the question of offshore mineral resources. We examined the question of certain principles being fundamental to the resolution of the offshore resource issue as you had suggested in your letter. I am happy to confirm the acceptance of the four principles which are set out as an annex to this letter." And in the annex to the letter, Mr. Speaker, the first principle is, "The Province of Newfoundland should own the resource. Such ownership should be to the extent possible of the same nature as if these resources were located within the boundaries of the Province." And it goes on further, and the fourth point, "The above principles will be further confirmed and implemented by the signing of an agreement between the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and by appropriate legislative action and constitutional change." That was a letter, and the annex was written by the Prime Minister of this Country to the Premier of this Province- Prime Minister Clark.

DR. J. COLLINS: So, Mr. Speaker, we have absolutely no difficulty and problem in reaching agreements with the federal government. What we do have a problem with, what we have a great problem with is reaching an agreement with the Trudeau Administration. It is not with the federal government, it is with the Trudeau Administration that our problem arises.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make sure that there is an appreciation of what is going on in this negotiating process that we are trying to set up between the government of this Province and the Trudeau Administration. There has been some

DR. COLLINS: indication that this is looked upon as a squabble, that this is looked on as bickering, as though it was not only, shall we say, a minor thing rather than an absolutely fundamentally important thing, but also that implies that there is equal blame on both sides. Mr. Speaker, I want to do my best to try to put the blame where the blame should be and to show the instances where there has been federal dissembling, less than forthrightness on this whole issue.

Mr. Speaker, let me just remind hon. members of the statement made by the Prime Minister of Canada, the Prime Minister of Canada after Mr. Clark, that is Prime Minister Trudeau, on May 5th, I believe it was, 1981, when he spoke to a rally over at the university and he said at that point, "We consistently maintain that ownership is not the important issue and that reaching a negotiated statement on shared management is a vitally important issue. Either it will be negotiation or it will be a court decision." Now, either/or, not both, not something going on concurrently, either negotiation or court action. "I am offering the choice to negotiate, not offering the choice of court action. It is either negotiation or court action, and I am offering the chance to negotiate, not court action." Now I am quoting the words that were spoken by the Prime Minister himself. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is not a squabble. That indicates that we are not squabbling when we say, 'Stick to what you said. You indicated we wanted to negotiate, not get into court action.' That is not a squabble. We are merely saying, 'Stick to what you indicated.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, to go further with that, I would like to just inform the hon. members of certain communications, certain direct communications

June 9,1982

Tape No. 1120

ah-2

DR. COLLINS: that took place between the
present Premier of this Province and Prime Minister Trudeau.

DR. COLLINS: On the 19th. of May, in order to get this negotiating process on the go, the Premier telexed the Prime Minister of Canada and in part said as follows: "In light of your expressed willingness to enter negotiations I would assume that your position with respect to the SIU case" - and I will go into the SIU case a little further along, but I am sure that hon. members and most other people in the Province know what the SIU case is all about by this time - "now before the federal court will be altered to involve only the labour relations issue."

Now, there was a reply to that. The reply took over two months in coming, but there was a reply. There was a reply on the 27th. of July, two months and about six days after the hon. the Premier sent off that telex to get clarification on the federal position. But there was a reply, thank goodness!

Now, in part the Prime Minister said as follows: "Our divergence of views on ownership has introduced an element of uncertainty". Now, our divergence of views - it indicates the divergence of views is the issue. "The ownership issue cannot remain unresolved much longer". So the Prime Minister indicates he wants to resolve the ownership issue, exactly what we want to do. "This leaves the Federal Government with no alternative but to see that this matter is resolved by one means or another". Not by a particular approach, "by one means or another through the legal process". Not the judicial process, through the legal process.

We in this House are engaged, for instance, in a legal process, we are in the process of creating laws. The Constitution is the legal process. The Constitution is the great law.

DR. COLLINS: The constitution is
the great law. So if you put something in the
Constitution you are dealing with the legal process.

Now the Prime Minister
went on and he said: "However, more important is
the fact that the jurisdiction issue should not be
allowed to obscure the requirement

DR. COLLINS: to find a solution which best meets the needs of the people of Newfoundland and all Canadians. The overriding thing should be a means of arriving at a solution which meets both needs." The overriding thing is not to get into court, the overriding thing is to reach an agreement. "The federal government is most anxious to renew negotiations with provincial authorities with a view to resolving the present impasse."

Now, Mr. Speaker, who would take any reading from that other than that the federal government feels that the ownership issue should be resolved, it should be resolved through the legal process in which we are all involved. But the overriding thing is we reach an agreement, we should not allow the court issue or a reference to the court to obscure, to interfere with or otherwise obstruct the negotiations and the arriving at a good solution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a reply to the Prime Minister by our Premier, not in two months, two and a half months time but on the 6th of August, approximately ten day later. And the Premier said 'I believe the discussions would have a greater chance of success if you and I were to hold a prior meeting concerning the framework within which our respective officials will operate'. Is that a co-operative approach? Is that a person who wants to fight, who wants to squabble, who wants to bicker? This is an offer to sit down, to set up the framework so that the officials who will have to carry the ball will be able to work efficiently and expeditiously. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the response to that very reasonable approach? There was a response, a fairly hurried response, on the 28th of August, about three weeks later, and from the Prime Minister of Canada to the Premier of this Province. And the response in part was, 'I remain convinced that officials should prepare the ground

DR. COLLINS: prior to ministerial consideration'.

So there is a flat turndown, an absolutely flat turndown. Who is being the co-operative one? Who is putting forward his best efforts to get things going? Is it the Premier? Is it the Prime Minister? I think that if we are talking about squabbling, if we are talking about obstruction, we should remember the record and see what took place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also remind hon. members, if they need reminding, that that was not the only indication that was less than forthright enthusiasm and co-operation to have this negotiating process. I remind hon. members that the federal government put a deadline, the 28th of February, 1982, there was to be a deadline. It did not matter whether things were progressing slowly or quickly, there was to be a deadline and at that point in time it was going to be a cut off anyway. Is that a co-operative, is that a useful approach to settling this complex issue?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to just mention a few other instances where the federal government, not the provincial government, where the federal government has been less than helpful in this negotiating process.

DR. COLLINS:

I mentioned the SIU case.

And I would remind hon. members again that the SIU case arose out of a labour dispute. It had nothing directly to do with the jurisdictional issue whatever. It had to do with a labour dispute that was being settled by various courts, and finally ended up in a federal court.

And at this point what happened, Mr. Speaker? What happened was that the federal government decided to intervene so as to assert its ownership claims, it was tacking its ownership claims on to what was a labour dispute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Now when the negotiating process got underway, so as to keep to the understanding on both sides, to keep to a co-operative approach, the Government of Newfoundland called upon the courts, made an application to the courts to adjourn the case so that it would not come up, as it was destined to do, during the negotiating process and then this whole ownership thing come out and upset the negotiating process.

The Newfoundland Government called upon the federal government to join them in that action, which would seem logical, and if the federal government was to be co-operative and helpful within that negotiating framework, surely it should acceded to the Newfoundland request. A total federal refusal to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

They were going to permit, they were going to insert the question, in the judicial system they were going to insert the question of ownership in the middle of the negotiating process.

Now, Mr. Speaker, who is fooling whom when they say that someone is trying to upset the negotiating process? Now, Mr. Speaker, was that all that came out of the issue there? By no means. A short time before this, or around

June 9, 1982

Tape 1123

PK - 2

DR. COLLINS: the same time, I believe it was a short time before this Mr. Lalonde's office sent out calls for the sending in of proposals for permits on the offshore. I think it was for 4.7 million acres, the vast, vast majority of which was within

DR. J. COLLINS: the Newfoundland offshore area, the disputed area. In the midst of the negotiating process the question that was being negotiated and at issue was to be taken over by the federal government on the basis of calling for permits. Mr. Speaker, on the 31st of August that year, the Premier telexed the Prime Minister again on this issue and he said, 'We must insist that actions now underway by your government, to issue permits unilaterally on the disputed lands be deferred' - be deferred - 'while such negotiations are being held.' Again, there was a response about two weeks later and the response was, ' Mr. LaLonde has announced a two month extension to November 10th of the deadline for his call for proposals.' Was there an agreement to adjourn, to defer this call for proposals until after the negotiating process was over? No, Mr. Speaker. Because the deadline that the federal government had unilaterally - we never accepted it - that they had unilaterally put on the negotiation process was the 28th of February and it was just a deferment until the 10th of November. Again, who was being the co-operative one here? Who was trying to have the negotiation process go forward steadily, smoothly, steadfastly? I think that I need hardly to ask the question?

Mr. Speaker, what did then occur?

What occurred was that the Newfoundland Government put the question to our own Court of Appeal. When it saw that what the federal government was doing was not acting - and I do not have any hesitation in saying this - was not acting in good faith, it was not continuing under the terms that were quite readily understood by any reasonable person, that they were going ahead with issuing permits, that they were going ahead with promoting a judicial decision on the offshore question, the Newfoundland Government had no choice but to put the whole question into its own Court of Appeal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us be very

June 9, 1982

Tape No. 1124

MJ - 2

DR. J. COLLINS: clear on this: If a question goes to the Supreme Court of Canada, there is no appeal from that. That is the end of the line. It is over and done with once the Supreme Court of Canada comes down. You have just one chance once you get into the Supreme Court of Canada. It is therefore absolutely incredibly important that a fair hearing be given to the side putting in the question. To have any question about a fair hearing when you are at the final decision making without any hope of any further appeal, to have any question of a fair hearing there would be outlandish.

DR. COLLINS: I submit that and I suggest that no reasonable person would question that.

Now, what is the process that is set up in Canada to ensure that the side putting in the question ultimately to the Supreme Court of Canada gets a fair hearing? The process is that it goes into that province's own Court of Appeal in the first instance. That is a means of ensuring a fair hearing, because you do not get a second chance. And to interfere with that whole process is little short of iniquitous, a little short of malevolent. But that is what happened, Mr. Speaker. As we all know, to our chagrin, that is what happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to mention to hon. members some points in a telegram that was received by this government, a telegram sent by the Prime Minister of Canada at the time that the federal government set out to interfere with that mechanism whereby fair hearings are obtained upon reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. There was an explanatory telex sent in which, Mr. Speaker, there were statements made that do not attune themselves with the facts. I would like very briefly just to mention one or two of these.

In his telex, the Prime Minister said: "I was convinced that our two governments should be able to reach an honourable agreement to which both sides would commit themselves regardless of the outcome of any court ruling on ownership." Mr. Speaker, how can you commit yourself against a court ruling? There is only one way to commit yourself to be safe from a court ruling, that is, to entrench the agreement in the

DR. COLLINS: constitution. The federal government during the negotiation process absolutely refused to do so. So to say that 'I was convinced that we could commit ourselves' to be safe from any challenge from a court ruling and then, at the same time, refuse entrenchment in the constitution, was dissembling.

DR. COLLINS: It was not being factual, it was not being straight. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister went on a little further down, "It was on this basis that my negotiators conducted extensive negotiation with your representatives last Fall and Winter." Mr. Speaker, I do not need to remind hon. members in this House that we were the ones who put in a proposal and the federal government, to this date, to this very date has not responded to it. Now what extensive negotiations are those where one side puts in proposals, comes forward, comes to the table and the other side refuses to even answer? Extensive negotiations!

