

VOL. 3

NO. 17

THIRD SESSION OF THE  
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my  
statement today is to outline to the members of this House  
the callous position adopted by the Government of Canada  
on the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation  
Limited.

As hon. members are no doubt  
aware, NLDC is a federal/provincial organization which  
provides loan and equity financing for small and medium-  
sized firms in Newfoundland and Labrador to become es-  
tablished, to expand or to modernize present operations  
and to diversify into new operations. Since its inception  
in 1972 by the two levels of government, NLDC has  
concentrated its assistance to manufacturing enterprises  
and resource based firms in the Province. During the  
past ten years, NLDC has approved over 260 loans with  
a value of \$56.8 million and approved fifty-six projects  
for equity financing with a value of \$2.8 million. More  
than 3,300 full-time and 700 part-time jobs have been  
created in private sector projects supported by the  
Corporation's activity. Mr. Speaker, certainly these  
statistics show the important role NLDC fulfills in  
business development in this Province.

To carry out this work, the  
Corporation has been served by a diligent and hard working

MR. WINDSOR: board of directors. The board, appointed respectively by the shareholders - the two levels of government - has given valuable advice and guidance over the years. In addition, the Corporation has a strong professional group of employees dedicated to business development.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada now wants to destroy this Corporation which has been so successful during the past ten years. It is the federal intention to withdraw from and wind up NLDC - a legal right under the terms and conditions of the Federal-Provincial Agreement. However, this federal position is in complete contrast to the Province's position of wanting to maintain NLDC as a jointly funded organization to assist business development.

Mr. Speaker, the latest five-year federal/provincial funding agreement expired on July 17, 1982. Prior to, and after that date, the Province made several representations to the Government of Canada regarding its intention to participate in a renewed five-year agreement with the Province. We have executed since 1982 two amendment agreements, one of six month duration and the latest of fifteen months which expired March 31, 1984.

MR. WINDSOR: The Province has never received from the Government of Canada a longer term commitment even though NLDC has proven to be such a valuable body.

Mr. Speaker, during the discussions between federal/provincial officials concerning NLDC, it was disclosed that the Government of Canada views the activities of NLDC as duplicating the services of the Federal Business Development Bank. Furthermore, the restructuring of the federal departments such as DRIE and MSERD are said by the federal government to be capable of providing adequate programmes and services to assist business development. However, a joint governmental evaluation of the activities of the Corporation completed in May 1982 clearly showed that the lending activities of the FBDB are not directed to the all important manufacturing and processing sectors of our economy and do little to encourage the expansion and diversification of Newfoundland business in this respect.

This evaluation concluded the following with respect to the Corporation's achievement of its various objectives during the 1977-1982 period. in the matter of loan financing, "After considering the level of economic activity in the period under review, the reactive role of the Corporation, and its lender of last resort policy, it was concluded that the NLDC had achieved the above objective and did so without duplicating alternate existing loan services,"

And secondly, to provide equity financing, "It was concluded that NLDC is filling an existing financing gap by providing the kind of equity financing that is not available in similar terms and conditions from other sources,"

MR. WINDSOR:

Thirdly, to provide management advisory services, "The Corporation was found to be quite strong in the financial and accounting expertise that it provided ... The Evaluation Committee concluded that within the constraints of staff resources, the Corporation had met its objective of providing management advisory services,"

Fourthly, to provide other related services, "It was the conclusion of the Evaluation Committee that NLDC had met its objective to provide other related services and assistance to Newfoundland businesses. This was achieved through its highly successful and unique books by mail service, its business and technical library, its involvement in the delivery of other federal/provincial and provincial business assistance programmes, and latterly through a co-operative arrangement with the National Research Council to strengthen its technical information and advisory services."

MR. WINDSOR: Fifthly, to assist small and medium sized businesses, "The Evaluation Committee concluded that the companies assisted by NLDC would be considered small or medium sized by any reasonable standards."

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Dr. James G. Barnes, Dean of the School of Business, Memorial University of Newfoundland carried out a study to gain information about the opinions of individuals and businesses with whom NLDC has had dealings during the ten years since its establishment. In order to attain as much information as possible from the business community of the Province it was decided that as many clients of, and applicants to, the corporation as possible would be contacted. The list contained a total of 163 Newfoundland businesses and included both successful and unsuccessful applicants.

Some of the the more significant findings of the survey were as follows:

Seventy per cent of respondents felt that Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation had been effective in creating jobs and more than 70 per cent felt that the corporation had been effective in assisting the establishment of new businesses to expand and modernize.

Secondly, NLDC staff is considered to be highly accessible to clients:

Thirdly, when clients make use of services provided by the corporation, they are generally satisfied with the service obtained.

Fourthly, approximately 90 per cent of the respondents indicated that they would apply again for funding from the corporation. Even 60 per cent of the unsuccessful applicants indicated that they would apply again.

MR. WINDSOR: The Barnes Report served to provide answers to a number of soul-searching questions and the results of this have helped the corporation to adjust its operational policies from time to time.

Also, Omnifacts Research Limited undertook a survey to gain information about the users of InfoReach services and their opinion of these services.

The survey indicated the overwhelming success and widening usage of this unique programme. Custom designed for the Province's business environment, it caters equally to those persons who can actually visit the library at St. John's of those who are resident in other parts of the Province and therefore cannot visit the facility in person. This very special service to business persons and entrepreneurs in rural Newfoundland and Labrador is achieved through a 'Books-By-Mail' programme and the publishing of a series of book catalogues detailing library contents and instructions on how to access them by mail. While the vast majority of InfoReach service users are from Newfoundland and Labrador business communities it is important to note that many federal and provincial officials make regular use of the facility.

To summarize, the Omnifact Research Limited survey concluded that, "InfoReach is perceived as being valuable and worthwhile by its members and their future utilization of these services should, in most cases, increase."

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, NLDC has a regional office network throughout the Province and this has been utilized by government. The federal/provincial tourism accommodations incentives programme had the regional NLDC representatives assist clients in the preparation of applications. In addition, the Department of Fisheries consolidated with the financial services of NLDC the secondary fish processing loans programme. This arrangement provided a rationalization of delivery systems and easy access for prospective clients. In addition to this, the recent and highly successful OICAP programme has been assisted by the staff at NLDC and in the recent budget we announced that a venture capital programme would be established and would be administered by NLDC on behalf of the Department of Development.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the results of NLDC's activities, the 1982 evaluation report and the studies undertaken, it is clear why this Province made every effort to continue the operations of NLDC as a jointly funded federal/provincial organization.

To this end, Mr. Speaker, over the past two years, the hon. the Premier, my officials and I have repeatedly addressed a stream of letters, urgent telexes, and discussions to the federal government on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, we have scarcely been favoured with the courtesy of a reply.

Eleven separate communications have been sent to the federal government concerning NLDC since March of 1982, the time at which the evaluation report was being finalized, and only twice have there been replies. These replies resulted in the last minute and short-term extensions to which I referred earlier.

MR. WINDSOR: More recently, Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 1983, I wrote the hon. E. Lumley requesting that our officials again discuss long-term participation in NLDC; on December 5, 1983 the hon. the Premier - wrote the same federal minister asking for the start of negotiations. We have not received a response to either letter, in fact, neither the Premier nor I have even received an acknowledgement of their receipt.

Mr. Speaker, on March 27 of this year, the Province indirectly heard of the Federal Minister's position. We did not receive a letter from shareholder to shareholder, but rather a letter addressed to my deputy minister from the Executive Director (Newfoundland) Federal Department of Regional and Industrial Development. Essentially, this letter expresses a federal intent to withdraw and wind up NLDC. The handling of this communication of the federal position is certainly a direct insult to the Province, the Board of Directors of NLDC and the entire performance shows a total lack of respect for the professional staff of the Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, this government abhors the federal government's apparent determination to destroy an organization which has been not only the principal incentive financing institution for industrial development in the Province but also a visible and continuing proof of the valuable results that can be achieved when the federal and provincial government co-operate effectively and in harmony.

MR. WINDSOR: This is an approach which, regrettably, the Government of Canada does not these days see fit to continue with.

The Province sincerely wishes to maintain the operations of NLDC and to continue the federal presence in some form that allows this organization, which is uniquely matched to the specific conditions of our Province, to continue in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that in light of the above the federal government will reconsider its position. It is most unfortunate, indeed, that the Government of Canada often sees fit to change that which is working well. Such is the case with NLDC, a shining example of how federal/provincial co-operation can work to the benefit of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. As we say in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, 'If it ain't broke don't fix it'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope that hon. gentlemen know what they are applauding. They are applauding another failure. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard that song before. The hon. gentleman started out his Ministerial Statement by say how callous the federal government are, Mr. Speaker. And we are not surprised to hear this kind of a statement being made here today, especially by a minister who has been announcing projects prematurely, trying to upstage the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker. We saw it in the case of - what was the name of that company?

MR. WARREN: Easteel.

MR. NEARY: Easteel, Mr. Speaker. We saw a classic example of where the hon. gentleman and the

MR. NEARY: Province -

MR. WARREN: And the North West River Bridge

MR. NEARY: - and we saw it in the case of the North West River Bridge and the bridge across the Codroy River, Mr. Speaker, where the hon. gentlemen, using federal money, decided that -

MR. WINDSOR: I had nothing to do with the North West River Bridge.

MR. NEARY: - they would upstage the Government of Canada and make their own announcements prematurely.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said that, again I have to say that what we are seeing is a classic example in this Province of 'group think'. They are on the same old kick and they seem to be elated and they take great pleasure and joy, they are almost sadistic, in their attitude when they are giving Ottawa a broadsides over something or other. They cannot wait to get on their feet, Mr. Speaker, to get up on -

MR. WINDSOR: Do you support NLDC or not?

MR. NEARY: I am coming to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman. I listened to the hon. gentleman read his Ministerial Statement, Mr. Speaker, and the whole statement was designed to give Ottawa another broadsides and the hon. gentleman seemed to be elated. It is too bad that the Emperor was not in his seat to see the hon. gentleman, I am sure he would get the first Medal for Bravery in this Province for getting

MR. NEARY:

up and emulating the Premier, parroting what the Premier has been saying in this Province. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that nobody in this hon. House, no member on either side of this House can be as enthusiastic about the achievements of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation as the hon. gentleman. In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, they have achieved very little.