Mr. Speaker

I will skip over a few things, but here is the most shocking part of this telex, and it says, "The federal government has today asked the Supreme Court of Canada to rule on the question of whether Canada or Newfoundland has ownership of and jurisdiction over the Hibernia fields." Mr. Speaker, we know that is an absolute travesty of what in actual fact happened. There is a map of what went to the Supreme Court; it was not over the Hibernia field, it was over the Nautilus structure, it was partly over the Ben Nevis structure, it was partly over the Hebron structure, it was partly over the Terra Nova structure. So that even on that simple point there cannot be straightforwardness, there cannot be clean dealing with the people of this Province. Mr. Speaker, if there is any question of quibbling, of bickering, of good faith or bad faith, the facts show that it is the Newfoundland government which has been straightforward and it is the federal government which continually and repeatedly throughout the thing threw roadblocks in the way, went back on its undertakings, and did ultimately ruin, as it has so many

June 9, 1982

Tape No. 1126

ah-2

DR. COLLINS: other things, ruined the negotiating process.

Mr. Speaker, accordingly I have the greatest of pleasure in saying that we will go back to the negotiating table, but we will go back with the zippers on our pockets, and we will make sure we do not turn our backs to the other side. We will do it cheerfully and we will do it with the interest of the people of this Province and of all Canadians in mind.

Thank you.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to have a few words on

MR. CALLAN: this resolution by the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). I first of all want to respond to at least some of the things that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was saying. He was giving us, in my opinion, all the wrong reasons, of course, why negotiations have broken off and have failed to this point in time, and blaming the whole thing on Ottawa and the Prime Minister and so on.

MR. NEARY: Squabbling again.

MR. CALLAN: Squabbling. It is traditional, of course, Mr. Speaker, of most of the Ministerial Statements and the ministers arguments on practically every topic that has to do with anything that goes on between this Province and Ottawa.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can refer to many agreements that have been signed, and perhaps it is a fair question to ask, Why were there no DREE agreements signed with the federal government in Ottawa during the nine months that another Prime Minister was there? You see, in my opinion I believe, Mr. Speaker, that an awful lot of people across this Province are beginning, perhaps a little bit late now, but they are beginning to share the opinion that the reason that this Province is stagnant and is not moving forward, and the reason why no more settlements and no more agreements are being made, goes back to the nature of the Premier, goes back to the nature of the man who is the Premier of this Province.

As I just finished saying, Mr. Speaker, everybody in this Province knows it is not only during the period of time that our Premier has been in office and that Mr. Trudeau has been in office in Ottawa, that is not the only time, in that short history, that there has been squabbles and disagreements and so on. Perhaps hon. members opposite like to forget the

MR. CALLAN:

nine months when Mr.

Clark was the Prime Minister of this country and they like to forget that there were no DREE agreements signed during that nine month period. And, of course, we had our Premier, the same Premier that we have today, saying that Romeo LeBlanc was a better Fisheries Minister than his own colleague, Mr. McGrath.

MR. CALLAN: And we had the unholy row with Nova Scotia, and the cat-calls and the name calling that went on between our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), of course, who was led by the Premier, against the Minister of Fisheries in Nova Scotia. All these things happened, Mr. Speaker, between two Tory Governments. It went on between two Tory Governments. Even though the players have changed in Nova Scotia and the players have changed in Ottawa, the players have not changed in this Province, Mr. Speaker. The players and the chief actors in this play are the same. The Premier is the chief actor in this play. And the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) who was then the Minister of Fisheries, is the other actor. He is still here in the same portfolio, and, of course, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) still here and was here then.

Mr. Speaker, I want to move an amendment to resolution moved by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). I move, seconded by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) that the motion be amended by striking out all words in the resolution after 'negotiations', all words after 'negotiations'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: So that the motion will read then Mr. Speaker, the motion will read as follows:
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.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, we are against that last little half a dozen words there which read

MR. CALLAN: as follows in the original motion, "and permanently should an agreement be reached." We do not agree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: We do not agree.

MR. MORGAN: A pre-condition.

MR. NEARY: You cannot negotiate with that over your head. That is a part of the negotiation.

AN HON. MEMBER: It cannot be.

MR. NEARY: Yes, absolutely. It should be part of the negotiations.

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get back to what I was saying. The reason, by the way, that we are moving this amendment is obvious, forever and ever and permanently is a long, long time, and I do not want to dwell on that, it is self-evident.

MR. NEARY: No, we hear that every day on the Upper Churchill.

MR. CALLAN: That is right. We hear about the other agreements.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that love is blind. There is an old saying, a proverb, I suppose, that love is blind. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that that proverb can be any truer applied than to the love that some politicians have for their own political party. In no way can they see any fault with what their own party does even though everybody else around them sees that the Premier's position is wrong or somebody else's position is wrong.

What we have happening, Mr. Speaker, in this Province - and it has been going on now for nearly four years, for nearly four years it has been going on - what we have happening is this: We do not have in word and we do not have in actual fact a department with that particular name, with that particular title, but what we really have, even though the name is not given to that department - and as we all know, Mr. Speaker, we have enough departments of government already; we had a couple of new ones created following the last election to accommodate a couple of the Premier's friends. But what we have, Mr. Speaker - let me just quote from a few notes. You see, the whole problem lies with the Premier, and what has actually happened is that the Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador has created a new government office -

MR. WARREN: What? Tell us about it.

MR. CALLAN: - for the handling of affairs with the federal government.

MR. WARREN: What is the name of the office?

MR. CALLAN: The office is called the Department of Intergovernmental Bickering and Fussing Purpose of Keeping the News Media Busy - and that has been happening for nearly four years now and confusing constituents. And the Premier did

MR. CALLAN: an admirable job of it over the four years, and especially during the twenty-one days during March and April. As of yet the Premier has not yet appointed a minister to oversee the department, although the most qualified person for the job happens to be the Premier himself.

MR. WARREN: Oh, 1 sec. 1 sec.

MR. CALLAN: The newly created department will take over the duties of the present Intergovernmental Affairs Department that pertain to dealing with the federal government. And the new department will be subdivided into two divisions, the Compromise Division and the Stubborn Division.

MR. WARREN: Oh, oh! Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: The function of these two divisions, although they have not been defined, are more or less self-evident. The department of intergovernmental bickering and fussing for the purpose of keeping the news media busy and confusing the constituents, will begin hiring and training programmes immediately. Applicants for a job with this department -

MR. WARREN: How do you get a job?

MR. CALLAN: - must have some basic qualifications -

MR. TULK: That is a good job to have.

That is a job to have.

MR. CALLAN: - which include -

MR. WARREN: What are they?

MR. CALLAN: - experience in name calling, disagreeing with whatever is said, sulking, not going down, for example, to the Newfoundland Hotel to sign an agreement but sulking and saying, "We are going to stay here at the seat of government," even though the Premier could have gone down and said, "I am very pleased that we are signing

MR. CALLAN: this agreement here in the Newfoundland Hotel because in several months from now the hotel will be destroyed to make room for the new Newfoundland Hotel and therefore we are making history here in this building today."

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: He could have said all of these things. He could have compromised. But no, no, that division of that new department of government is not a compromising division. It is the stubborn division -

MR. WARREN: What other qualifications do you need?

MR. CALLAN: - which the emphasis has been placed on in particular, Mr. Speaker. Anyway, the other qualifications, in addition to experience in name calling, disagreeing with whatever is said and sulking, that, Mr. Speaker, is what has been happening in this Province in particular for the past three and a half to four years. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, because of its unusually long name, the department of intergovernmental bickering and fussing for the purpose of keeping the news media busy and confusing the constituents will be known shortly as Interfuss -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: - the new department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, there is no department of government, it is not listed in the telephone directory, the internal telephone directory and neither do we find it in the departmental salary estimates or anywhere else, but as everybody in this Province, and some people a bit late, are beginning to realize, Mr. Speaker, that this is what has been happening in this Province. So even though it does not exist on paper it does exist in fact. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, we do not have an agreement with Ottawa such as Nova Scotia has, even though we were told and it was indicated in the Nova Scotia agreement that Newfoundland would probably get a better agreement because right in the Nova Scotia agreement it said, unless this will remain -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: . You should sit there for the first year and be seen and not heard.

MR. TOBIN: I intend to represent the people.

MR. NEARY: You are copying what the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) teaches you - nastiness.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is here for a visit so he should enjoy himself.

MR. WARREN: He is here for a visit, that is all.

MR. NEARY: Right, you are only here for a short time anyway.

MR. WARREN: That is right.

MR. TOBIN: You will be lying down and I will be still around.

MR. NEARY: I have seen a lot of members come and go who said that.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: There is a lot of water under the bridge in twenty years. When you get twenty years under your belt then you will be able to talk.

MR. WARREN: That is right. Do not be too cocky now with only six weeks under your belt.

MR. NEARY: Seven elections in twenty years. When you get that under your belt then you will have something to talk about.

MR. TOBIN: I will tell you one thing, I am a great worker (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: He is getting flushed up again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the vocal member, the very vocal member opposite from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) -

MR. WARREN:

A young junior.

MR. CALLAN:

- is a prime example of what I was saying earlier in my few remarks.

MR. WARREN:

Of the new department.

MR. CALLAN:

No, he is a prime example of what I was saying earlier, that the old proverb that says that love is blind cannot be applied any better, I do not think, to love that some people have for their political party. And the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West should remember, Mr. Speaker, that one of his colleagues on his side, who was now looking in through the doorway and just left, was also down for a visit.

MR. WARREN:

That is right, in the same area.

MR. CALLAN:

The member who now represents Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), he went down there and he got elected, but it was just for a visit. The next time around he was knocked head over heels.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

And if the member - Mr. Speaker, I ran into a colleague of the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West when he was with the Department of Social Services. I ran into one of his colleagues who told me two weeks before polling day - and he was correct on this point - he said, and he used his name which I cannot do in the Legislature, but he, the P.C. candidate - it was the first time ever I heard his name - said, 'You know, he is going to give Don Hollett a run for his money in Burin -

MR. CALLAN: Placentia West,' and he said, 'I think he is going to win.' And he was right.

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

Would the hon. member confine his remarks to the motion, please?

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will confine my remarks to the motion, and the motion is - what the motion is all about, Mr. Speaker, is why negotiations have not been concluded - not only this particular negotiation, but all the others that I mentioned earlier - why they have not succeeded. And it has to do, Mr. Speaker, with the Premier of this Province.

June 9, 1932

Tape No. 1133

MJ - 1

MR. W. CALLAN: And, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Premier called an election, which was held on April 6th, on this very issue which this motion is all about. And the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. G. Tobin) was one of the members who got elected on the coattails of the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: - on the coattails of the Premier, and he is here for a visit.

MR. G. WARREN: Right on. It was not his own experience, it was not his own knowledge, I will tell you that.

MR. CALLAN: That is what this motion is all about, Mr. Speaker. But anyway his colleague said to me, he said, 'He is going to win the district of Burin-Placentia West,' and he was correct on that. But he said, 'He is pretty shallow,' I think he was correct on that as well.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. the hon. the President of the Council, on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: You called the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. W. Callan) to order because he was being irrelevant. The hon. member is continuing along in the same refrain. When the hon. member is doing that, what he is doing is he is disregarding the ruling of Your Honour.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: My hon. colleague did observe the ruling given by Your Honour there a couple of minutes ago. And it is relevant. The hon. gentleman may have been wandering at the time, and he may be saying things now that hurt the hon. gentleman because they cannot stand the truth on that side of the House,

MR. S. NEARY: but I think it is merely now, Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. gentleman is back on track a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member is not going to leave the House with his back up, is he?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: We do not have Marshall Rules here either.

It is not Marshall Law in this House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, I think there is a difference of opinion. I have to ask the hon. member to continue.

MR. WARREN: Good ruling. Good ruling.

MR. CALLAN: Thank-you, Mr. Speaker. In the two minutes that I have left I want to quote from a very famous writer. In earlier remarks, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House of Assembly,

MR. CALLAN: I have been talking about the district of Bellevue and the many important people who have been born in the district of Bellevue, including the Premier, at Whitbourne, in the Markland Cottage Hospital, and the last President of the University. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a very important writer who was also born in the district of Bellevue, and just let me quote how this gentleman, this famous writer described what happened on April 6th.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not relevant.

MR. CALLAN: This is relevant, it has to do with the Premier calling a provincial election on the offshore issue and how he won the tremendous mandate. And this writer, this very famous writer who was born in the district of Bellevue and who I believe is a Tory, as far as I know, I know his father is -

MR. MARSHALL: Most people are now.

MR. CALLAN: Not most people, 60 per cent in this Province. Most people were on April 6th., but I would say at this point in time, if they had a chance again, especially after seeing the infamous budget and the silly nonsense that the Premier is continuing with, they probably are not very Tory at all. I rather doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the most of the members of the Markland Cottage Hospital Improvement Committee, who are Tories, and they admit it, it is public knowledge, I rather doubt that they are as Tory now as they were, and I rather doubt that they are Tory at all.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

And all over Newfoundland and Labrador it is the same way.

MR. CALLAN: And that includes Dr. Norman and Stan Dawe and the other members of the Committee. And we will find out tonight, myself and

MR. CALLAN: the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid). Because I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde opposes what is happening in Markland. Three towns, Greens Harbour, Hopeall and New Harbour are also trusting to that hospital. And, Mr. Speaker, since my time is up - I was going to quote from that famous speaker but I will have another occasion. It is very interesting reading, very interesting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I was very, very glad to hear the remarks of the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) since presumably after the upcoming Liberal Leadership Convention he will be resigning again to make way for the new leader. Of course, on second thought that may not happen because Bellevue is no more safe, after the last election, than is any other seat for the members opposite.

Mr. Speaker, to get to the topic of the resolution, I have to confess for the life of me I do not understand what the intent or the meaning of the amendment proposed by members opposite is and, therefore, I cannot support it, not

MR. BARRY:

understanding it. I do support the resolution as originally framed for reasons which I will attempt to set out. Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody should have any doubts that this Province is willing to negotiate, that the government of this Province has stated time after time that it is willing to negotiate with the federal government. It has been alleged by members opposite that pre-conditions are being set, and there is a reference in the resolution as framed by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), that negotiations be reopened as soon as the federal government agrees to set the ownership issue aside for the duration of the negotiations and permanently should an agreement be reached. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am against pre-conditions to negotiation also. I do not believe that that is the way of approaching matters, but this point is not a pre-condition because this goes to the very essence of what we are talking about. How, Mr. Speaker, can we contemplate negotiating an agreement if we then contemplate the issue of ownership going to the courts and then ownership giving -

MR. NEARY: It is part of the negotiations.

MR. BARRY: - certain rights to either party completely different from what would be negotiated?

MR. NEARY: Whether or not it should be permanently set aside should be a part of the negotiations.

MR. BARRY: Whether or not it should be what?

MR. NEARY: Whether or not it should be permanently set aside should be part of the negotiations.

MR. BARRY: Oh, that will be done, that will

MR. BARRY: be done anyhow. Sure. That will be done anyhow. And I agree, you know, you have different styles of negotiating. You can put up your pre-conditions and say now before we do anything you have to do this, this and this.

MR. TULK: That is on your style.

MR. BARRY: No, that is not my style. I tend to believe that as long as you keep your principles straight when you are sitting around the negotiating table, as long as you keep your principles clear in your own head, and do not adopt any position that would break these principles, counteract these principles, then you can go in there without pre-conditions and you can gnaw away at the other side. You know, you can say, I will give you this and you give me that and pretty soon you are getting to the stage where the difference between the two sides is narrower and narrower. But as far as ownership is concerned, ownership goes right to the essence, goes right to the essence, Mr. Speaker, of this issue and one cannot contemplate an negotiated agreement if ownership is left floating around. And one cannot believe that the federal government is interested in bona fide negotiation if there are not prepared to agree that ownership will have to be dealt with. It will have to be recognized that that will have

MR. BARRY:

to be set aside. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, for example, if the Province ends up with ownership before the courts, then this is going to give the Province the absolute right to do certain things, such as to say, "This oil does not move out of the ground until we get such and such a thing." But that is not what is contemplated by this proposal for joint management. The Province is saying, "No, we are not saying that we want the absolute say. We are prepared to have joint decision making." But if the matter of ownership goes to the courts and ownership is found to reside with the Province this will give the Province the absolute right. There will be no joint management at that point as far as the federal government is concerned, they are out in the cold. They will still have the right to deal with environmental matters. They will still have certain rights of taxation and so forth, but there will not be that joint management with respect to the granting and exploration permits, with respect to the setting of royalties and so forth that is contemplated by any, I think, any commentator on what a reasonable negotiated settlement would be. So ownership has to be set aside. And ultimately it has to be set aside permanently if we are going to have a fixed agreement. And in fact, Mr. Speaker, it should be contemplated that the ultimate agreement will be enshrined in the constitution, by constitutional amendment. And we have enough provinces supporting our position to bring about that amendment. It only remains for the federal government to live up to what they say they believe in and to agree to the same constitutional change.

MR. BAIRD:

The member for LaPoile

said he would not trust Lalonde.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to see the churches take an interest in this issue, and I welcome them into the arena. This is an issue that is very important to the welfare of our people. But I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the heads of the churches, now that they have decided that they are going to become involved, they now have a responsibility to take a stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it is not an even-handed approach to continue to cajole both sides to negotiate where one side, namely the Province, has already evidenced its bona fide willingness to negotiate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: So, Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is now a duty upon the heads of the churches to look at the provincial position, to look at,

MR. BARRY:

if they can find, a federal position and to take a stand, to point out the adequacy or the inadequacy of both positions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, they will have to come out, I believe they have an obligation. Up to now their statement, to somebody who was not familiar with the issue, would seem to be saying, 'Well, neither one of you are prepared to negotiate'.

MR. NEARY:

And they are right.

Right on!

MR. BARRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, they should have, if they do not have it already, I am sure that the Premier and the government will have sent on to them the Province's position.

MR. NEARY:

One is just as bad as the other.

MR. BARRY:

And I am sure that the heads of the churches are going to see that they will have a responsibility now to request the federal position, to request the federal government to send them the federal position as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

And I would be very interested in seeing what it is they receive as the federal position, because I do not know what the federal position is. I can only speculate, Mr. Speaker, that the federal position in the negotiations with Newfoundland is that the settlement with Newfoundland presumably should be the same as the settlement with Nova Scotia. I would like to know from the heads of the churches whether they accept that the Nova Scotia agreement is a good agreement for Newfoundland. I

MR. BARRY: would like to ask them to comment upon whether they believe that the Nova Scotia agreement contains a real joint management provision. As far as I can see it only provides for consultation with the Government of Nova Scotia, but the federal government has the final say.

So I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the churches should comment upon if it is the Nova Scotia agreement that is the federal proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Come on.

MR. BARRY: I believe that they should, that they have a moral responsibility and an obligation to say, do they accept the Nova Scotia agreement for Newfoundland or do they want something different.

MR. NEARY: That is shocking. That is shameful.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to know with respect to revenue whether they accept the Nova Scotia agreement where it refers basically to equalization but does not, as far as I can see, have as its aim seeing that the province gets up to the same standard of government services, the same per capita income levels, the same employment levels as other parts of the country. To accept an agreement along the lines of the Nova Scotia agreement would condemn this Province forever to an existence less than the national average.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that my children and my grandchildren should be able to aim for something more. By living in this great part of a great country, they should be able to aim for something more than less than the national average.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

So, Mr. Speaker, I expect now that the heads of the churches will - they have decided that it is an important issue and I am sure that we are going to see them take a stand, as I believe they have a responsibility to do, and I am confident that when they have analysed the evidence which is laid out for them that they will support the position that it is the Province of Newfoundland which has been prepared to negotiate and it is the federal government which has been stonewalling, and continually stonewalling on this issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the going to the courts, I think it was Senator Flynn had a little bit of research done on previous reference cases that went to the Supreme Court of Canada,

MR. BARRY: and while it seems to be generally assumed that there has never been a case where they went to the Supreme Court of Canada, there is, in fact, one case. There is one case back in 1932, a reference with respect to radio broadcasting, where even though there was a case

MR. BARRY:

started in the Quebec Court of Appeal, the federal government took a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, it should be clearly understood and pointed out that there was no objection raised by the Government of Quebec at the time to this procedure being taken. So this is not a precedent for the federal government to justify the action, the amazing action which they decided to take in this particular case, where the Province was clearly on the record of objecting to the Supreme Court of Canada reference until the decision of our Newfoundland Court of Appeal was available to assist the Supreme Court of Canada in arriving at their ultimate decision.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of Canada is the ultimate arbiter of the law in Canada. We will have to accept as a government, as a people living under the rule of law, we will have to accept their decision, from a legal point of view, as setting forth the legal position. However, Mr. Speaker, there will be no limit to our right and ability to continue the political battle if in fact there should be an adverse legal decision by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Now I believe with the work that has been done over the past close to ten years now, the research that is being prepared, the material that is there, I believe that the material is available for Newfoundland to present a good case which can be successful in the Supreme Court of Canada -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - properly presented, properly argued, But, Mr. Speaker, it would have a better chance of success if it had an airing before our local Court of Appeal before they hit the Supreme Court of Canada cold with this

MR. BARRY: issue.

Our judges, the judges of this Province, federally appointed judges, our judges -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - there is nothing strange or unusual or weird about it - these are members of the Bar from this Province, as it is customary in every province to appoint members of the Bar from this Province to the Bench of Newfoundland. Having grown up in this Province they are very much aware of local conditions.

MR. NEARY: Is that what they base their decision on, local conditions, or law?

MR. BARRY: Partly. Partly. Both.

MR. NEARY: Based on both.

MR. BARRY: Both.

MR. NEARY: I see.

MR. BARRY: Both, Mr. Speaker. There is no such thing, Mr. Speaker, as law in a vacuum, Mr. Speaker. The law deals with people. The law deals with local conditions as well as national conditions,

MR. BARRY:

and both of those are relevant, Mr. Speaker. The judges of this country, whether it be in Newfoundland or the Supreme Court of Canada, their decision will partly be based upon their own value judgments. It is not just a pure legal principle which forces them to arrive at a decision irrevocably no matter what they think personally. It is not prejudice, Mr. Speaker, in the derogatory sense as the members opposite are holding out. That is not prejudice, that is a recognition that any human being in arriving at a legal decision bases that decision on his own belief system, on his own values, as well as on legal principles.

MR. TULK: You do not really believe that.

MR. BAIRD: Whose side are you on?

MR. BARRY: Well, if the hon. member does not believe that he can read an article that is coming out in the Canadian Bar Review this month, written by myself, where I set this out,

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member opposite has, I would say it is a very common view of the law but it is an erroneous view of the law, that there is such a thing as a legal principle in a vacuum. There is no such animal. It is not possible, Mr. Speaker, to have a legal principle in a vacuum. The law concerns itself with people and with values and most difficult legal cases involve having to balance two particular values. Now in this case, Mr. Speaker, the difficult issue before the Supreme Court of Canada is going to have to concern itself with balancing local provincial interests with national interests. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe -

MR. NEARY: You should be on the Paper Chase.