Now, I regret to have to say that, because the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Loan Corporation was a Liberal concept. Mr. Speaker, it was on the drawing board, it was something that the Moores administration inherited -

MR. WINDSOR: You will have to change your minds now that it was such a great Liberal concept.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. gentleman and I did not interrupt, and I only have half the time that the hon. gentleman had.

MR. WINDSOR: You have not got half as much to say.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the concept was a Liberal concept and Mr. Moores, when he formed the government of this Province, inherited the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation. It was only a matter of just implementing the terms and provisions of the agreement. But somewhere along the line it got off the rails. It was meant to be a lender of last resort, but it got off the rails, as hon. gentlemen know, because we all have had dealings with the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Loan Corporation. I gave up on it years ago. We could not even find out in this House what companies and what individuals were getting the loans and getting assistance from the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when it was first established, I would say for the first six of seven years, it was used by the previous administration for pork barrelling purposes, for looking after their political friends. Mr. Speaker, that is what it was used for. Now, after the previous administration disappeared, and the hon. gentlemen there opposite refused to acknowledge that there was a Moores administration there for seven years, they refused to acknowledge that, then it tightened up and, Mr. Speaker, the terms and conditions of doing business with the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation were almost identical to the banks.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there is nothing that the Federal Business Development Bank cannot, or DRIE cannot do that the Newfoundland

MR. NEARY:

Development Loan Corporation is doing - nothing that they cannot do. The Federal Business Development Bank is federal money, Mr. Speaker, and there is nothing that that bank cannot do that the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation was doing. And if that fails, then they have DRIE, which is a new federal programme to give assistance to business and industry and to provide venture capital for any businessman or any industry wanting to start up in this Province.

MR. WINDSOR: They will not fund manufacturers, they will not service them.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman stressed the fact that they have a library. Mr. Speaker, they do indeed have a library, but I would say it is a pretty expensive library, because that is about the only service that they have provided in recent years. And the hon. gentleman pointed to a few successes. Well, what about the failures? I would say, Mr. Speaker, from the records that I have seen and the examination that I have been able to make of the activities of the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation, and scrutinizing their projects and their loans, that there are very few jobs in existence today as a result of loans and grants and assistance that were provided by that Corporation. And they have had a pretty hefty string of failures, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR: Not true.

MR. NEARY: It is true.

MR. WINDSOR: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: No? Well, I remember the under-water connectors, \$2.5 million, down in the Donovans Industrial Park, Mr. Speaker, when they were supposed to have with the United States Navy a contract, but it did not exist. Fraud was what I called it at the time -

MR. NEARY: \$2.5 million, the building is still down there. I do not know who has it now.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So long, it's been good to know you, that is what I would say now about the Newfoundland Development Loan Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions about the Bell Island ferry service. I notice the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is in his seat. The hon. gentleman is probably aware that on Bell Island at the terminal on Sunday past, a large number of residents of the Island came down to the terminal to protest the increase in the rates and general dissatisfaction with the ferry service. The hon. gentleman was invited to attend but he did not elect to do so.

Now, let me ask the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if there is a contract now between the provincial government, between the hon. gentleman's department and the Newfoundland Transportation Company? And if there is a contract, if there is an agreement, will the hon. gentleman indicate why that project was not put to public tender, why the hon. gentleman chose, in violation of

MR. NEARY:

the Public Tendering Act, to just award the contract to the company which was currently operating the service and not call public tenders?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, over the past two or three years since I have been in this portfolio I have made several visits to Bell Island and have spoken with the Commuters Committee on the Island, have spoken with them in my office here in St. John's, here at the Confederation Building from time to time with the member for the area, Mr. Doyle, have met with the Town Council and been with a Cabinet Committee that received a brief on behalf of the people of Bell Island with regard to the ferry service. We have been very deeply involved as a department, and I have been personally very deeply involved in the whole intra-provincial ferry system in the Province. And we have made, Mr. Speaker, what I consider and what many consider to be tremendous strides. Perhaps no other aspect of transportation in this Province has improved as dramatically and as significantly as that of the intraprovincial ferry system.

We have improved the systems in ever single instance. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, since the Province took over the operation of the intra-provincial ferry system we have in fact increased the number of services that we have. We now have a ferry system to Gaultois, which before was not there, a passenger service to Gaultois. We have an increased service in the Little Bay Islands/Long Island area where that service was split, so there is a new operation there. We have improved the Ramea-

MR. DAWE: Burgeo service to the extent that that service is now increased from a passenger service to a passenger/vehicle service. We have studied the situation on fares.

MR. NEARY: It is Bell Island you are supposed to be talking about.

MR. DAWE: I am just indicating to the hon. member, who somehow suggested that perhaps I would not meet with the group from Bell Island, that I have just indicated to him that I have met with several groups and will continue to do so when necessary as it relates to that ferry system.

And we have looked at very seriously, Mr. Speaker, the fare structure which had built into it no real association from fares charged on one service to those charged on another service. It was one of the real inequities of the whole intraprovincial ferry system and we had to try and do something

MR. DAWE:

about that to bring it in line with some fare increases that might be put in place and at the same time make them equitable in all services. And we have devised a method of doing that, Mr. Speaker, spread over a five year period. So in fact where there will be increases, they will be spread over a five year period. At the end of that five year period it will be the same principle in charging these fares in all the services throughout the Province. And I note, Mr. Speaker, that the increases for single passengers on the Bell Island service will increase from fifty cents to sixty-five cents, and they will increase fifteen cents a year for that five year period, which I do not consider, and many people whom I have spoken to on Bell Island do not consider to be an exorbitant increase by any stretch of the imagination. The commuters who use the ferry services will be getting their fares at 50 per cent of the normal charge. So people who are using the ferry system, not only on Bell Island but also in other parts of the Province, who use it as a commuter service will be doing so at 50 per cent of the regular fare. Also, Mr. Speaker, we have introduced a reduction of 50 per cent for senior citizens who travel on the various services in the Province. I think we have been more than responsible in dealing with the fare increases or the equalization of the fare charges. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, in particular services the fares will decrease. I might point out that one of these is in an area represented by the Speaker, and represented very well by the Speaker, and it is through conversations that I had with him in discussing this whole fare structure that these fares were brought in line. In that particular service, the Change Island service, the fare is cut in half and will remain at that level for the five year period.

April 4, 1984

Tape No. 660

MJ - 2

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, we have looked at different methods of supplying a service to the residents of Bell Island with the need to try and improve and increase the frequency of the boats;

MR. DAWE: in other words, bring it from what three years ago when we started this whole process, when the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) began representing the area, from what was a five week two-boat system to this year when that will be increased, Mr. Speaker, not to six weeks, seven weeks, eight weeks, nine weeks but to a two-boat system for nine months, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WINDSOR: Nine months!

MR. DAWE: It has increased from five week to nine months for a two-boat service, a very significant increase in the service provided to the people of Bell Island and a recognition, Mr. Speaker, of concerns for the aspirations of the people from Bell Island as it relates to the necessity of having a regular and available transportation system to get back and forth and for other amenities that they have access to on the mainland.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is not answering the question but apart from that he is breaking the rules of the House. Answers have to be brief. The hon. gentleman is taking us all around the Province now and in his harangue over there he is trying to justify increasing rates on ferry services throughout the Province. I asked the hon. gentleman about the Public Tendering Act and the hon. gentleman did not address himself to that. So in addition to not answering the question, Mr. Speaker, he is into a long harangue about nothing and I would submit he is out of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman asked a question and, you know, he cannot dictate the terms in which the question is going to be answered. He asked a question that requires a comprehensive answer and the hon. minister is giving a comprehensive answer, and when he is doing that he is giving him the information that he requested in the question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): To that point of order, again I must repeat that the purpose of the Question Period is to provide an opportunity for as many questions to be asked and as many answers to be received as possible. Certainly I would request hon. members to my left and to my right to observe that rule.

The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. NEARY: I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I did not know the hon. minister would not get up and finish his answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I have a supplementary for the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I recognized the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Is this the way it is going to be done now, Mr. Speaker, in this House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: This is absolutely ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It is absolutely ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Your Honour, once again

the hon. gentleman wants to take this House, which is the House of the people of Newfoundland, on his back. Who is recognized depends upon the Speaker of this House. There is no right to ask supplementary questions, but I dare say the hon. gentleman will get ample opportunity in this Question Period and elsewhere to ask other questions. But regardless of the fact, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman to get up and make the kind of observation he did is impugning the authority of the Speaker of this House and that is not given to the hon. gentleman to be able to do. And it calls for an immediate retraction from the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman would like to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Name him!

MR. MARSHALL:

- have this House as a beer hall if he could have it, but he is not going to have it, Mr. Speaker, while this government is in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

The fact of the matter is the Speaker, when he is in the Chair and exercising is entitled to the support of this House. He is certainly going to get it from all members of this House, and this requires the hon. gentleman to retract his statement and apologize to the Chair without any qualification whatsoever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition to that point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has the face of a robber's horse to stand in this House and criticize the Opposition for the way they behave in this House. In the last couple of weeks - you talk about a beer pit or a beer garden or a boxing ring - they are over there trying to shout us down because they cannot win the debates, they are shouting from the doorways, they are hurling objections across the House, they are hurling insults across the House, and that hon. gentleman has the face to stand up, Mr. Speaker, and criticize me because I have asked for my right as an officer, as the Leader of the Opposition in this House. All I am asking for is my rights, Mr. Speaker. No aspersions were cast on the Chair. I know how to deal with the Chair under the rules of this House if I want to, I do not need a lecture from the hon. gentleman. And the hon. gentleman can be as nasty as he wants, and with his

MR. NEARY: snake-like tongue he can squirt all the venom and all the poison he wants across this House, Mr. Speaker. It will do him no good because in the eyes of the public they have made complete shambles out of this House with their superirofty complex since the April 6 election, Mr. Speaker. And I would submit that there is no point of order and I think Your Honour realizes that. I think we should get on with the Question Period. If the government members want to have a love-in with the ministers over there, let them go out in the Common Room and do it over a cup of coffee and not use up the time of this House.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get engaged with the hon. gentleman. I have long since learned when you get down in the dirt with people that you get dirty and soiled yourself.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a question of anything that has transpired in this House. This is a question with respect to the hon. gentleman's conduct a few moments ago in this House in questioning Your Honour's ruling. Now the hon. gentleman, I do not need to quote Beauchesne - I mean, the hon. gentleman knows it, all hon. members know it - that the Speaker when he sits over the proceedings of this House is entitled to and must receive the respect of all members of the House. His rulings cannot be questioned, his judgment cannot be questioned, aspersions cannot be cast on the Chair. I mean, it is there in black and white.

I also quote as well for the hon. gentleman, because this is the issue, and he is not going to be able to camouflague it. Standing Order 31 (f) - and this is related to the general parliamentary practice of the protection of the Speaker, Mr. Speaker - "The

April 4, 1984

Tape 662

PK - 3

MR. MARSHALL: Speaker's ruling relating to oral questions are not debatable or subject to appeal." They are not subject to questioning in a base

MR. MARSHALL:

manner, which the hon. gentleman did. And the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is not going to be able to confuse the issue. The fact of the matter is he called into question a judgement of Your Honour, he called into question the authority of the Chair. He is required to retract and apologize and I submit to Your Honour that it calls for an immediate retraction from the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear that no member of the House is allowed to call Your Honour's authority into account and there is no question here, in my view, that is what has been done.

Despite the vehement protestations of the learned gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) what happened was this - and I have been in the House throughout as, of course, has Your Honour: My friend and colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was asking a question of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe); the minister was making his answer. My friend, the Leader of the Opposition, raised a point of order. It was perfectly in order. Your Honour heard it and Your Honour disposed of it. The minister was standing, prepared to carry on with the answer, when Your Honour did say, and I have no doubt Hansard will say, 'The member for St. John's North,' (Mr. Carter) who, I have no doubt was standing down in his place attempting to catch Your Honour's eye.

MR. ROBERTS: There is nothing wrong with that, there is no reason why he should not try to. The only problem, Mr. Speaker, is there is a long tradition in this House which Your Honour has followed scrupulously, as Your Honour does all of the traditions of this House, that you are allowed a supplementary question or two. And my friend, the Leader of the Opposition, once Your Honour finished, was on his feet saying, 'A supplementary question.'

Now, it is up to Your Honour who has the floor. And I suppose if it is not a supplementary there can be another question asked. I mean, it is not the end of the world. But, when my friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says - and I forget his precise words, but it went something like this - 'Is this the way it is to be in the House?' that is a perfectly legitimate question.

MR. TULK: After all of that!

MR. ROBERTS: Because what Your Honour did, I submit with respect, Sir, was contrary to what Your Honour has done time and time again.

DR. COLLINS: Questioning the Speaker!

MR. WARREN: Sure! And why not?

MR. ROBERTS: The dirt from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I will ignore. What I am saying is that that is not questioning any ruling, that is a perfectly proper question, I suggest, Sir, growing out of the course of events which I have described. If Your Honour says, 'Fine, the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is entitled to ask his question and read what somebody on the government side has written out for him,' that is fine, we have no problem with that; but, Sir, that does not for a moment raise any matter of question by my friend the Leader of the Opposition or anybody else. It is a perfectly legitimate

MR. ROBERTS: question: 'Is that the way it is to be? Are we no longer to have supplementary questions?' I do not think there is a point of order here, Sir, I think all that has happened is that the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) cannot resist the chance to try to lower the whole tone of debate, wraps himself in his seamless cloak of sanctimoniousness and, Sir, he should not be allowed to get away with it because it is not warranted.

---

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

The Chair has heard enough argument on this point of order and certainly will reserve a ruling until it has had an opportunity to look at the transcripts.

It is certainly the responsibility of the Chair to recognize the first member who catches the Speaker's eye, and I shall continue to do that. Subsequent to the hon. the Minister of Transportation(Mr.Dawe) having taken his seat, to my knowledge the hon. the member for St. John's North(Mr. Carter) was the first person on his feet and the Chair subsequently recognized that hon. member and does recognize the hon. member.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is nice to know that someone on our side can be fast on their feet. Mr. Speaker, I have a -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I move that we appeal Your Honour's ruling.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order I quote Standing Order 31(f): "The Speaker's rulings relating to oral questions are not debatable or subject to appeal." This is one instance, Mr. Speaker, when His Honour's ruling is not subject to appeal.

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

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, that was not an appeal of a ruling by Your Honour on an oral question, it

MR. ROBERTS: was a matter of a ruling by Your Honour on who Your Honour recognized. There is a difference, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The point raised by the hon. the President of the Council(Mr. Marshall) is well taken. There is no appeal of the Speaker's decisions during the Oral Question Period and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary) is out of order in putting forward that motion.

MR. CARTER: I have a question -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms). In today's Evening Telegram there is a photograph of the former, former Premier of this Province donating a pair of dueling pistols to the Province. Now, these dueling pistols were the property of Max Whiteway, who was the son of the late Sir William Whiteway, one-time Prime Minister of this country, and my question to the minister is on what basis were they accepted from the former, former Premier? who I do know borrowed them but, I understand, did not possess them. The credit should rightfully go to Mr. or Mrs. Whiteway.

MR. NEARY:

That is slander!

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, that is a clear case of slander in this House and a waste of the taxpayer dollar, a waste of the time of the House, and Your Honour should not allow it. Your Honour should rule it out of order because it is slanderous in every way, shape and form.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is not slanderous, you know, Mr. Speaker. If Your Honour is in the domain of making judgements on the quality of the questions that are asked from time to time, I would suggest there would be very few questions asked in this hon. House.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition to that point of order.

MR. NEARY:

I would submit that the hon. gentleman does not have the courage to say outside the House what he just said inside the House, Mr. Speaker. And I think Your Honour should look at this very, very seriously. Because the hon. gentleman is too cowardly to make that kind of a statement outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The question asked by the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is in order.

The hon. Minister of Culture,  
Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure if I understand the hon. member's question to be perfectly frank.

MR. NEARY: You should not even bother to answer it.

MR. SIMMS: All I can say to the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is that Mr. Smallwood I think is known to have a great deal of interest in preserving and conserving Newfoundland's culture and history in many ways, and I think he has shown that, of course. And in this particular instance I was advised as minister that he had some artifacts that he wished to donate or contribute back to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador through the museum and I was quite happy to represent the government and the department in accepting those artifacts, which I did yesterday. And I would suggest to the hon. member, if he wishes to obtain other information as to where they came from and so on, perhaps he might better deal with that by maybe writing Mr. Smallwood directly, I am sure he might respond. But I certainly have no such intention.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, thank God the hon. gentleman did not stoop to the level that the hon. member for St. John's North did. Let me come back to the Bell Island ferry service again. I was asking the hon. gentleman about the tender, if tenders were called before the contract was awarded and the hon. gentleman evaded that question. He did not answer it so I can only assume that he does not want to answer it and under the rules of the House I cannot force the hon. gentleman.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please! The hon.

the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is asking a supplementary question in the Question Period. The hon. gentleman is not allowed to make speeches or make comments. If the hon. gentleman is dissatisfied with the answer, there is a procedure on Thursday to debate the minister's answer. I would note that it has been used very, very sparingly by the Opposition both in the current session and in previous sessions.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition to that point of order.

MR. NEARY:

It is so obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman wants now to set up a full dictatorship in this Province. Now the administration has found a new technique for not wanting

MR. NEARY: to answer questions, when they want to deflect a question directed towards a minister. In every jurisdiction, as Your Honour knows, in Canada, and where you have the British Parliamentary system, you are allowed a brief preamble. I watch every night in the House of Commons, in the debates from Ottawa. Now, Your Honour may rule that on your supplementaries you do not need a preamble but all I was doing was making an observation. I was making an observation that the hon. gentleman did not answer my question, and I assume that he did not want to answer it, and I assume also, Mr. Speaker, that he has a lot to hide, and I cannot force the hon. gentleman to answer my question, so therefore I have to go on to the next supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) I feel just said what he was going to say in the first place. It is indeed correct that in an original question there is some preamble at times permitted, but certainly in a supplementary question there should not be a need for any preamble whatsoever.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we do not have much time left. I want to concentrate on that Bell Island ferry service, so I will come back to it later.

Let me ask the hon. gentleman a question about his use of chartered aircrafts. The hon. gentleman admitted in a public statement on radio yesterday morning that he is chartering a private aircraft to take him to his district, but he added the rider, 'to hold business meetings.' He goes home for the weekend, uses a chartered aircraft from Labrador Airways, a Navajo, \$1,600 for the charter. The hon. gentleman admitted it. Now will

MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman tell the House how many times he has chartered the Navajo aircraft to take him to Stephenville so he can go home for the weekend, who else travels on the aircraft with him, and the total cost of all these trips, all these charters to date?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, it is really too silly to reply to, but since the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did not want the answer to the first question, I suppose perhaps he will not want the answer to this one.

As it relates to his query, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what media he has been listening to but I certainly have not made any comment as it relates to things that he has said inside the House. I would certainly be pleased to make a comment if he cares to say those things outside the House, but we will leave that to see if he indeed has the courage to do it.

The direct question, Mr. Speaker, and I guess it is important that it be cleared up, was whether in fact I used in some way government financing to charter aircraft in order to go home to my district. The answer to that question very simply, Mr. Speaker, is, no, I do not do it, no, I have never done it, and I certainly do not have any intention of doing it in the future.

MR. NEARY: We will see.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) when it is planned to proclaim the amendment to the City of St. John's Act, which was passed in the last session of the Legislature, providing that, 'Where the City of St. John's is not in a position to provide services to areas of the city recently taken into the city, it will provide a reduced basis of taxation for those areas'. Now I am informed that constituents have been checking with the city and are informed by city officials that there are no plans to bring in any form of reduced taxation because this is not yet law. I wonder if the minister's department is planning to move on this very quickly because otherwise we are going to be well into another taxation year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take this question under advisement. I am not quite sure at this moment.

MR. BARRY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the minister might explain why it was that the act was made subject to proclamation. It must have been amended at the Committee stage or something, because I have to confess it completely passed my attention that the bill was being made subject to proclamation. The initial printed bill was not subject to proclamation, this was added once it came to the House. I wonder what the reason for making this amendment subject to proclamation was?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any very important reason at all. I am not sure just exactly why it was not proclaimed at that particular time. I would have to check on that as well.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell) The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: I wonder if we could have the minister's commitment to get an answer fairly shortly because I am not sure what the timing of the city's court of revision and so forth is, but we may miss the complete taxation year this year if this amendment to the City of St. John's Act is not brought into force fairly quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I will do that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) tabled in the House the other day a list of loans and guarantees. Down at the bottom of the list there are the names of two gentleman who received a principal amount of \$137,000 which was guaranteed by the Province. Could the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what this money was for?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon.

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) misunderstanding things.