MR. BARRY: If members opposite would listen for a moment now they would get rid of some of these weird, bizarre ideas they have about what the law is. Mr.

MR. BARRY: Speaker, the law is an ass but only when it is set forth by asinine individuals. Otherwise the law is not an ass, the law is a good mechanism for social order. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that it would be of great value to the Supreme Court of Canada to have had the views of the judges of the Newfoundland Court of Appeal, who have certain values as people who have grown up in Atlantic Canada, in Newfoundland, who are aware of the high levels of unemployment, the low per capita income, the limited opportunities, Mr. Speaker, for development in this Province, the limited opportunities for a provincial government to control its own destiny. Mr. Speaker, I fear that some of these values, some of these concerns, may be lost when it gets to Ottawa where we have judges, in many cases, appointed from all across Canada but, Mr. Speaker, after they have been in Ottawa for a while they tend to think that the world,

June 9, 1982

Tape No. 1141

MJ - 1

MR. L. BARRY: as I fear as do some of MP's, they tend to think that the world revolves around the Rideau Canal, Mr. Speaker. And I think it would benefit our judges, the Supreme Court of Canada as well as other judges in all parts of Canada, to get out and get a better feel for what conditions people are living under here in Newfoundland, in British Columbia, in Alberta, anywhere within Canada. And this will make their legal decisions more humane, Mr. Speaker. It will bring their legal decisions closer to common sense. It will avoid decisions being looked at as being exercises in so-called legal technicalities.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I believe it is important that this particular issue be heard initially by the Newfoundland Court of Appeal.

MR. S. NEARY: He should be disbarred for making statements like that.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this member is not going to be disbarred for making statements like this and I will defend, Mr. Speaker, the position I have taken as being a legitimate exercise of my responsibility as an MHA. And I will say the same thing outside of the House as inside, and if there is a threat to disbarment, well so be it. But this is what I believe and this is what the facts are. This is an issue which is so important to our Province that we should start forgetting about our personal interest.

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

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

MR. YOUNG: You cannot take it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, one of the no-no's-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Now we know whose side the two of you are on. Now we know where you stand.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this has nothing to do with where we stand or we do not stand, it has to do with just a vicious attack that was just made by the hon. gentleman on the judges of the Supreme Court. Now, Mr. Speaker, under the rules of this House, and our oath of office, by the way, nobody but nobody is permitted to attack the Queen or judges of the Supreme Court. The hon. gentleman just did it via the back door. Inuendo -

MR. BAIRD: A difference of opinion.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not a difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker, and I think we should send for Hansard and have it brought into the House. The kind of remarks just made by the hon. gentleman will undermine the judicial system of this country.

MR. TOBIN: Trying to weasel out.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not trying to weasel out. The hon. gentleman made an indirect attack on the Supreme Court judges and that is a no-no in this House, Mr. Speaker. And before Your Honour rules I would hope Your Honour will send for Hansard, because this is the first time to my knowledge that I have ever witnessed an attack on the judges of the court that was just made by the hon. gentleman. It is a very serious matter and it is a no-no, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. Honour.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, the hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: I welcome Your Honour taking a look at Hansard and Your Honour will find that there was no attack on the judiciary, no attack on the Queen,

MR. BARRY:

maybe an attack on the Queen's English from time to time. But, Mr. Speaker, what I set out was the belief that judges are influenced in their decisions by their own value systems. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is a criticism of the judiciary, so be it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I have heard enough on the point of order. I was paying very close attention to the hon. member's speech and I do not see that there was a point of order. I do not consider his speech an attack on the judges, so there is no point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, just to conclude my remarks, I would submit that the Prime Minister of Canada should get down off his high horse, his ministers should get down off their high ponies, and they should be prepared to speak to the Premier of this Province and the Government of this Province on this issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: I believe it is shameful that the Prime Minister of Canada has to date refused to meet with the Premier to discuss this issue. The time has come for an offshore summit, a summit meeting, Mr. Speaker. The Versailles Summit may have failed but the offshore summit must not fail.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I recall the
days when the hon. Don Jamieson was in this House.
He always liked and cherished what he used to call
a bit of friendly heckling and the like. In fact,
I miss him sometimes in this House.

I would like just to make
a couple of remarks. First of all, Mr. Speaker,
I would like to

MR. WOODROW:

congratulate the Sergeant-at-Arms. He, like his predecessor, is certainly carrying out his duties in a very dignified manner.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

A point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt the hon. gentleman so early in his remarks, but I do not think the hon. gentleman is relevant, and I ask Your Honour, if the hon. gentleman -

MR. BAIRD:

As relevant as you will ever be.

MR. NEARY:

if the hon. gentleman is going to speak on the resolution we would like to hear what he has to say, but what does it have to do with the Sergeant-at-Arms, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, that is no point of order. In fact, that has been done frequently in this House. In fact there is a lot of foolishness expressed.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order, I wish to point out to the hon. member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) that there is an amendment to the resolution which we were dealing with, but I would also like to say that quite often in this House as the member is making his initial speech in the House he congratulates different officers of the House while he is making them.

MR. BAIRD:

Shot down again. Shot down again.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have a few brief remarks on this timely Private Members motion presented by my colleague from Stephenville (Mr. Staqq).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: It would be an understatement to say that it is an important issue, as I think all hon. members present here would agree, that the fair and equitable settlement of our offshore resources is the last chance for our Province and people to experience equality within Confederation.

MR. NEARY: Sounds like develop or perish.

MR. WOODROW: At no other time since we entered Canada in 1949 have sentiments been running higher in this Province. Our people have stood united and determined that right shall prevail, that we are no longer content with sell-outs or give-aways of our resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, they have also spoken loud that takeaways are also a thing of the past, Sixty-one per cent of our people of the Province in their statement of expression on April 6th., when the Liberal Party was almost wiped out in this Province.

MR. YOUNG: When the leader had a majority of only twenty-one votes.

MR. WOODROW: Twenty-one. On that date, Mr. Speaker, a clear message and warning was sent to Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Trudeau, that the spirit of the Fighting Newfoundlander is still alive and well here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, the time is quickly approaching. We have a rendezvous with destiny it seems. The cards are almost fully played out. History is being written daily. Mr. Speaker, this destiny, this history will not only directly affect each and everyone today, but as the hon. the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) said, his children and his grandchildren, and all succeeding generations of unborn Newfoundlanders. The ultimate settlement of our offshore resources will decide for all time whether we as people are given the opportunity to secure the means to become equal Canadians, or whether we are forever to be a poor cousin in Confederation, content with federal handouts.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government, including this Province's five Liberal M.P.s have indicated during the past number of years that this is their vision and perception of Newfoundland and Labrador, to keep us down under, to keep us going for handouts, to keep giving us the equalization payments.

MR. WOODROW: It would be terrible if we happened to get up with Nova Scotia or up with Ontario or the like.

MR. WOODROW: They have by their actions ignored our court, ignored the message of our people, ignored this Legislature, which serves our people, and is embarked on a course which will forever scuttle any hope of equality for our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That will not get you in the Cabinet.

MR. WOODROW: Now they are not -

MR. NEARY: You will not get in the Cabinet with that.

MR. WOODROW: I must admit that the members here in this House, the Liberal members, are with us. At least they voted in favour of the resolution we had a while back.

MR. TOBIN: You are gone wishy, washy.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Wishy-washy!

MR. WOODROW: It is frightening to witness the complete disregard and coldness of the present federal government. We all heard the catch phrase fed-bashing thrown about by the media, with the feds bashing Canadians from coast to coast through their ruthless Budget, bashing business and homeowners with high interest rates, bashing the legitimate goals and aspirations of individuals through record unemployment. It is obvious that the term has been re-defined. Mr. Speaker, our just society seems a world away. The just society of Prime Minister Trudeau obviously does not apply in our case.

MR. TULK: You should be in the cabinet.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, a just society in which the Provincial Court of Appeal is ignored, a just society in which 61 per cent of the people of the Province are ignored, a just society where justice and equality of treatment is ignored, and we could go on and on.

Mr. Speaker, these are the things that

MR. WOODROW: one would expect to see in Poland, in Russia, or Argentina, rather than the Canadian just society. Do we have a junta in Ottawa?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: Do we have a junta in Ottawa who are removed from the democratic process? Who push on with their tunnel vision despite the pleas of our ten provinces? I see here a former member of this House sitting close by us. Are our Liberal MPs afraid to speak out on our offshore resources?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, right. I can say then, Mr. Speaker, they do not really have to ignore their party on this particular issue. They are free to speak. Are they afraid of their boss in Ottawa?

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right!

MR. BAIRD: They will be more scared of their constituents in the next election.

MR. WOODROW: Is the federal government afraid to address the fair and reasonable proposal submitted by the Province; a proposal, Mr. Speaker, hailed across Canada as being an enlightening and workable document that many of the Canadian Premiers have endorsed? It is reasonable, and, as our Premier said, it was not written in stone, they could sit down and talk the proposal over and they could come to some good agreement, but it was ignored, it was ignored completely by the Prime Minister of Canada. No wonder the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) says that there should be a summit meeting between our Premier and Mr. Trudeau. Mr. Speaker, the federal government has attempted and is attempting to wrestle our offshore resources from this Province through the backdoor. And I as one member of this House, representing a district where I won with a big majority, and won it for the third time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WOODROW: - I, as one, get more upset each day about it. In fact, it makes me sick to the stomach on times to think that we cannot be given equality with other Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WOODROW: They attempt it through the SIU case, through pressure tactics following the so-called Nova Scotia offshore assessment and now through the unprecedented action of bypassing our provincial court with a direct reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. Followed by this cowardly action, we had the spectacle of one of our Liberal MPs, Mr. Bill Rompkey, telling us it was a great thing for our Province. In fact, he sat by Mr. Chretien, the Minister of Justice, he did not open his mouth, just ready to give our Province away. That the -

June 9, 1982

Tape 1146

JC - 2

MR. WOODROW: unprecedented action was
taken in our best interest, that the offshore was not
going to be considered only the Hibernia oilfield,

MR. WOODROW: nonsense! I wonder does the Prime Minister think that we are fools down here, or what? What does he think about us? Mr. Speaker, how green do they think we are? Have they not realized that the days of the Newfie joke are over? Given Mr. Rompkey's comments and actions during the past number of months, it is obvious that there are few around who still fit the bill, Bill Rompkey.

Mr. Speaker, the biggest joke of all, cruel though it is in his ignorance, is that the federal action in the Supreme Court is a benefit to this Province. As the Province was in mourning, Mr. Rompkey basked in celebration

Well, there is going to be some fun when the next federal election is called!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, we have attempted to negotiate in good faith. We have attempted to negotiate in good faith. We have indicated that we have always been willing to negotiate in good faith and towards this end submitted a fair and reasonable proposal as the basis for discussion.

MR. NEARY: What did the heads of the churches say about it?

MR. WOODROW: They can speak for themselves.

MR. NEARY: I see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, our proposal was ignored. Everybody knows it was ignored. The Premier did not even receive a reply from the Prime Minister of Canada. Our proposal was ignored and is being ignored like the plague by the federal government.

MR. WOODROW: Well I would congratulate our church leaders for their initiative and sensitive comments on this vital issue, their concern. I would conclude by saying that further meaningful discussions seem impossible, because recent action by the federal government without historic precedent has made it so. If the Prime Minister of Canada - in fact, he has not yet replied to the churches, unless he replied today. But our Premier had a message out twenty-four hours after.