I did not table anything that said that two individuals

received any amounts of money at all.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have here in

front of me a document says Ocean Harvesters, Fisheries Products,  
Bay St. George, Newfoundland Food Processors, Blue Ocean Products,  
Cape Pine Fisheries, Gerald Ryder and Walter Street, \$137,000.

They defaulted on their loan and the taxpayers had to pick up

the principal and interest of \$156,685.73. Now would the

hon. gentleman stop playing games and tell the House what that

\$137,000 was for?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: No problem whatever, Mr. Speaker.

I was correcting the hon. member -

MR. NEARY: You tabled the list the other

day.

DR. COLLINS: - who said that these individuals

received that money. I was correcting him. He was stating

something which was totally incorrect, The hon. Leader of

the Opposition (Mr. Neary) makes these broad statements which

have no basis in facts. And I frequently have to get on my

feet and correct him. And I was on my feet again correcting

him. He says these individuals got \$137,000 or whatever it was.

MR. NEARY: A guarantee. Rights.

DR. COLLINS: I was correcting him. They did

not get it.

MR. NEARY: A guarantee. They did get it.

DR. COLLINS: They did not get the money which

is what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said. Who got the money?

DR. COLLINS: The bank got the money —

MR. NEARY: Well, what was it for?

DR. COLLINS: - because we repossessed the boat to which this amount of money was guaranteed. Those individuals got no money. We took the boat away from them because, unfortunately, these honest fishermen were unable to meet their obligations because of the state of the fishery and so on. They could not meet their obligations, we had to honour the guarantee we had on. We gave the money to the bank, and as a result of that we repossessed the boat. It is very different from what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was implying when he said that the government had given \$136,000 to these two individuals. I hope for once the press will get the truth and not come out with the headlines, such as came out in a certain paper the other day, when the hon. Leader made a statement on provincial debt, which I came out immediately and corrected what he said, and yet it ended up in headlines what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said. I mean, it was totally disgraceful.

MR. MARSHALL: Which paper?

DR. COLLINS: It was some rag called The Daily News. I do not know if anyone reads it. But anyway it was totally disgraceful, and especially after I had said, now, this is what I suspect that this raggish document will say, and sure enough, this is what this raggish document said the next morning, even though I said it would say that and it should not say it because here are the facts.

# House of Assembly

April 4, 1984, Tape 669, Page 1 -- apb

MR. SPEAKER(Russell):

Order, please!

The time for the Question

Period has expired.

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I have the answer

to question No. 19 on the Order Paper of March 28, 1984

asked by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary).

'Since 1977 how many issuers of marriage licences have been granted for the Province?' The total is 434. 'Since 1977, how many resignations of same have been received?' The total 227. Some are deaths and they have the same effect as resignations, but strictly speaking, they are not resignations.

MR. NEARY:

Why have so many resigned?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

They do not give reasons.

MR. NEARY:

There is no business, no money.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I would imagine. Because that seems to be a great number of people to issue a marriage licence. I understand there are something in excess of 200 now. They do not give reasons for resigning. I would think it was because they had nothing to do, and a number would have moved away, and a number would have died.

## PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 196 residents of the town of Markland. This is not the first occasion where I have had the opportunity to present a petition on behalf of the people who live in Markland. It concerns their horrible road conditions. I am glad that the Minister of Transportation is in his seat so that he can respond favourably, I hope,

MR. CALLAN: and tell the people that they will get something done with their road this Spring.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time that I have presented a petition on behalf of these people. They have been looking for improved road conditions, and hopefully a paved road, in the town of Markland for years and years and years. On one occasion they thought they had their pavement, back in 1974/75, but then along came an election and the plans were changed. That was about the same time that the districts were changed, when ten additional districts were added to the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the prayer of the petition: It says, "To the hon. House of Assembly. The undersigned residents of the community of Markland hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland, through the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), to give immediate consideration to paving and upgrading the main and branch roads through the community of Markland."

So there it is, Mr. Speaker, a very simple request by people who, on a day like today, especially after the snow we had last week, with the melting snow on a day like today, I would hazard a guess that the cars and trucks that travel this road are finding it very, very muddy and soft and dirty, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, this petition was initiated by one of the clergy who serves that town. Actually, he came into my office a couple of months ago and asked about getting a petition on the go. I did not prepare the prayer of the petition, I guess he must have. But, anyway, a lot of work had to go into going door to door with a petition such as this one, and getting the people to sign their names for a very basic and simple request, asking that their tax dollars be put back into their town. There are a fair number of farmers in Markland, they are primary producers. They are like the fishermen who lived

MR. CALLAN:

down in South West Arm, who had been asking for improved and paved roads for years. And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is in his seat. Actually, I had it written last week, but it was only yesterday that the minister was there and I sent across a letter in which I outlined not only the Markland road and the need to have some money allocated for it this year, I also sent across to the minister a piece of barite, but that has to do with his other portfolio as Minister of Mines. I will talk about that on some other occasion. But, Mr. Speaker, the minister is well aware of all of the dirt roads in the district of Bellevue. I wrote him a letter last week and hand delivered it yesterday here in the Legislature and, as I said in my letter, if enough funds cannot be found to do all of the dirt roads in the district of Bellevue, we understand it - I understand it, the people in the district understand it - but, if there is enough money found, to spread it around the Province equitably and fairly, if there is enough money found to do a couple of miles of road in Markland during this construction season then, of course, the people will understand that they cannot get it all in one shot. But fairness and equity will be served to these people if enough money is found to do, as I said, upgrading on some of the road. And, of course, if a couple of miles that are already ready for paving can be done this year, I am sure that the people would be very happy indeed.

I understand, I believe that there are 3,400 kilometers of dirt road in this Province. That is about - what? -

MR. CALLAN: That is about 2,000 miles of dirt road in the Province. But even if the people in Markland, Mr. Speaker, could only get a couple of miles, \$200,000 or \$300,000 or \$400,000 out of this year's budget, then I am sure the people in Markland will be happy, Mr. Speaker. At least a start will have been made and perhaps next year a finish can be made.

Mr. Speaker, in the five minutes that I have, I support this petition and I trust that the minister will support it as well, not only verbally but by putting his money where his mouth is and that, of course, means doing something constructive for them.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I recognize the hon. the Minister of Transportation. I have to remind him that, it being Private Member's Day, except, of course, by leave, he only has until 4:00 p.m.

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I will not take too long.

I certainly support the prayer of the petition presented by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). I did indeed receive his letter yesterday and I did indeed receive the sample of barite from Colliers Point.

Mr. Speaker, some of the things that I have been saying in response to similar petitions and to delegations that I have met with over the past number of years seems to be sinking in and a realization occurring in the minds of hon. members opposite that we do have a monumental job ahead of us in this Province as it relates to bringing our transportation system, particularly the road aspect of transportation, up to an acceptable

MR. DAWE: standard, the kind of a standard that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, as Canadians, should expect.

We have in this Province a very, very sparse population, spread out over a large landmass. I believe, Mr. Speaker, although I would stand to be corrected, that we have more miles per capita than any other Province in the country. Our population is spread around the coast on the Island of Newfoundland and is very scattered in the Labrador region of the Province, and we have unusual conditions. We have extreme highroad construction conditions in the Province; we have extremes of solid rock to very deep bog to anything in-between. We have stretches of road in the Province that are subject to violent storms. Sometimes we have a stretch of road, for instance, the Burgeo road, which covers ninety miles, and about sixty of those miles are relatively easy to maintain under Winter conditions, but the other thirty miles are just about impossible. So we have those extreme conditions.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! I must interrupt the hon. member. Does the hon. minister have leave to continue?

MR. NEARY: Providing that we can get leave to have a second go at it on this side, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! This arose I think a few days ago, or last week, and the Chair had to rule that certainly if leave is given it is given freely and not on any condition. I understand under normal conditions, of course, somebody else from the Opposition side if it had not been Wednesday would have had time to reply to the petition.

Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is no Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) over there. It is just a point of clarification. There is no Government House Leader over there, Mr. Speaker, they are leaderless. No wonder they are in complete disarray. Will somebody indicate to us - because we are allowed to have another spokesman on this side to support the petition - will somebody indicate if we give the minister leave that I can have leave to support this petition?

MR. DAWE: No, certainly not.

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

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

MR. MORGAN: The rules of the House clearly indicate that there can be three speakers on the petition and in this case if the hon. minister now speaking sits someone else can respond from the Opposition. So it is automatic. It is not a condition of the House.

MR. NEARY: Okay. Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! On Wednesday it is not automatic because Private Member's Day has to begin at four o'clock. That is why I asked the House if the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) could have leave to go beyond four o'clock.

MR. NEARY: Okay. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave, the hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not be that much longer. I just wanted to indicate that I do indeed support the prayer of the petition as I do in fact support the aspirations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in many areas of the Province. We have a very limited financial resource at our disposal with a great number of requirements and needs right throughout the Province. We are attempting to address those needs with the money that we have available to us and we will continue to do so. If we are successful in negotiating another fair and equitable cost sharing arrangement with the federal government, we will do some of these projects much quicker than we can under our own resources.

This is the hope that I have, Mr. Speaker, and members on this side hope that perhaps those in the federal regime will recognize the extra problems

MR. DAWE: as every royal commission that has studied transportation in this Province has done in the past, recognize that there are special requirements in this Province and we need additional funding to be able to do that, and we hope to be able to procure that.

Mr. Speaker, just one other point; this year this government, this administration has put forward extra funding to address itself to some ongoing problems, extreme maintenance problems, a recap and rehabilitation programme of existing road networks and also a rehabilitation programme for selected bridges around the Province. And hopefully over a short period of years this will see the recapping and restoration of these projects on a continuous basis. This will allow us some additional funding, Mr. Speaker, to be able to use in some more of the important areas and I would hope, as I am sure the people who signed the petition, hope that some of that funding may be available for that area. We will have to wait and see how the estimates go through the House, Mr. Speaker, and determine from our priority list which projects will go ahead this year.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have leave to respond to that petition?

MR. CARTER: The hon. member does not have leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I want to be sure. Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition have leave?

MR. CARTER: No, he does not.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, how small and bigoted  
can you get!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Are you running the House,  
or is the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) running  
it?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to  
ask the fair minded hon. gentleman there opposite if he  
approves of the behaviour and the attitude of his colleague? Does  
he have any control over the member for St. John's North  
(Mr. Carter)? We were good enough to grant leave for five  
minutes for the minister to support or respond to the  
petition. Under the rules, as hon. members know, we can  
have another spokesman on this side, but the hon. gentleman said,  
no to leave. Now what is the view of the Government House  
Leader on that?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am nonplussed  
by the complimentary remarks made by the hon. gentleman. I  
am almost in ecstasy. But I can say to the hon. gentleman that  
every member in this House is a member.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) really was not a valid point of order. I must repeat again that leave has not been granted.

MR. NEARY: I know what to do from now on, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Being Private Member's Day, we shall continue with Motion 7. The debate last day was adjourned by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who is not in his seat today, I am assuming somebody will want to carry on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to carry on.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, once again I rise in this hon. House to address the question of offshore oil resources and the necessity for the provincial government to reach a negotiated settlement with Ottawa as far as the development of these resources are concerned. This administration, as hon. members know, won two mandates now on a promise to reach an agreement with Ottawa and yet it has failed to deliver on these promises. Hon. members will recall that in the 1972 provincial general election, it was a one issue election, one issue and one issue only, and that was to -

MR. TOBIN: What year?

MR. NEARY: On April 6, 1982.

MR. TOBIN: You said 1972.

MR. NEARY: No, 1982. The hon. gentleman should listen.

MR. NEARY: It was a one issue election, one issue and one issue only, and that was to get an offshore agreement, Mr. Speaker, and they have failed to deliver on that agreement. If anything, judging by the rhetoric of the Premier and his Minister of Energy on the offshore (Mr. Marshall), we are further away from a settlement now, Mr. Speaker, than ever before. They want Ottawa apparently to completely capitulate and agree with all their pre-conditions and terms and then perhaps they would be willing to sign on the dotted line. And as one of their many infamous propoganda brochures so graphically illustrated recently, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was called writer's cramp.

For so long this administration has told the people of this Province that if they could not get the present Liberal administration in Ottawa to settle on terms acceptable to the administration there opposite, then all the people will have to do is wait for a change of government in Ottawa. They were told to wait until after the next federal election. So sure were they, Mr. Speaker, of the changing of the guard in Ottawa, so sure were they that there would be a new regime in Ottawa that they felt that they would get their day in the sun, as they call it, the Tory way, the sunshine way, that all they would have to do is to just wait for the administration to change in Ottawa. Now it looks, Mr. Speaker, that it was only a false hope and that once more the great balloon of expectations has burst. The new Tory leader, the man who devastated Labrador West while he was President of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, will not deliver the much-coveted ownership of the offshore which the Premier and the Minister of Energy want. Like the present Liberal administration, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mulroney can only do so through a

MR. NEARY: Constitutional amendment which requires the approval of seven of the Canadian provinces and 50 per cent of the population of Canada. Mr. Speaker, even if this were done by either a Liberal or a Tory administration, it would have to be the same for all the coastal provinces also. Mr. Speaker, I believe, unfortunately, central Canada would not approve; that is, either Ontario or Quebec or both.

MR. NEARY:

Given the present state of our relations with Quebec over the hydro issue in Labrador, I do not think that Quebec's support for such a constitutional amendment will be forthcoming, Mr. Speaker, in the very near future. So, Mr. Speaker, what is left for Newfoundland to assume legal ownership of the offshore? This administration tells us that both Ottawa and Newfoundland, under the new Constitution, could enter into a bilateral agreement giving Newfoundland the much sought after ownership. But really, Mr. Speaker, would either a Tory or a Liberal administration in Ottawa be willing to be courageous enough to do this in the wake of two court decisions confirming Ottawa's ownership, to give Newfoundland through the backdoor what it could not achieve through the front doors of the Supreme Court in Newfoundland and in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker? Is that what they expect to happen? The prospect is very unlikely indeed of this ever happening. Mr. Mulroney has already said that he will not do this and thus he has adopted the same position as the present Liberal administration in Ottawa.

So after many stormy seas and winds, Mr. Speaker, the administration there opposite, the ship of state, has arrived back in the same old port and the people of Newfoundland are no longer willing to set sail with this administration again. So what options, Mr. Speaker, are left open to the present administration on the offshore? Formal ownership of the offshore is out of the question. The oil companies and the federal government are now going ahead and planning the development of the offshore. Mobil Oil has awarded a contract to study the possibility of using concrete platforms in the production stage of the development. And again Mobil is now involved in its environmental impact study for the federal government.

MR. NEARY: COGLA has stated that within the next year or so there will be at least ten to twelve rigs working off the Grand Banks. Halifax is now speeding ahead of St. John's as a site for servicing the offshore, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that development is going ahead in spite of the stubborn position of the administration there opposite. Newfoundland workers and firms will still be given first preference in the offshore under the development now being supervised by the federal government, so there is no question of Ottawa's commitment that it will keep the interests of the Newfoundland people uppermost in its mind in this development.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we Liberals, the Liberals in this Province, will not make the same mistake as did the provincial Tories when our forthcoming Leadership Convention is held in Ottawa this June.

MR. PATTERSON: How many Liberals are there in the Province?

MR. MARSHALL: Are you reading that?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not reading, I have a few notes just to remind me of what I want to say.

Mr. Speaker, unlike the Tories, we will demand of every leadership candidate that they come to Newfoundland and state categorically to the people of this Province exactly what they are prepared to offer Newfoundland and Labrador, what they are prepared to offer us, Mr. Speaker, and where they stand on the offshore. Mr. Speaker, that is where the Tories there opposite, and the Tories of this Province who went to the Leadership Convention and saw Mr. Mulroney elected leader, that is where they missed the boat completely.

Mr. Speaker, the next leader of the Liberal Party will become Prime Minister of Canada. And it is very important for us Liberals to get a commitment from the next Prime Minister of Canada, from the leadership candidates, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. NEARY: - to get a firm commitment, whether it be a handshake or whether it be in writing, that we get a firm commitment from all the candidates as to what they will do for Newfoundland, Canada as a whole. But the Tories did not do that when they went to their Leadership Convention, they missed the boat. And, Mr. Speaker, we intend to do that. At some point in time we hope to get all of the leadership candidates in the Province and we will ask them to state their position on certain issues concerning Newfoundland, especially the offshore.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we in the Liberal Party unlike the Tories, we Liberals in this Province, Mr. Speaker, will not trust to some backroom wheeling and dealing among the leading contenders for the leadership, as the Tories did last year.

We not put some mythical hope, Mr. Speaker, in any of our representatives now in Ottawa that they will deliver the goods if we just trust them without any public guarantee that they will deliver.

We want each Liberal candidate to state clearly and in detail where they stand on revenue sharing, Mr. Speaker, where they stand on joint management, and where they stand on an equalization formula for scaling down the equalization payments to this Province once oil is being produced and revenues are accruing from the production of oil. These are the three main issues, Mr. Speaker, that the candidates must address before they get our support.

Let me repeat the three main issues as I see them; revenue sharing, joint management, and a formula for phasing down or phasing out equalization grants to this Province, Mr. Speaker. These are the main issues that must be addressed.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is a veteran and he knows. I quote page 101 of Beauchesne "It is a rule that a Member must address the House orally, and not read from a written, previously prepared speech." Now if the hon. gentleman is uncomfortable in addressing

MR. MARSHALL: this issue-which he is very uncomfortable with - we will permit him, Mr. Speaker, to continue to read his speech if he would like to tell us who wrote it for him.

MR. CARTER: By leave!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!  
To that point of order: The hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) is correct, that is not permitted to read speeches in the House of Assembly, but each hon. member is permitted to use notes, and extensive notes if necessary.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We saw the skinful of hate coming out again. The hon. gentleman cannot stand the heat. He knows, Mr. Speaker, that my speech is very statesmanlike, it is above partisan politics. It is common sense.

MR. BUTT: Who wrote it?

MR. NEARY: If I were the hon. gentleman, I would go out and start learning how to read and write.

MR. STAGG: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

MR. NEARY: No, I will not permit a question, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to be distracted from what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, I am going after big game, and not rabbit tracks from Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: No need to be insulting.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is - in case the hon. gentleman does not understand me - that we will put the interest of our Province above any personal preference for any candidate, at least I will.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) declared, that is the point.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is his right, by the way, he has the right to do that. He may have jumped the gun, but he has a right to do that. Now, Mr. Speaker, personally I intend to put the interest of Newfoundland and Labrador before any personal preference for one of the candidates. And I repeat, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland's interest must come first. I have appealed to Liberals, as hon. gentlemen know, in this Province who may be going to the the convention in Ottawa in June as delegates, to use whatever influence they have to persuade Liberals not to commit themselves too early, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: that we have it in our hands to change the course of history in this Province, and that is what we must keep uppermost in our minds.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, an offshore deal must be signed, in my opinion, and signed soon. Our economy is in the worst shape it has ever experienced since the 1930s. Increasing numbers of our people want work, and they want work more than ever before. But there is no employment to be found. The offshore is one means to help the Newfoundland and Canadian economies out of the doldrums and the mire that we now find ourselves in. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to this administration again to sit down with Ottawa and try to hammer out and negotiate a settlement that is good for both Newfoundland and Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how can hon. gentlemen there opposite say that that is not a fair position for us to take?

DR. COLLINS: It is hot air, though.

MR. NEARY: It is not hot air. Mr. Speaker I have gone public. I cannot help it if factions develop, I can only state that the executive board of the Liberal Party met last weekend and this was our stated position.

MR. WINDSOR: What was that?

MR. NEARY: That we will put the interests of Newfoundland and Labrador before our personal preference for a candidate in the Leadership. In other words, there are those of us who will demand commitments. They do not have to be in writing, they can be oral or a handshake, or they can be in writing, but we want commitments on three things: revenue sharing, a formula for the equalization grants, and a management committee.

MR. SIMMS: That sounds familiar. It sounds like outs.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, they can ridicule it and they can poke fun at it all they want, but the fact of the matter is that it is essential.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I support the amendment, the amendment to the resolution made by my colleague, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), and I hope, as a result of my few remarks this afternoon, that I have persuaded some hon. gentlemen there opposite to be statesmen, to be honest with themselves, forget the 'group think' position they find themselves in, forget the paranoia, and forget the schizophrenia and get up like men, Mr. Speaker, and vote on this resolution according to the dictates of their conscience and not allow themselves to be persuaded by the political rhetoric and game-playing of the Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), the 'group think' attitude that they have on that side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: A new word.

MR. NEARY: It is a new word and I have a definition of it here and I am going to read it tomorrow. I am going to read the definition tomorrow and the hon. gentleman, when I read the definition, will hang his head in shame.

MR. SIMMS: You read it the other day.