The federal government, Mr. Speaker, must realize that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will accept nothing less than a fair and reasonable settlement of our rich offshore wealth.

MR. WOODROW: In fact, it is sad to think, you know, we have been striving for hundreds of years. I recall, in fact, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) when he spoke here recently, he spoke about the settlement where I was born, he spoke about Northern Bay. It was the first time I heard it mentioned in the House of Assembly. And I recall in those days - probably the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) would recall it also - how hard our people worked, how hard our fathers and forefathers worked in the fishing boats and what have you. I know my father said to me, 'Try to educate yourself so you will not have to work as hard as I have to work'. And it seems that this hard work, this begging, this going to Ottawa for the crumbs is still going to continue. It is a shame, Mr. Speaker, it would make one's blood run wild, or run cold or something.

MR. BAIRD: Vile.

MR. WOODROW: It is vile. That is the word. It is unfortunate, and it will be a sad day for our Province when we have to fight for rights that other Canadians have always enjoyed without question. It is sad to think that we are here still struggling, with a Premier who is honest and sincere, who lays the cards on the table, lays them on the table. That is what it is all about. This, Mr. Speaker, is precisely the bondage that has enslaved us and which will be broken. Let the message go forth to Prime Minister Trudeau and Energy Minister Lalonde that Newfoundland and Labrador shall have its place in the sun, not because of but in spite of their efforts.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this hon. House of Assembly is united on it, but there still seems to be a lot of pussyfooting,

MR. WOODROW: wishy-washy stuff going
on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: I think we should really
say we are going to work together to get what this
Province deserves and what it owns.

Mr. Speaker, I support
the resolution. I am really delighted to have the
opportunity to speak on it. I must say I am surprised -
I had another little remark to make, but because of
the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) making a point of
order, 'Oh' he says, 'you have to speak to the
resolution'.

MR. NEARY: That is right. You cannot
attack the Queen, you cannot attack the judges of the
Supreme Court.

MR. WOODROW: Well, it has always been
done in this House. There has always been little
preambles

MR. WOODROW: and who makes them more than the hon. member of LaPoile (Mr. Neary)?

MR. NEARY: You cannot slander a member's mother in this House.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution in the hope that there may yet be time for the federal government to abandon its present course of action and negotiate a settlement in the best interests of Newfoundland and Canada. Our proposal is on the table awaiting a reply. How nice it would be if tomorrow morning the Premier could announce that he received a telegram or a telephone call from the Prime Minister of Canada saying, "Come on up boy, let us settle down and get this thing over with." How can you blame this Province? What more can we do? We have almost gone on bended knees and they still are ignoring us. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the message will be sent by the CBC, that we are still awaiting the Prime Minister's reply. We may have to wait until he gets back from - he is over in Europe somewhere now, I guess. However, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution.

MR. BAIRD: He is probably down discoing in New York somewhere.

MR. WOODROW: And I would like to say that I would do everything in my power to make Newfoundland and Labrador a better place to live in and to make us all equal Canadians, make us all equal Canadians. Why keep down and pick on a little Province like Newfoundland? It certainly is not fair. So, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have had the opportunity to say a few words and once again I support the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, let me first of all congratulate the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: While I may not always agree with him, I believe that what he says he believes and that is a laudable thing in itself. Mr. Speaker, this resolution -

MR. NEARY: What he reads he believes in.

MR. TULK: I agree the member believes it to be true and that is good, if he says what he believes to be true.

MR. BAIRD: Do you believe it?

MR. TULK: Some of it, but only some of it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution itself, if you want to look at the resolution, some of the things in that resolution are laudable

MR. B. TULK: perhaps, but certainly just as much in that resolution is not laudable. I think that is the reason why the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) has asked that it be amended. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that this resolution does, as hon. members of this House will remember if they were in the House last year, one of the things this resolution does, and shows is that the government of this Province has taken a complete reversal in policy on our offshore rights.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. TULK: A complete reversal in policy. The previous position of this government as expounded by the Premier was that we must have complete ownership, complete and total control.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. TULK: And he says without ownership, those are his words, there can be no control. I remember the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), about two years ago, standing up and trying to tell the Premier that even if you had ownership, and I think the example that he used was a house, even if you had ownership you did not necessarily have control. And the Premier, of course, pooh-poohed that. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. BAIRD: Do you want joint ownership?

MR. TULK: No, that is our position. Welcome aboard. They now seem to realize, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his people on the other side now seem to realize that perhaps the member for the Strait of Belle Isle, and perhaps this side of the House, were right all along. So what do they want to do now? They want to set ownership aside, set it aside, let us not talk about it anymore. You do not have to have ownership to get the benefits of the offshore anymore, they want now to negotiate.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a complete flip-flop on the part of this administration.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. TULK: Either they are being political and perhaps realizing that the people of this Province- I believe it was last year they saw that there was a little dent in their argument, last September or last October, when the people of this Province, started to say to the Premier, 'Perhaps you should negotiate. Perhaps they realize the facts, the facts of life, and that is that they were in some trouble. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome the members on the other side, the government, to the Liberal position on the offshore ownership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: I want to welcome them to it.

MR. BUTT: (Inaudible) . The hon. member is going to ask to sink.

MR. TULK: I am still afloat, my dear friend. As I said, Mr. Speaker-

MR. NEARY: They are both going to sink if they put anymore money up there.

MR. TULK: He has got every cent of money, I understand, that is over there. As I said, Mr. Speaker, on that night of mourning, when we saw the arm bands displayed on the other side, I could not believe my eyes. In August of 81, I saw this newspaper, I still got a copy of it somewhere, saw this newspaper from the Premier's office. I think it was from the Premier's office, it was from the government office's anyway, the Premier's propaganda, this political newspaper

MR. TULK: appeared with the liberal position, the position that I just outlined to you, with the liberal position firmly stated. I think what happened, as I said before, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier realized that the people of this Province really wanted to negotiate so he added the word 'negotiate' to his vocabulary.

MR. NEARY: Is that what you are talking about? They sent one to every householder in Newfoundland.

MR. TULK: I think that is it. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe—and I think the member for Mount Scio, (Mr. Barry) and I wish he were here, started off on the right track this evening— I do not believe that even though he has added that word 'negotiate' to his vocabulary, I do not believe that he really knows what the word means. And I think the member for Mount Scio started to say that and he got afraid perhaps that he was going to get put out in the gallery and he withdrew somewhat into a shell. The Premier and this government have set up barriers, they have set up barriers to the whole negotiating process. And one, Mr. Speaker, is that they want — they say, 'Well, we must have ownership set aside'. Why not make that a goal of the negotiations, a principal of the negotiations that you keep in your mind, and that you negotiate and that you will not sign an agreement unless you can negotiate, ownership aside? Why not? So, Mr. Speaker, we see a complete flip-flop, their inability to negotiate. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was going to say some of the things that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) said last Wednesday. It is not going to be an attack, so I will just record it for him in Hansard so he can read it. He opened the debate and for about the tenth time he regurgitated the Clark/Peckford fiasco and that

MR. TULK: is what it was, I think it ended on the steps of Confederation building. The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) and he is not here, poor soul, said nothing except to say what everybody else had not said. That is all he said. I think he went back and used his speech that he should have made, perhaps, on that night of mourning, the night when we had the black arm bands in the House. He engaged on a little bit of hero worship, I think he has learned the trait that you have to kiss the picture, and then he sat down. The member for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) stood in this House and said what a wonderful job he had done by crossing the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, he is the prime example, the prime example of the flip-flop that this government is taking on the ownership issue. I can clearly remember sitting in this House - I thought I was right so I said, 'I must go to Hansard'. I can clearly remember - I think, the member for Baie Verte-White Bay was sitting there and I was sitting next to him - on April 18th. when the member for Baie Verte-White Bay stood in this House and in an acceptance and a rejection speech, rejected the Liberal Party and accepted the Tory Party, I think he accepted the Tory Party a long time before that. I can clearly remember him saying - so I went to the Hansard, Mr. Speaker, and I want to read some pertinent parts of

MR. B. TULK: two speeches that that member made. Mr. Speaker, he goes on, "It has just been more than a month ago since I stood in this House to state clearly and unequivocally my position with regard to one of the most vital issues to face this Province in its history, the issue of Newfoundland's ownership of its offshore resources. At that time I stated in the strongest terms my disagreement with the position of this party as it relates to this vital matter". Disagreed with this party, and his own government is now back to that position. And in a speech that he referred to a month before, Mr. Speaker, Hansard shows this is what the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) said "I believe that it is vital that we as a Province have absolute ownership and control over it". He goes on, Mr. Speaker, "Ownership of that resource must be vested in this Province. How else can we ensure maximum economic returns? How else can we control the rate of development? How else can we ensure maximum job opportunities for our people, at a time when we have the highest unemployment rate in the country. "If we do not own it, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, he goes on " if we do not own it, we do not control it and if we do not control it we become second fiddlers in our own backyards." Well Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the member for Baie Verte - White Bay, if that is still his principle for crossing this House, then he is now a fiddler in his own backyard.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: So let us not hear any of this nonsense about the great principles of the member from Baie Verte-White Bay. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of

MR. TULK: Finance (Dr. Collins) stood in this House and took a few words from a statement made by the Prime Minister at Memorial University last year, twisted them around a little bit and got his 20 minutes. Mr. Speaker, I think a correct name for the Minister of Finance might be The Twister because he is probably the guy who invented the Twist. The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry),

MR. TULK: questioned the loyalty of the churches to this Provinces, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What?

MR. TULK: Questioned the loyalty of the churches, questioned the Supreme Court of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. NEARY: He certainly did. And the courts.

MR. TULK: By innuendo questioned the loyalty of the churches- they should now take a position on our side- as if the churches in this Province would not be loyal to Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. It almost speaks of treason, almost.

MR. NEARY: That is right. It is insulting, to say the least.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the government side of this House, as I said on that night of mourning on March 16th. or April 16th., whenever it was, May 16th., that I am going to support this resolution regardless of whether they make the amendment or not. The amendment should be made. I am going to support the resolution and I am going to support it, Mr. Speaker, because I believe it is in the best interests of the people of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer see the unemployment that is in this Province, the situation that exists with our social services in this Province, and the situation that exists with our schools and hospitals and so on. But I am going to support it for one other reason, Mr. Speaker, and that is that I want to expose the fact that the Premier of this Province is using our offshore resources as a political football. You can tell the Premier of this Province and this government that you have our support.

MR. TULK: No, no, do not want it.

DR. COLLINS: Are you saying down with the issue?

MR. TULK: About as much as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Now, that is nothing. If that is nothing, then it is nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this development could have occurred five years ago. I believe that one of the biggest obstacles to this development taking place is perhaps the Premier and his desire to play politics.

Mr. Speaker, why are we so concerned in the last two weeks in this House with the fact that the federal government has put this matter before the Supreme Court? It is a question that nobody answers on that side of the House. We have been led to believe by the Premier, by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) and by everybody else on that side - the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) when he was the Minister of Energy - that our case is infallible, we cannot lose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is true, then that crew on that side should now be rejoicing. Because what it means, once the decision has been made, is that we will either have total ownership or we will not. And if our case is infallible, then we will have total ownership and the Premier can go back to his original dream of having total control and total ownership of our offshore resources. And, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TULK: he can then perhaps, if he believes that offshore oil and gas will make this Province a have Province, if he believes that - there is some doubts in some people's minds about that - but if he believes that, then he will again be able to stand in this House and say, "Have not will be no more," not only for the Premier, but "Have not will be no more" for Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, if it is not true, if we do not have an infallible case before the court, as we have been led to believe by this government, then the Premier and his government will obviously have to answer for that. But in any case -

MR. NEARY: Forever and ever.