MR. NEARY: No, I did not.

Mr. Speaker, so here we have it. Let hon. members get up and vote according to the dictates of their conscience, let them base their decision on the wishes of their constituents and not on the 'group think' attitude that they have, where they all follow along like lapdogs behind their leader, paranoid and schizophrenic. So we will have to wait and see what happens Mr. Speaker. I am going to support the amendment and I am going to vote against the resolution which is nothing but a harangue of political rhetoric and game-playing. I believe

MR. NEARY: the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, are sick and tired of squabbling and fighting and arguing and confrontation politics, they are sick and tired of the Premier not being in this House to debate these issues. He will use any excuse to get out of his office. Not only is he probably the most greedy Premier in our whole history, he is probably one of the laziest in the history of this Province. And excuse will do to have his picture taken, to get out of his office so he will not have to work. What we should be doing is logging the number of days the Premier spends in his office and the number of hours that they spend down on the eighth floor at Cabinet meetings trying to solve the problems of this Province.

DR. COLLINS: Thousands of hours.

MR. NEARY: You will discover, Mr. Speaker, it is not thousands. You have the most greedy and the laziest Premier in the whole history of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: You know, as bad as Mr. Moores was, he delivered and produced more than the present administration, as bad as he was. And God only knows he had the name of a playboy Premier and several other things, but he managed to get a few things done and that is more than you can say about the administration there opposite, Mr. Speaker. Greed and laziness! Any excuse! Now he is gone down to Labrador. He will not meet with the unions, he will not meet with the town councils, he is gone down to address a Tory gathering so he can squirt some more propaganda out, Mr. Speaker, get another broadsides out at somebody.

MR. YOUNG: It is a big gathering - 400 to 500 people.

MR. NEARY: Yes, no doubt it is a big gathering.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment and not the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, if I may, I would like to make a brief comment about something that is not related to the resolution. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would permit me the opportunity of passing along congratulations in particular to the local CBC station here for winning that Actra Award last night, which is the first, by the way, ever for Newfoundland for a production of a film Gilbert in the series The Undaunted. Now you will recall the Leader of the Opposition, of course, did not have much interest in Gilbert last year at all, but he will probably come out now full square and support the CBC and congratulate them and everything on this wonderful series that they produced - which it was, by the way, Mr. Speaker. So I want to congratulate CBC, Tom Cahill in particular was the writer and producer, and Wayne Guzzwell was the director and, of course, local Newfoundland actors and actresses performed in that particular performance. I want to specifically mention the acceptance speech by Mr. Guzzwell on behalf of the CBC here. I thought it was a tremendous speech and I remember his words very vividly, his acceptance words, when he said he held up this Nelly and he mentioned that it was the first ever for Newfoundland. And you could see that he was beaming with excitement and enthusiasm and he said, 'This is for Newfoundland'. And I will tell you it almost brought tears to my eyes just

MR. SIMMS: to see him make that speech. So I want to take the opportunity while I am on my feet, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to express my congratulations to the CBC for winning that Actra Award.

Mr. Speaker, to get to the resolution which was so ably presented by my colleague, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) last week, I want, first of all, to indicate my whole-hearted support for the resolution and address very quickly the amendment put forth by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) last week when he spoke in the debate. The amendment, of course, is unnecessary, totally ridiculous and irrelevant, so therefore it is not even worthy of comment let alone vote. So I will not be supporting the amendment by any stretch of the imagination. I know the member for Mount Scio is absolutely surprised to hear that.

DR. COLLINS: He did not like it either.

MR. SIMMS: In any event, yes, and aside from all of that, I did not like it.

Now I listened very intently to some of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and tried to listen to the arguments that he put forth. And I realize, of course, there are two sides to almost any argument, to any debate, and I grant him his right to put forth that argument. I do not agree with it. He obviously knows that. But throughout the course of his comments there were some points that he made,

MR. SIMMS:                    I tried to make, at least, that I really could not address myself to at all. For example, one of the first things we noticed throughout the course of his remarks was this word 'group think' that he had been throwing in the debate for the last several days.

MR. NEARY:                    I will give you a copy of that.

MR. SIMMS:                    It is obviously a brand new word that he picked up somewhere about five or six days ago, but from the number of times he has used it in this House over the last four or five days, he obviously has beaten it to death. He says he is going to give us the definition -

MR. NEARY:                    You can use it on Nazi Germany, Israel, Bay of Pigs; there are all kinds of places you can use it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):    Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:                    Well, I am sure the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is very familiar with those places and people from those places; he would be an expert on it, I suppose.

                                  You know, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), his tactic is the same as it always is in any debate. When he has no substance to put forth in an argument, what does he do? He attacks members on this side personally, talks about their incompetence or talks about their laziness or whatever the case might be, and specifically, the tactic now, which is a tactic accepted by other members on that side, is to attack the Premier, of course, obviously, the leader of the government, to try to somehow suggest that the Premier is not doing a good job or not working hard and these kinds of things. But I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that this tactic is easily recognizable and well-known by the people around the Province.

MR. SIMMS: He talks about us going out and speaking on behalf of our constituents and talking to our constituents. Well, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that that is one point that has been raised to me frequently by many of my constituents and they recognize very clearly what their objective is, which is to attack personally, and that they lack substance in any of their arguments or debate.

Now, I will try to address some of the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the necessity of obtaining an agreement on the offshore. He talked about ownership. Well, of course, he is very well aware by now that we have agreed to move on the issue of ownership, that is not a major point now in the debate, nor in the argument, nor in the discussions. He says that he and his party - although I am not sure he is supported totally by everybody on the other side when he says this - that they are going to hold back their support for their favourite leadership candidate until they have an opportunity to see where they stand on the issue of the offshore. Well, we had one leadership candidate down here, I think, just last week, Mr. Donald Johnston. He spoke at the university, as I understand it.

DR. COLLINS: He is out.

MR. SIMMS: Yes, I would say he is out by now. He strongly supported Mr. Trudeau's position on the offshore. Now, it will be interesting to see how the rest of them come forth with their positions. I notice the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is wearing John Munro's button. I am not sure what Mr. Munro's position is on the offshore, but he must be satisfied.

MR. TOBIN: How many conventions is that going to be for some people opposite in a twelve month span?

MR. SIMMS: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member is saying, 'I am not going to be side-tracked by rabbits' - is that how it goes? - 'when I am after elephants.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: In any event, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to say that we on this side and certainly I, personally, am awfully disappointed with the recent ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada which ruled that the ownership and control of our resources offshore on the Continental Shelf belong to the federal government, the Government of Canada. I think I am quite free in expressing that disappointment and I hope that it is shared by members on the other side, because, in my own opinion - and I feel very strongly about this regardless of any strict, legal interpretation on the question of ownership - one very important fact remains, in my opinion, and that is that this Province upon entering Confederation in 1949, brought the Grand Banks of Newfoundland into Canada, and if the people of Newfoundland and Labrador at that time had decided not to join Confederation with Canada, then I feel quite certain that

MR. SIMMS:

the federal government would have no legal claim to any of the resources found on this Province's Continental Shelf.

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland and Labrador presently suffers from the highest unemployment, and our standard of living, of course, is somewhat lower than that presently enjoyed by other Canadians, to say the least. And, as my hon. friend's resolution says and correctly points out, we want to reverse this particular situation and achieve a measure of prosperity that is equal to that enjoyed by other Canadians. However, we do not want prosperity that is measured by the amount of federal transfer payments or equalization payments sent our way on a platter by the Government of Canada, we want to base that prosperity on the development of our own natural resources. And if we are to prosper and reach the economic level, Mr. Speaker, where our standard of living is equal to that of other Canadians, then we have to do everything in our power to ensure that our fishery, our forestry, our mining, our hydro and our offshore resources are developed in such a way that the people of this Province can establish a strong economic base right here in Newfoundland and Labrador, and only then, Mr. Speaker, can we pay our own way or be able to make a viable contribution to the Country of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this administration has tried on numerous occasions to reach some type of reasonable agreement which would be acceptable to both this Province and the federal government. We have consistently negotiated in good faith and all members of this hon. House, I believe, know the facts related to those discussions regardless of what some try to claim.

MR. SIMMS: During the last round of negotiations, Mr. Speaker, we did everything we could to reach an equitable agreement but we all know what happened, that the federal side offered by word of mouth they were unable to commit to writing. And I said to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) early in the debate, when I first started my few comments, that I recognize that everybody has the right to express an opinion and that there are always two sides to an argument, but I say to the Leader of the Opposition and to members opposite that it may be true that there are two sides to every question, but it is also true that there are two sides to a sheet of flypaper and it makes a very, very big difference to the fly which side he chooses. I think those are words that the members opposite could carefully consider because we believe that we are on the right side and we shall continue to defend our position in that particular regard. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1983, some fifteen months ago, the President of the Council, the Minister responsible for the offshore (Mr. Marshall), wrote to his federal counterpart, Mr. Chretien, and pointed out that during those discussions there had been considerable progress made. In fact, negotiations had progressed so well that both ministers agreed to refer some of the matters under discussion to their respective negotiating teams. But then, Mr. Speaker, what happened? The bottom dropped out of the negotiations, Mr. Chretien could not deliver in writing what he had agreed to verbally in the meetings that he had with Mr. Marshall. The minister, Mr. Marshall, asked for clarification in writing to some seventeen points, which we have heard lots about, by the way, but what we have not heard and what we have not had emphasized by anybody on that side of the House is the fact that these points had been agreed to verbally by both

MR. SIMMS: ministers. And today, Mr. Speaker, fifteen months later and still counting, Mr. Chretien has not offered anything in reply or response to that letter. Now that, Mr. Speaker, to me is proof of which side was negotiating in good faith and which side has the best interest of Newfoundlanders at heart.

Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1982, the people of this Province gave this government an overwhelming mandate to ensure that the natural resources of this Province be developed so as to provide maximum social and economic benefits for the residents of this Province.

MR. SIMMS: I believe that we have to stand firm in our resolve to obtain those maximum benefits. We must not betray our heritage and our birthright, and we must not betray the mandate given to us by the people of this Province. We must not sacrifice the future of our children and our children's children simply to gain a short-term advantage if, indeed, there is a short-term advantage to be gathered.

The motion that we are debating today makes reference, as well, to the fact that the Prairie Provinces were given control of their natural resources back in 1930. And we all know that Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba were not given control of these resources when they were created as Provinces, but in 1930 the federal government of the day, wishing to establish a country of equal provinces, and also wanting to alleviate some of the economic stress caused by the Great Depression, did, indeed, give the Prairie Provinces control of all their natural resources, and that control of natural resources was then transferred by way of a constitutional amendment.