MR. TULK: but in any case, Mr. Speaker, if we believe our case to be as good as we say it is, then perhaps we should be welcoming the chance to see this thing before the Supreme Court.

MR. NEARY: Put it to the test.

MR. TULK: One other thing, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was the first government official in Canada to go to court. He was the first person -

MR. RIDEOUT: We were forced into it.

MR. TULK: Forced into it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, forced in, I see.

MR. TULK: Forced into it. The resolution itself is perhaps wrongly stated.

MR. NEARY: The SIU put it there.

MR. TULK: I agree, the federal government put that matter in court, but what happened? It got thrown out. Got thrown out.

MR. RIDEOUT: Hindsight is great. stuff, is it not?

MR. TULK: What good is it going to do you to go to court if you are not prepared to go there now?

MR. NEARY:

It is a court for all

jurisdictions.

MR. TULK:

Did you believe that you could push the Government of Canada into doing what you wanted done? Are you that -

MR. WARREN:

That naive?

MR. TULK:

Naive, is the only word that you can use.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the essence of hypocrisy, what is in this resolution. That the Provincial Government subsequently referred the off-shore ownership issue to the Newfoundland Supreme Court. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me just use a phrase that the Premier himself loves to use and that is, "What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier reacts - so if our case is infallible then perhaps we should be proud and rejoice. Perhaps there is no need for negotiations, if our case is infallible. If not, then, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his government must take the brunt of the burden.

But I want to say to the Premier today, and I want to say to him, I think, what everybody else on this side of the House has been saying to him, if he believes, he is the government of this Province, if he believes that negotiation is the best route to go, then remove the obstacles that he has put in place. Remove some of the obstacles, remove some of the pre-conditions. Keep them as a principle, but remove them per-conditions for negotiations -

MR. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

- and see where the support for them will come from. Take the chance. Do it, but keep it here

MR. TULK: and never sign an agreement, never sign an agreement until we have ownership in this Province. Do not ever sign it but remove the conditions to start with, then he will see where his support will come from. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, in closing I say that not because the Premier is going to bully me, not because I want to kiss his picture. I got a little note back the other day from the Premier saying that I should co-operate with the government before he meets with a mayor from my district.

MR. NEARY: Genuflect and kiss his picture.

MR. TULK: What does he think? Does he think you are going to bend over to them? Not at all. But I say to him, remove his obstacles and, Mr. Speaker, I will support him because I believe it is in the best interests of Newfoundland. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. TOBIN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to avail of the opportunity to address myself to the resolution which was so ably presented by my colleague from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: And as a new member, Mr. Speaker, representing a district that is going to benefit greatly from the offshore oil and gas, and it depends heavily on resources for its survival, both in terms of this resource and the other resources, I am deeply saddened, Sir, to have to stand here today, and to have to see a resolution such as this being put forth, to support a bright and prosperous future which my district holds in relation to the oil and gas, which other people in Canada take for granted, but this, Sir, is being deeply jeopardized by the actions of the federal government..

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, Mortier Bay and Spanish Room Point in my district, is regarded as one of the best in North America for petroleum marine related activities. The shipyard in the past number of years has had a very successful relationship with offshore industry. Since 1977 the yard had built several offshore supply vessels, and has also completed work on many of the offshore rigs. Mr. Speaker, the federal government seem to want to get involved and set records, make history. In the last couple of weeks, Mr. Speaker, they have made history with the highest unemployment in Canada and the lowest rate the dollar has ever been. And now, Mr. Speaker, they have moved away from all precedents, all custom and all practice, and asked the federal Court of Canada to refer a case that is already before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say, Sir, that the next history that will be made will be made whenever the federal government have the guts or the courage to call the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is unparliamentary. That kind of language we do not use in the House.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, that history will be when the Liberal Party, federally, is wiped out in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: The little children in the Gallery, what would they think?

MR. TOBIN: And I will be involved, Mr. Speaker, in the next federal campaign not because, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Simmons came down-

AN HON. MEMBER:: He was only here for a good time.

MR. TOBIN: - came down in Burin-Placentia West in the April 6 th, election campaign, not because, Mr. Speaker, they brought back Don Jamieson to campaign, not because they brought in Pat Canning to campaign against me. Mr. Speaker, let me say it is a great feeling to win an election. They did this when they saw the great Liberal stronghold with a 2,000 vote majority in '79, slipping through their fingers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: That is when they got involved, Mr. Speaker. But I will be involved in the next campaign, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the people of Burin-St. George's has the right to compassionate representation, not people who are going for the jugular, for the life-stream and the lifeblood of the district that they represent. Mr. Speaker, in a telegram to the Premier Mr. Simmons said, 'I call upon you to set the wheels in motion to recommence negotiations without further delay'. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Simmons confirmed in that telegram what I always believed, and that is that he is not up to date on what is taking place in the Province of Newfoundland,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Not just that, Mr. Speaker, this government is the only government which has a proposal on the table for the negotiations, not the federal government. I understand they were asked to bring one back, or they were supposed to bring one back, but it has not been brought around yet. Why the hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker? Why does not the member for Burin-St. George's (Mr. Simmons) bring that to the attention of his boss, or the three great destroyers in Ottawa? Let me refer back, Mr. Speaker, to my district for a second. This cruel and callous action by the federal government, this action, Mr. Speaker, can have long and devastating effects on my district. Mr. Speaker, Mortier Bay is on the verge of becoming one of the greatest industrial centres in this Province. All we need, Sir, is for the federal government to be fairer to Newfoundland and Mortier Bay could very easily one day, be involved in the construction of oil rigs, platforms, etcetera. But, Sir, this government must have a say in where the spin-off is going to go, because if we do not, Sir, I would suspect that the oil companies would rather go to the foreign countries to have their work done. And I would suspect, Sir, that if the federal government has a say, God help us. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, the federal government trying to allocate where things happen in Canada. Can you imagine, Simmons versus MacEachen and Regan for work in Marystown and Nova Scotia? Can you imagine Simmons versus

June 9, 1992

Tape No. 1157

RA - 1

MR. G. TOBIN: Romeo LeBlanc for work for Newfoundland or New Brunswick? We all know what his record is. One of my colleagues reminded me that I have to bring in Mr. Rompkey's name. I forgot to mention Mr. Rompkey's name when I mentioned Mr. Simmons' name. Well, Sir, I would like to go on the record that I, for one, like forgetting Newfie jokes.

MR. BARRETT: Most people would rather forget 'Rompkey'.

MR. TOBIN: The only sure way of -

MR. NEARY: Neither one of these people are here to defend themselves. Neither one of them.

MR. DINN: They were here. He had a different tune when he was here.

MR. BARRETT: That has never caused you a problem, has it?

MR. DINN: Simmons had a different tune when he was here.

MR. TOBIN: Do you want to know what he said when he was here? Here is Hansard from 1975, March 7, 1975.

MR. DINN: He only said!

MR. TOBIN: - if you want to know what he said when he was here. And I know how he represents the district too. I know how he represents the district. "Mr. Speaker, the only sure way of ensuring the future of my district's potential is to have the system of joint management where this Province has equal say into where these platforms etc. for Hibernia will be built".

MR. NEARY: Only a coward would attack people who are not here.

MR. BARRETT: You should know all about that, you have been doing it for years. You have been doing it for years.

MR. TOBIN: I do not know, Sir, who is more qualified to speak about a coward than the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: He is an expert.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, at no other point in our history has the future course of our Province been in such jeopardy. This course would not only directly affect each and every one of us today, but also succeeding generations of unknown Newfoundlanders.

MR. WARREN: You can only attack 'John' boy.

MR. TOBIN: It is a choice as to whether we as a people are given the opportunity to secure the means to become equal Canadians, or whether we are to forever be poor cousins in Confederation, content with federal hand-outs. Mr. Speaker, on April 6th, the people of our Province stood up and were counted, determined that right and justice shall prevail, that we must receive a just return from our offshore resources, or 60 per cent of our people throughout Newfoundland and Labrador have served notice that the day of sellouts and giveaways are over.

MR. NEARY: Is that right?

MR. TOBIN: And that this time, Mr. Speaker, we will accept nothing less than a fair and reasonable settlement of our offshore gas resources. Mr. Speaker, the voice of Newfoundland and Labrador has obviously been ignored. It has fallen on deaf ears, uncaring ears.

MR. TOBIN: However, Mr. Speaker, the federal government will realize that this government and this Province are determined that this time we shall do it right, that this time justice shall prevail. Mr. Speaker, that is what we need, Sir, in order to get this Province moving again, in order to recover, Sir, in order to put us where we should be if it had not been for the giveaways that we saw back in the 1960's. Some hon. members, Mr. Speaker, should hang their heads in shame, to be part of a government -

MR. NEARY: You know all about giveaways in the departments too. You know about all the giveaways.

MR. TOBIN: I know all about it too. I know where you stood on it, yes.

MR. WARREN: You were part of it.

MR. TOBIN: I know all about giveaways

MR. WARREN: You were a part of it.

MR. TOBIN: I know all about giveaways in the departments. Do not ask me, I know all about giveaways.

MR. WARREN: You were part of them.

MR. TOBIN: I know more about it than some people would like me to know.

MR. WARREN: \$225,000

MR. TOBIN: I worked there for 10 years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: All about the strikes.

MR. TOBIN: You should know all about nothing too. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member, the topless member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. NEARY: Your first year in the House and we have seen enough already.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, and I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TOBIN: that he will be long gone, he will be long gone, Mr. Speaker, when I am still around. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. I think Sir, that the resolution is very important to Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, not because the great district of Burin - Placentia West was passed through in the last election that is going to continue. Mr. Speaker, is closing let me say, Sir, that I am delighted that we stand united for a secure future, and that I believe that is incumbent upon us all to ensure, Sir, that this prosperous future that Newfoundland can have with the offshore oil and gas will not be denied us. Mr. Speaker, let me say God guard thee Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would be indeed remiss in my duties if I did not stand in my place and have a few words to say about this very important private member's resolution put on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). And, of course, it is a resolution which has been debated, or the relevant parts of the resolution have been debated in this House on many occasions, both on Private Members' Day and in Throne Speech debates and Budget Speech debates for a number of years. The interesting thing in trying to listen to some of the debate today, Mr. Speaker, was, the ongoing

PREMIER PECKFORD. flip-flopness of the members of the Opposition, the way that they are trying to scurry around the issue. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and a few more of the hon. members who have spoken today on the one hand half support the resolution, half not support the resolution, that while they might be supporting the resolution the Government of Newfoundland are the biggest barrier to getting the offshore negotiations going.

I do not know what it will take for the hon. members of the Opposition to learn one clear and unmistakable lesson which was demonstrated on April 6th. 1982, and which has been demonstrated on a number of occasions in this Province in recent times, that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are sick and tired of giveaways, that they do not want to see another one of the magnitude that is implied in this resource go by the boards so that we remain forever the number tenth province in this Confederation, so that we are always a have not Province, always in a second-class status.

And I firmly believe that the large majority of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians today are solidly behind the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in trying to argue with the federal government for a fair and reasonable deal on offshore oil and gas resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, a number of points have been made by the Opposition and just let me review them very, very briefly. We had, as everybody knows, from about 1972 until January 25, I guess, 1982, for about ten years, the Government of Newfoundland had argued strongly that the whole question of the legal

PREMIER PECKFORD: ownership, jurisdiction over the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf belonged to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, and we have maintained it right through the whole piece, and for a long period of time we kept arguing that in preparing our legal case, as everybody knows. And it was not until, Mr. Speaker, it was not until the Prime Minister of Canada got into the act and came down to Newfoundland to a fund raising dinner, a Liberal fund raising dinner, and some other comments that he made, that we moved from that position.