Well, why, Mr. Speaker, why, may I ask, should it be any different today here in Newfoundland and Labrador? Are we any different as a Province, or any less important a Province than Alberta, Saskatchewan or Manitoba? And I think that any fair-minded Canadian who ask themselves that question, Mr. Speaker, must answer, certainly not! We deserve to be treated in the same fair manner as our sister provinces were back in 1930. Now, we have indicated as a government, Mr. Speaker, that we are willing to put the issue of ownership aside, and also that we are willing to settle for less than complete control, and all we ask is a fair share of the revenues derived from production, and some say in management whereby the interests of our people

MR. SIMMS: can be protected without infringing on national goals.

There has been a lot of talk, Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks and months about who is most capable of managing the offshore, and then, of course, developing the deposits in such a way so that all Newfoundlanders will benefit. Mr. Chretien believes the offshore will be developed with this Province's interests in mind. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say that is easily said and easily promised, but judging by Mr. Chretien's record, I doubt very much if he can ever deliver on that promise.

And all we have to do is look at some other examples of how the Government of Canada have protected the interests of Newfoundlanders in the past. We only have to take a short look at two other great resources, the fishery and our hydroelectric power. And even recently, Mr. Speaker, to give some indication of the commitment of the federal government to this Province in the development of the offshore resources - I recall reading last week where John Roberts is another leadership candidate. It would be good to put the question to him - it has just announced the establishment of an offshore training school, an offshore training centre, but where, Mr. Speaker? In Nova Scotia. In Nova Scotia.

Come By Chance is another perfect example. Both of these are examples of the kind of commitment that the federal government has to this Province with respect to the offshore, I suggest to hon. members. So, Mr. Speaker, that is how the federal government protects the interests of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Few provinces in this country are as rich in natural resources, Mr. Speaker, as Newfoundland and Labrador, but we still remain the poorest province in the country. And if the federal government

MR. SIMMS: does as much for Newfoundland when developing our offshore resources as they did when helping us with our fishery, and our hydro power -

DR. COLLINS: God help us all!

MR. SIMMS: - then all I can say, Mr. Speaker, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) just said, is God help us all!

Now, here we are, Mr. Speaker, in 1984, thirty-five years after Confederation, but even after thirty-five years of Confederation the federal government's attitude toward this Province has changed little, not one iota, and today we once again find ourselves in that all too familiar position of having to fight and struggle and scrape what was given to other provinces as a natural course of history.

There are some among us, Mr. Speaker, who would suggest and advocate the position that we should give in now and sign a deal similar to that

MR. SIMMS:

signed by Nova Scotia. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that would prove to be disastrous. It would be a sellout of our culture and our heritage, and our way of life. And I just refer hon. members briefly to a recent opinion as outlined in the board's report, this federal/provincial board set up by the Province of Nova Scotia and the federal government to assess the social and economic impact of the venture development in Nova for the Province of Nova Scotia and it is a damning indictment on what has happened in Nova Scotia and what the members opposite want us to sign today. They listened to a litany of complaints from all over the Province, this board did, and they said that Mobil's company's construction schedule would prevent most Nova Scotia firms from bidding on the work, that Mobil and both levels of government had exaggerated the projects benefits, that Mobil was withholding crucial information from the public and that the timing of this panel zone review prevented proper public participation. And they say that the most important benefits, Mr. Speaker, from that development are not taxes or royalties or even short-term construction jobs, the crucial thing is that venture should contribute something lasting to Nova Scotia's economy, that it should teach Nova Scotia's workers new skills, and that it should enable Nova Scotian companies to handle new kinds of jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that sounds awfully familiar to me as a position that has long been advocated by this government, and by this Premier, and this side of the House. And the opposite is true of the members opposite. They want us to sign that kind of an agreement, which has been damned by a federal/provincial board made up of a Nova Scotia representative, and a federal government representative.

MR. SIMMS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that we have consistently illustrated that we are determined to maintain some control on all of our resources and then to develop them to provide the most benefit to the people of this Province. But if we are to pay our way and not become entirely dependent upon equalization, we must first ensure that we develop a strong economic base right here in this Province, not develop at any cost, not develop at full speed ahead and repeat the mistakes of the fifties and sixties. I call upon all hon. members in this House to unanimously support this very important resolution. Certainly we must seek an agreement with the Government of Canada, but any agreement reached, as it says in the resolution put forth by my hon. friend, any agreement reached must reflect the principles contained in the Province's latest proposal of January, 1983.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is determined to reach a fair and equitable agreement. And I suggest to hon. members in closing that they remember the words of Emerson the poet when he said, "Whatever you do you need courage. Whatever course you decide upon there is always someone to tell you that you are wrong. There are always difficulties arising which tempt you to believe your critics are right. To map out a course of action and follow it requires some of the same courage which a soldier needs. Peace has its victories but it takes brave men to win them." Mr. Speaker, I quote, to conclude, from a well-known newspaper columnist, a former Leader of the Newfoundland Liberal Party in this Province, who just three weeks ago concluded his column of that day and said to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, "Yes, ladies and gentlemen, Peckford and Marshall are right." And I agree.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

The hon. the member for

Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, there is another poet who wrote, "Two roads diverged in a yellow wood, and I/ Took the one less travelled by,/ And that has made all the difference." And, Mr. Speaker, that is the road that was taken by our Premier.

MR. BARRY:

It is a dead-end road too.

MR. CALLAN:

It was less travelled by certainly, but it was the road that was taken by our Premier when he brought the offshore case into the courts, firstly into the Newfoundland Court, and then, of course, subsequently into the Federal Court, the Ottawa Court,

MR. CALLAN: and on both counts, Mr. Speaker, the Premier lost.

In speaking to this motion before us today, Mr. Speaker, and the amendment made by my colleague for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) last week, let us look at what it says and let us see what difference there is between this side of the House and the other side. The member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) says " WHEREAS the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that the ownership and control of Mineral resources on our Continental Shelf belongs to the Government of Canada". There is no question about that - about the opening statement in the motion by the member for St. Mary's-The Capes - there is no question about that - thanks to the Premier.

The Premier, Mr. Speaker, in 1982 went to the people of this Province with evangelical type speeches across this Province bluffing the people, telling the people how strong a case we had. There was no question that we would win our case. 'We have all of the documented evidence', he said. If we cannot get a fair deal from successive ministers in Ottawa then we have no choice only to put our case in the courts. But we will win.' This was the big lie that the premier perpetrated on the people of this Province in 1982 in the high school in Norman's Cove and all over the Province "We would not be going to court if we did not have a strong case. We will win it, and, of course, once we prove it is ours then it will be a lot easier for us to negotiate with those bad boys in Ottawa." Even then, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Premier knew that we did not have a good case, but he wanted to use it as an election platform.

MR. CALLAN:

it, swallowed it up because the issue, of course, was motherhood. It was based on emotion, yourself in the flag, on gathering around the Premier, Newfoundlanders fighting this bad, outside enemy, Ottawa, that was trying to take our birthright from us. So there is no question, Mr. Speaker, about the opening statement made by the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) in his motion that the Continental Shelf belongs to the Government of Canada.

He says secondly, "WHEREAS Newfoundland's high unemployment rate, a high rate of taxation and a comparatively low level of services"- we have all three of these for sure, Mr. Speaker. The member for St. Mary's-The Cape of the lack of control which the Province exercises over its resources" Mr. Speaker, that may be partly over some of our resources.

We heard the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) addressing a group downtown a month ago and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands praised some of the ministers in Ottawa. And he was kind of suggesting to me that he did not have any trouble negotiating with ministers in Ottawa.

MR. CALLAN: Perhaps the ministers from this Province who had difficulty, it was not because Ottawa was all bad. Perhaps it is because the ministers in this Province are not all good, perhaps they are bad as well.

Mr. Speaker, we saw some changes in Ottawa. We saw two different ministers who tried to negotiate with the present minister responsible for the offshore (Mr. Marshall). Is it possible that these two ministers were wrong and this minister right? Is it possible that everybody in Canada is wrong, everybody else is wrong and the minister is right? Not very likely, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier talks about how his government has a good record for negotiating. And, of course, he points to ERCO and the renegotiation of the ERCO contract. But the Premier must have difficulty spouting out that kind of trash, Mr. Speaker, because he knows that it was the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), who now sits on this side of the Legislature, it was he, as minister, who negotiated that contract, and, of course, it is he, the same member, Mr. Speaker, who now sits on this side of the Legislature. It was he who could have made a deal with Ottawa, but it was he who was forced to resign his ministry because he did not like the way that the Premier wanted things done; his way or nobody's way is the way the Premier has got it, Mr. Speaker.

So, in the second 'Whereas' of this resolution, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) talks about the lack of control that the Province exercises over its resources, which is not true, of course. We do have some control, and what a

MR. CALLAN: mess we have made of these controls, Mr. Speaker.

In the third 'Whereas', the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) says, 'WHEREAS all Newfoundlanders' - I guess he means "and Labradorians" as well - 'WHEREAS all Newfoundlanders want to achieve a measure of prosperity that is based not on federal transfer payments, but on the development of our own natural resources' - that is his third 'Whereas'. Is there anybody on this side of the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, who disagrees with that? No, Mr. Speaker, we all agree. We all agree that our resources should be developed so that we can get rid of the transfer payments, or the welfare payments as they are sometimes referred to, from Ottawa. There is no disagreement with that from us on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. The only disagreement that we have, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to the way that negotiations should be conducted. That is the only disagreement.

The fourth 'Whereas':

'WHEREAS the Government of Canada in 1930 consented to and obtained an amendment to the Constitution of Canada providing the Prairie Provinces with the rights to their resources which had the effect of ensuring for each province, not only economic stability but also substantial growth and prosperity' - well, that is a fact, we cannot deny that - 'and WHEREAS an agreement with the Government of Canada governing the management and development of our offshore resources must be based on fairness' - we agree - 'must be based on fairness and equity and accommodate our goals relating to employment' - no

MR. CALLAN:

disagreement from this side, Mr. Speaker, on that. We agree with all of that - 'relating to employment, industrial development, the establishment of safeguards against the negative effects of oil and gas'. - I guess, you know, an upheaval in our social fabric is what is referred to there. We agree with all of that, no disagreement - 'to receive a fair share of related revenues'. We agree, Mr. Speaker, we agree with all of that.