We had agreed that the negotiations could be held. But negotiations were not being held and we were adamantly sticking to the position that ownership must reside with the people of Newfoundland and Labrador so that with ownership and jurisdiction - the same kind of ownership, Mr. Speaker, as they have in Alberta and Saskatchewan. It was not what you would call 100 per cent ownership in the true sense of those words, it was 100 per cent ownership in the Canadian context, in the context of as if the oil and gas were above the salt water, ownership in that sense. And then the Prime Minister came to town and in a couple of phrases and sentences and what turned out to be a lot of gobbledygook, he persuaded a lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians at the time

PREMIER PECKFORD. that he was prepared to make a major concession in this whole dispute over the management and control and revenue sharing of offshore oil and gas. He indicated that he was prepared, speaking on behalf of the Canadian Government, they were prepared as a government to put aside the question of ownership and let us get down to the thorny issues of joint management and revenue sharing. In other words, to try to negotiate a settlement rather than to continue the matter through the legal processes, because if the legal processes were to have their normal course that has been followed over the last 100 years, it would take two or three years to do it; meanwhile, all that development opportunity would be lost and the economy would be worse off as a result, so let us sit down and negotiate. And that is what we did. We sat down and tried to negotiate with the federal government, but lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, we were hoodwinked, because the Prime Minister did not mean that he was willing to put ownership aside. Now, the whole guts of this resolution, the whole soul of this resolution here is that apparently the members of the Opposition want to delete the last part 'and put ownership aside permanently should an agreement be reached'. The whole soul of the business of negotiating rather than going through the courts is that the question of ownership would be out of the way permanently. In other words, if an agreement on joint management and revenue sharing were reached between the two governments, that that agreement on joint management, that that agreement on revenue sharing would be permanent forever more and could not be torn up by either party in the future. However, if ownership is not put aside permanently, then one side or the other could at some time in the

PREMIER PECKFORD: future tear up that agreement.

So how can you - I mean, that is the basis, that is the fundamental issue at stake here. How can you?

And here are the Opposition now wishy-washing around trying to say the Government of Newfoundland is unreasonable because we are putting in pre-conditions. Is that a pre-condition, Mr. Speaker, that both sides honour an agreement that they sign on joint management and revenue sharing forever and ever, that we both agree that neither one of us will ever have the opportunity in the future by some other government or whatever to tear up an agreement? That is why we sat down for negotiations in the beginning. That was the whole reason for the negotiations getting started, because the Prime Minister had indicated in so many words, in a way that most Newfoundlanders and Canadians thought that he meant it, genuinely meant it, that he was going to put the ownership question aside so that we could get that.

So we have changed our position, Mr. Speaker. We have demonstrated flexibility on two important points, and the members of the Opposition are right on that, we have changed our position because we wanted to demonstrate flexibility, but we have not deserted the principles which underlie ownership, which are joint management,

PREMIER PECKFORD: a say in the control of the development and a revenue-sharing formula which will meaningfully and significantly improve our position economically within the Canadian Confederation. We have not ignored the two principles that underlie ownership, but we have - and so when the Opposition trying to have it both ways, say that on the one hand, you are putting up stumbling blocks, and on the other hand, have capitulated, that is an inconsistent way for the Opposition to get on. And we have demonstrated that we are not putting stumbling blocks in the way because we have agreed to put ownership aside permanently. Permanently! And that is a big concession. We have moved from the position that we own the resource outright, The jurisdiction and control, the mineral resources on the Continental Shelf belong to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador as the oil and gas in Alberta belongs to the people of Alberta, in that context, we have put that aside. That is one concession that we have made.

And the second concession we have made, Mr. Speaker.- talk about stumbling blocks - that there will be a trigger point, that we agree that in the future there will come a time, if our revenue formula is accepted, if our joint management regime is accepted, that there will come a time if there is sufficient oil out there when not only our equalization will go to zero - that is one measure of wealth, that your equalization goes down. But that is not the key to whether you are a wealthy society or you are really making progress, the key to whether an economy or society is really improving is after you eliminate equalization. Because until the day you eliminate equalization, you are still in a have not situation.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So the first thing we have got to do is eliminate \$690 million. And then, when you get \$690 million plus 1 cent, you are 1 cent better off than you were under equalization, and \$690 million and 2 cents, you are 2 cents better off than you were when you were on equalization.

So we have got to create out of oil and gas \$690 million plus something. And when you get into the plus something, you are starting to be better off. Then as you go up plus \$690 million, you start to improve your wealth within Confederation. And then if you use a formula like per capita earned income equal to the Canadian average, not equal to the wealthiest Canadian province, not equal to the second wealthiest Canadian province, not equal to the third wealthiest Canadian province, or the fourth wealthiest Canadian province, but equal to the Canadian average, when our per capita earned income is equal to the Canadian average, and when our level of services are equal to the best province in Canada, the second best province in Canada, the third best province in Canada? No, when our level of services are equal to the Canadian average,

PREMIER PECKORD: Therefore, we will be somewhere around number six or five in Canada. We will be out of number ten. We will not be number one, two, three, four or five. We will be close to five because then our level of services, our per capita earned income will be equal to the Canadian average and that will bring you in the middle. It does not bring you up on the top, Mr. Speaker, it does not bring you on the top, that we agree to a trigger point that when we reach that level of wealth where the normal 75/25 split of government revenues that are available - 75 per cent of what? Of government revenues available, not the revenues available to the companies. The money that is left over after the companies get their share out and pay for the development, what is left over for royalties for both governments we would, at the beginning of the development get 75 per cent of those government revenues and the federal government would get 25 per cent. Right from the first day the oil starts to flow the federal government gets 25 per cent of all government revenues. Right from the first day, the first second, the first dollar that is available to governments, they get 25 per cent of it and we get 75 per cent of it until we reach a trigger point. And when that trigger point is reached of having a per capita earned income - not just equalization, you see, that has to be eliminated and then get on to your per capita earned income - that is equal to the Canadian average at that time, and our level of services, as devised by a formula that we would work out in negotiations, is roughly equal to the Canadian average, we will get less than 75 per cent and the federal government will get more than 25 per cent.

In the last four weeks the Government of Newfoundland has met with - I do not know how many - just about every newspaper or editorial board

PREMIER PECKFORD: from Vancouver Island to Ottawa. We are on the way into Ottawa/Montreal now. And we have met with all the oil industry, most of the business community, just about all the financial community, with the Economic Council of Canada, with the Institute on Public Policy, and God knows how many more organizations and, Mr. Speaker, do you know something? there is nobody, but nobody who said anything but good about that proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Nobody but nobody has said anything but good about that proposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: What an eye-opener, Mr. Speaker, what an eye-opener when they actually take the time to take that proposal and either read it themselves - you should see the letters, I have them on file, Incredible! An incredible revelation, that this selfish Province down here suddenly

PREMIER PECKFORD has put a proposal on the table, even though they have a sound legal case, even though they are so far down, are willing to put a proposal on the table which no other government in Canada have ever done since Confederation on its resources. No other government have gone as far as we have and yet we are the furthest down of all of them. So when the members of the Opposition try to maintain lamely, try to establish some kind of position in contrast to ours, they would do well to support us foursquare, no ifs, ands or buts, no weasel words, no yes partly and partly not. They would do well to remember how they will be recorded in history besides being of some help today with getting this matter resolved in the negotiated way. They would do well to remember that they are in the minority, not only in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, but are fast becoming the minority in Canada, who oppose the position that we take on the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: One of the few groups now, identifiable groups in Canada, who are opposed to our position is the Liberal Opposition in Newfoundland. Is that not incredible? Is that not incredible? That is a great status to have. It is a great status for the members of the Liberal Party to have, that they are one of the few identifiable organized groups in Canada who actually take issue with our position on offshore oil and gas ownership and on the proposal that we have put on the table. And, as I said here a number of weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, and I reiterate it for the record now under this resolution - and as two or three groups in the Province have tried to say over

PREMIER PECKFORD: the last couple of days, you know, that somebody is - keep saying it: Why does not the Premier of Newfoundland pick up the phone - it is almost like calling your wife - why does not the Premier of Newfoundland pick up the phone and call the Prime Minister? Mr. Speaker, I tried first when I became Premier to call the Prime Minister on a number of occasions. Fun and games, Mr. Speaker! Fun and games! And I have tried through the back door and side door to get to see the Prime Minister on this issue and I am willing to go back tomorrow morning and this afternoon to call the Prime Minister. Do you know what I had to do, Mr. Speaker, last Friday? I was on my way to my constituency, and I have been trying for a month and I have been keeping my mouth shut, to get a meeting with Mr. Gray and Mr. Olson to see if we can resolve some of our outstanding issues on development of this Province with the proposal we have

PREMIER PECKFORD. on the table for him, and all those dates were not acceptable. I would go to Ottawa night or day, the whole works, I phoned him and phoned him and could only talk to his executive assistant and his secretary. So I got on the phone finally on Friday. He called down - his executive assistant called down to Newfoundland to my office looking for me. I was out of the office for a few minutes, so when I got back in the office I called. These are the problems we have. Talk about calling the Prime Minister! I called. 'Sorry, the executive assistant is in some kind of a meeting.' 'Well,' I said, 'this is the Premier of Newfoundland calling. I have been calling now for a number of weeks and we have written and telexed and so on and we are trying to be responsible and reasonable people down here to get some of these proposals moving and it is very, very necessary for me, as Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, to talk to somebody up there to see if we can get a few meetings started.' 'Well, leave it with me and I will get back to you.' 'Well,' I said, 'I am taking a plane now and I am going to Gander but I will be out there in an hour, perhaps, or an hour and fifteen minutes and when I get out there may I call you again?' 'Well, yes, you can call me again.' So out in the Gander terminal, at a pay phone in the center of Gander terminal, I called Mr. Gray's office and got the secretary on the phone again and asked for the executive assistant, who still was not available. And I said to her, 'Now, my dear, you know, this has gone far enough and my patience is about worn out. I have been at this for a long time. Mr. Gray must be around there somewhere. You are telling me he is in a meeting. Would you please tell

PREMIER PECKFORD: him the Premier of Newfoundland is on the phone. I am only trying to return calls that he has sent down to me. I have letters and telexes trying to get to see him. And I said, 'I am staying on here. I am going to go on hold on this line until I get to talk to Mr. Gray.' And, of course, the secretary went away and about six or seven minutes later - I timed it - I think it was six minutes later, the secretary came on the phone. She said, 'Mr. Gray is going to come out now and speak to you.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of problem that I am having in trying to deal with those people who say, 'Why does not the Premier of Newfoundland pick up the phone and call the Prime Minister,' as if I were calling the wife to tell her I will be half an hour late for supper. And I have said nothing about it. I have tried to be as responsible and as reasonable on it as I possibly can and still am, and told Mr. Gray I will come to Ottawa any time next week - that was last Friday. I said, 'I will drop everything and I will come, after supper, for lunch, for breakfast, whatever time, but I think we should meet eyeball to eyeball, go over these proposals, see where we are, see what your feelings are on them all and see if we can reach some agreements.' And he resisted me, sitting down -

MR. NEARY: Is that the industrial parks?

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the Institute of Marine Technology, that is the industrial parks, that is the highways, that is the rural development, that is Corner Brook development, all the ones that have been put on his plate now for two and three years. So he resisted a physical face to face meeting, even though I insisted on it about four times, and I am supposed to have a conference call with him and a couple of his officials

June 9, 1982

Tape 1164

EC - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: on Friday of this week at noon to try to resolve that. And I have been at it now six or eight weeks myself, just physically doing it, quietly doing it.

So now, Mr. Speaker, when people talk about trying to co-operate and putting obstacles in the way, just let it be recorded that when we talk about the offshore, if

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am having that much trouble on getting a few small agreements signed, and behold the problems that we are having on the offshore to try to get a meeting. But, as the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) says and other members of this House on both sides, if it takes an offshore summit, I am ready, willing and able to go at any time. I will go dance with the Prime Minister on a small Pacific atoll if that is what it takes, if that is where I have to go. If he wants to go water-skiing in Spain, I will water-ski with the Prime Minister. I might even steal his damsel away from him. But, in any case, Mr. Speaker, whatever it takes, I will do it. And I honestly have said so many times in the past and I will say again, that if it is speed we want to get the Hibernia development going, because pace of development only means something beyond the first one really, then the quickest way is to sit down and resolve it. Thirty days from the first day of meaningful negotiations we can have a deal to get Hibernia going, no question about it, it would not take any longer than 30 days, but there has to be a will. And my final comment will be just this, Mr. Speaker, I have to say, 'I told you so'. Because when these negotiations were getting under way, who was the person who said, 'That perhaps we had better make sure that the political will is there first and that I should meet with the Prime Minister of Canada'? Who was it? I said that, Mr. Speaker, I was one of the few people who said that perhaps we should have that cloud removed and word to go down from the Premier and the Prime Minister through their negotiating teams that we are serious about those principles, then perhaps we would have had a deal. And that was turned down and I

PREMIER PECKFORD: was forced by the consensus everywhere at the time, everywhere at the time, 'Ah, drop that boy, drop that and let the officials go ahead and negotiate it'. And so, I say, I told you so because I think it would have had a greater measure of success if from the beginning the political leaders of the day had sat down and set out the principles which would guide the officials in their duties and guide the ministers, especially Mr. Lalonde in his duties, as he later had to go and negotiate. Mr. Speaker, we stand ready but we stand behind this resolution, because if we do not we will always be number 10 and a have-not part of Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Is the House ready for the amendment?

All those in favour of the amendment 'aye'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye!

MR. SPEAKER: 'Those against the amendment 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay!

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is defeated.

On motion, the resolution was carried unanimously.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I just want to advise the House that as far as Estimates Committees-tomorrow the Resource Committee will meet at 9:30 at the Colonial building and the Energy part of the Department of Mines and Energy will be considered. Social Services will meet here in the House of Assembly and the Department of Justice estimates will be considered.

June 9, 1982

Tape No. 1165

RA - 3

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It being six o'clock I now

leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
TABLED
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1982

Table 7

QUESTION 71 -

ORDERS OF THE DAY

4/82

May 14/82

QUESTION:- Mr. Hodder to ask the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information.

- (a) Since April 1, 1979, what is the total amount of money borrowed by the Government to be paid after a period in excess of one year and of the total amount, list the date which borrowing was done.
- (b) The source of the funds borrowed.
- (c) The rate of interest to be paid on each borrowing.
- (d) The price at which the Government securities were sold whether at or under par.
- (e) The cost of the borrowing to the Government with respect to each separate borrowing.
- (f) The terms of repayment with respect to each separate borrowing.

ANSWER:-

SEE ATTACHMENT:

CANADIAN DOLLAR BORROWINGS

Public Market Issues

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Issue Price</u>	<u>Effective Interest Rate</u>	<u>Amount in Millions</u>	<u>Term</u>
4T	8.75%	99.40	8.90%	\$10.0	May 15, 1975-1980
4U	10.375%	99.75	10.40%	20.0	May 15, 1975-1995
4V	10.50%	100.00	10.50%	30.0	Oct. 15, 1975-1981/96
4X	10.75%	99.50	10.81%	30.0	June 29, 1976-1997
4Z	10.00%	99.50	10.06%	35.0	Jan. 5, 1977-1999
5E	13.375%	100.00	13.375%	75.0	May 15, 1980-1986

Euro-Canadian Public Market Issues

EC1	9.50%	100.00	9.50%	20.0	May 15, 1975-1983
EC2	10.25%	100.25	10.21%	30.0	Dec. 15, 1975-1985

Alberta Heritage Savings and Trust Fund Issues

5B	10.00%	100.00	10.00%	50.0	March 15, 1977-1998
5C	11.25%	100.00	11.25%	50.0	Dec. 15, 1979-1987
5J	16.375%	99.44	16.525%	55.0	Feb. 16, 1982-1988

Canadian Private Placements

5D (1)	Floating Rate	100.00		50.0	April 15, 1980-1985
5H (2)	Floating Rate	100.00		10.8	Feb. 5, 1981-1986
5F (3)	11.25%	100.00	11.25%	3.0	July 15, 1980-1988
5G (3)	11.25%	100.00	11.25%	2.0	July 15, 1980-1991

Canada Pension Plan Borrowings

8.21%- 9.48%	100.00	8.21%- 9.48%	29.4	1975-76 - 1995-96
8.73%- 9.25%	100.00	9.73%- 9.25%	31.0	1976-77 - 1996-97
8.77%- 9.22%	100.00	8.77%- 9.22%	33.0	1977-78 - 1997-98
9.35%-10.16%	100.00	9.35%-10.16%	36.6	1978-79 - 1998-99
9.98%-12.74%	100.00	9.98%-12.74%	40.1	1979-00 - 1999-00
11.61%-13.46%	100.00	11.61%-13.46%	42.6	1980-81 - 2000-01
13.66%-17.51%	100.00	13.66%-17.51%	53.0	1981-82 - 2001-02

(1) This issue was arranged with a group of trust companies and pension funds.

(2) This issue was placed with one chartered bank.

(3) These issues were placed with the Newfoundland Government Sinking Fund.

U.S. DOLLAR BORROWINGS

Public Market Issues

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Issue Price</u>	<u>Effective Interest Rate</u>	<u>Amount in Millions</u>	<u>Term</u>
4S	10.875%	99.25	10.96%	\$50.0	May 15, 1975-2000
4W	10.50%	100.00	10.50%	50.0	Feb. 1, 1976-2001
4Y	10.00%	100.00	10.00%	50.0	Aug. 1, 1976-2001
AB	9.125%	100.00	9.125%	75.0	Sept. 1, 1977-2002
AC	15.00%	99.50	15.10%	100.0	Nov. 15, 1981-1991

Euro-U.S. Public Market Issues

EU1	9.00%	100.50	8.93%	50.0	Feb. 15, 1977-1989
EU2	9.25%	100.50	9.18%	50.0	June 1, 1978-1990
EU3	10.00%	99.50	10.065%	50.0	March 15, 1979-1994
EU4	13.50%	99.00	13.697%	60.0	Feb. 1, 1981-1990
EU5	17.25%	100.00	17.25%	60.0	Oct. 1, 1981-1989

U.S. Private Placements

J2 ⁽¹⁾	9.75%	100.00	9.75%	50.0	Dec. 28, 1978-87/95
-------------------	-------	--------	-------	------	---------------------

(1) This issue was arranged with a group of Japanese banks.

100th 7 June 82

QUESTION 72

ORDERS OF THE DAY

4/82

May 14/82

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

The various debenture loans raised since the first of April 1975 giving:

- (a) Interest rates
- (b) Price of issue
- (c) Effective interest rate
- (d) Currency of issue
- (e) Due dates

ANSWER:- SEE ATTACHMENT:

CANADIAN DOLLAR BORROWINGS

Public Market Issues

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Issue Price</u>	<u>Effective Interest Rate</u>	<u>Amount in Millions</u>	<u>Term</u>
4T	8.75%	99.40	8.90%	\$10.0	May 15, 1975-1980
4U	10.375%	99.75	10.40%	20.0	May 15, 1975-1995
4V	10.50%	100.00	10.50%	30.0	Oct. 15, 1975-1981/96
4X	10.75%	99.50	10.81%	30.0	June 29, 1976-1997
4Z	10.00%	99.50	10.06%	35.0	Jan. 5, 1977-1999
5E	13.375%	100.00	13.375%	75.0	May 15, 1980-1986

Euro-Canadian Public Market Issues

EC1	9.50%	100.00	9.50%	20.0	May 15, 1975-1983
EC2	10.25%	100.25	10.21%	30.0	Dec. 15, 1975-1985

Alberta Heritage Savings and Trust Fund Issues

5B	10.00%	100.00	10.00%	50.0	March 15, 1977-1998
5C	11.25%	100.00	11.25%	50.0	Dec. 15, 1979-1987
5J	16.375%	99.44	16.525%	55.0	Feb. 16, 1982-1988

Canadian Private Placements

5D ⁽¹⁾	Floating Rate	100.00		50.0	April 15, 1980-1985
5H ⁽²⁾	Floating Rate	100.00		10.8	Feb. 5, 1981-1986
5F ⁽³⁾	11.25%	100.00	11.25%	3.0	July 15, 1980-1988
5G ⁽³⁾	11.25%	100.00	11.25%	2.0	July 15, 1980-1991

Canada Pension Plan Borrowings

8.21%- 9.48%	100.00	8.21%- 9.48%	29.4	1975-76 - 1995-96
8.73%- 9.25%	100.00	9.73%- 9.25%	31.0	1976-77 - 1996-97
8.77%- 9.22%	100.00	8.77%- 9.22%	33.0	1977-78 - 1997-98
9.35%-10.16%	100.00	9.35%-10.16%	36.6	1978-79 - 1996-99
9.98%-12.74%	100.00	9.98%-12.74%	40.1	1979-00 - 1999-00
11.61%-13.46%	100.00	11.61%-13.46%	42.6	1980-81 - 2000-01
13.66%-17.51%	100.00	13.66%-17.51%	53.0	1981-82 - 2001-02

(1) This issue was arranged with a group of trust companies and pension funds.

(2) This issue was placed with one chartered bank.

(3) These issues were placed with the Newfoundland Government Sinking Fund.

U.S. DOLLAR BORROWINGS

Public Market Issues

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Issue Price</u>	<u>Effective Interest Rate</u>	<u>Amount in Millions</u>	<u>Term</u>
4S	10.875%	99.25	10.96%	\$50.0	May 15, 1975-2000
4W	10.50%	100.00	10.50%	50.0	Feb. 1, 1976-2001
4Y	10.00%	100.00	10.00%	50.0	Aug. 1, 1976-2001
AB	9.125%	100.00	9.125%	75.0	Sept. 1, 1977-2002
AC	15.00%	99.50	15.10%	100.0	Nov. 15, 1981-1991

Euro-U.S. Public Market Issues

EU1	9.00%	100.50	8.93%	50.0	Feb. 15, 1977-1989
EU2	9.25%	100.50	9.18%	50.0	June 1, 1978-1990
EU3	10.00%	99.50	10.065%	50.0	March 15, 1979-1994
EU4	13.50%	99.00	13.697%	60.0	Feb. 1, 1981-1990
EU5	17.25%	100.00	17.25%	60.0	Oct. 1, 1981-1989

U.S. Private Placements

J2 ⁽¹⁾	9.75%	100.00	9.75%	50.0	Dec. 28, 1978-87/95
-------------------	-------	--------	-------	------	---------------------

(1) This issue was arranged with a group of Japanese banks.