MR. WINDSOR:

What do you disagree with?

MR. CALLAN:

We disagree with the way that negotiations were taking place. And, of course, now, here and now on this day, we disagree with the fact that there are no negotiations taking place and apparently no efforts. Of course, over the weekend we saw another spectacle which the Premier tried to cover up after by saying, 'No, I did not say that negotiations had broken off with Quebec. I did not say that.' Well, are negotiations ongoing with Quebec? Of course they are not. What the Premier is doing with Quebec, Mr. Speaker, is the same thing he is doing with Ottawa. He is hoping and waiting for a change of government in Ottawa and then, of course, hoping that, number one, he can sign a deal with a new Tory Prime Minister regarding our offshore resources and he can also get Mr. Mulroney to talk to Quebec and persuade that government. I assume that is what he is waiting for, If not, what else? But in both instances, Mr. Speaker, in both cases, the Premier is so wrong! He is playing this waiting game. Well, what are you waiting for? Even if the new Prime Minister is Brian Mulroney - then we will have two Brians, one federal and one provincial; and, of course, a third in the man who destroyed our seal fishery, so we will have three Brians - but even if we do get a second Brian in Ottawa, is he a good friend of this Province? Recent statements over the last week or so have not indicated that.

MR. CALLAN: The Leader of the Tory Party in Ottawa, Mr. Mulroney, apparently is rather wishy-washy on any stand regarding any matter.

MR. CARTER: A lot you know.

MR. CALLAN: I read the papers and I listen to the television and the radio, I know what I hear and what I read and what I see.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier is going to be wrong because even if he get Brian Mulroney as Prime Minister in Ottawa there is still no guarantee. Of course, we know the kind of tactics the Premier will use, He will go up to Ottawa and he will sign his deal and then he will come back and call another election and talk about the wonderful deal that he has. It could be a deal worse than the one he was offered by Jean Chretien. Who will know the difference? We will know after the election is over, after the Premier has spent three weeks travelling around this Province giving us the highlights, the good parts, but it will be after the election is over that we will find out the bad things like some of the bad things that are coming out now about MacPeck and so on. It will be long after the election is over.

So, Mr. Speaker, our stand on this side of the House is this, and this was the amendment made to the motion by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) last week: Forget these preconditions, forget them. How can you go and sit down at a negotiating table with preconditions?

MR. CARTER: Give it all away. Give it all away.

MR. CALLAN: No, nonsense.

MR. CARTER: Give it all away.

MR. CALLAN: Nobody ever gave anything away. That is nonsense. There is no such thing as a free lunch let alone anything else. Forget the preconditions,

MR. CALLAN: Let us sit down and hammer out an agreement through hard negotiating, even if it takes a couple or three or four months it is better than sitting in this Province doing absolutely nothing only buying time, waiting. I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that at least half of the 64 per cent who voted for the Premier in 1982 have realized their grave mistake. Thirty per cent or 35 percent do not realize and will not realize their mistake because they are dyed-in-the-wool Tory, they are anti-Confederate, they will never change their vote anymore than the 35 per cent hard-core Liberals will change theirs. If you look at every election result dating back to 1949, even when the Liberals formed huge majority governments, there was still that base of Tory support. And even, Mr. Speaker, in the last election in 1982 when the Premier elected 44 members to the Legislature, 44 to 8 on this side, even then it was not representative of the popular vote across the Province. The Premier got 64 per cent, the Liberals got 35 per cent, but even then, even in the big upheaval in 1982 you still had that same base of support across the Province. Well, thank God, Mr. Speaker, that the people in 1982 who voted with their hearts instead of with their heads, who voted with their emotions rather than thinking through the matter and asking themselves several fundamental questions about what the Premier was up to out in the district of Bellevue making empty promises, talking about the money that Bas had in his pocket for a new clinic at Markland adjacent to the hospital and all of that, the rhetoric, thank God that at least half of that 64 per cent that went head over heels for the Premier in 1982, at least half, have now started and a lot of them have gone a long way, to seeing the light, Mr. Speaker. Thank God for that.

MR. CALLAN: Because, Mr. Speaker, the Premier I believe is basing his future and the future of this Province on the wrong premise, on the premise that a new Tory government will be elected in Ottawa in a year or less. But unless the new Tory leader takes a stand on some fundamental issues that affect this country, then he will be swallowed up not only in the leadership of the federal Liberals, the leadership euphoria, but also the election euphoria that will follow because, Mr. Speaker, across Canada people are beginning to realize that all of the problems of the last three or four years have not been all Trudeau's fault as some people, like John Crosbie, have tried to convince Canadians. Some of the problems have to do with

MR. CALLAN:

economy, a lot of the problems. They experienced the same problems down in the United States where they have a Tory President, President Reagan. And they experienced some of the same problems over in Great Britain where they have a Tory Prime Minister. What is her nickname? - the iron lady.

MR. NEARY:

The iron lady.

MR. CALLAN:

The iron lady, Mrs. Thatcher.

People are beginning to realize that you cannot have the individual provinces saying, like this Province here, for example, "Well, you know, the reason we are in such a bad mess is because of the world economic depression." You cannot have seven Tory provinces across the country saying that and pointing and blaming everything on Ottawa. I mean, does not the Premier and the administration of this Province have any responsibility for creating employment?

MR. NEARY:

No, they do not think they have.

MR. CALLAN:

And in Ontario, and Alberta and New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and PEI, where they have all of these Tory provincial governments, do they have any responsibility for trying to settle the problems of their individual provinces? And if all the premiers across the provinces were doing well in their provinces, then, of course, Mr. Speaker, it is only sensible to assume that the country will be in good shape since it is made up of ten provinces, and the Northwest Territories, and the Yukon.

MR. CARTER:

Your time is up.

MR. CALLAN:

My time will soon be up and the member can have his flick at it. But, Mr. Speaker, that is our stand and that was the amendment made by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) last week, the same gentleman

MR. CALLAN: who negotiated the ERCO contract, the same gentleman who would have had a negotiated deal for this Province if it was not for the Premier, the same Premier who sat across in another hotel in Montreal -

MR. NEARY: With his binoculars.

MR. CALLAN: - with his binoculars. I heard the hon. Jean Chretien on radio this morning as I was on the way to the Colonial Building.

MR. NEARY: What did he do? Did he win the vote?

MR. CALLAN: I just heard about five or ten minutes of it. A lady phoned in to ask who walked away from the negotiating table? Is it true what Mr. Marshall has been telling us in this Province? And of course Jean Chretien denied it. He outlined what happened.

MR. CARTER: And you believe him, I suppose.

MR. CALLAN: The only two things that the hon. Jean Chretien and the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) have in common is they think that the refinery is trash, And, of course, in a letter to the editor today a gentleman condemned the member for St. John's North for calling the refinery trash.

MR. CARTER: But he agreed with me.

MR. CALLAN: And not only that, Mr. Speaker, but I just came from a meeting downstairs with the Department of Health officials, the minister, and the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), and there was a gentleman who attended that meeting who worked at the refinery right up until 1980. The member for St. John's North says that he visited the refinery in 1977, was given a tour. The member was never down there.

April 4, 1984

Tape No. 685

NM - 3

MR. CARTER:

Oh, yes I was.

MR. CALLAN:

tour.

The member was never given a

MR. CARTER:

around.

Homer White took me

MR. CALLAN:

Homer White. Mr. Speaker, that is the only thing that they have in common. But anyway we are talking about something that is gone and finished, the Come By Chance refinery.

He is a singer, is he not?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

gentleman's time has expired.

Order, please! The hon.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say a few words on this resolution which really reaffirms the policies and objectives of this government. It does much more than that; it reaffirms our commitment to the emancipation of our people. And as we look back on 400 years of history, there was at times a fair amount of inhuman oppression of these people.

The future always depends on the past, because without its guidelines we cannot set a course. And to briefly review the history of this Province over 400 years, its colonization at first was against the rules and regulations of the British Empire, yet there were gallant men and women who crossed the Atlantic and settled in its isolated coves because they wanted to attain for themselves and for their families a place in the affluence of the New World.

There were times they were deprived of medicine, of justice, of social services and even of nutrition, and the legacy of these days has persisted until just a few short years ago. As a result of their malnutrition they suffered from the deficiency diseases of scurvy and beriberi. Because of inadequate nutrition they also suffered from the terrible disease of tuberculosis. They had experienced the terrible tragedies of the other physical maladies that let them die in agony for over weeks on end.

You can go on to justice: They were rarely able to secure justice when all human beings would like to have some say on whether what they had done was right or wrong.

Education: Because of the lack of education they were unable to compete outside

DR. TWOMEY:                    their own communities, they were unable to learn about the world as it existed, and they were unable to get the pleasure out of the master-pieces of literature. In fact, many times they were unable to assemble a piece of mechanical equipment because they could not follow the directions that came with that piece of equipment.

                                 They also suffered from the deprivation of the banking system. They were spancellor to trade and commerce. In other words, they were vassals of some of the merchants. It happened in my day and it happened to me personally, where I had to write a medical script for some old, old patient to get a pound of butter from the merchant because this was not permitted in the barter system. I have seen men who wanted to buy trousers and could not do so because that trousers was only supplied by a merchant whom he did not sell his fish to.

                                 But despite all these things the Province seemed to produce a

DR. TWOMEY:

breed of men and women who were survivors. And among them they produced some very unusual people who, in that time, received world recognition. I can think of Miss Stirling, the opera singer, Captain Bartlett, the navigator and Arctic explorer, and, 'even early in our recent Confederation, Senator Forsey, who is an expert on our Canadian Constitution. It contributed its men to both wars, who fought for democracy, who fought for a principle, who fought for an ideal. And I presume the main attraction of these human beings as they went to the other side of the world, was to support their Empire; but in so supporting their Empire, they had dreams that maybe their part of the New World would become a little bit more prosperous, a little bit more livable, that it would offer something for the future, Their lives were constrained by geography and all the other factors I have mentioned. They have died, they earned their honours, and we have monuments of stone to their memory.

Coming on to the more recent years, we have learned again from history. We have learned of very bad arrangements made, of agreements signed, possibly because of our lack of looking into the future. We did not have the crystal ball and maybe we lacked a certain amount of international, worldly opinion and ideas. Because we have lost our offshore, that is definite, never to be redeemed, I believe; we lost our Churchill Falls power. It will not be ours for sixty-odd years hence. We have lost other things: We have lost a certain degree of security in our new Confederation. It started off well. It started off with a certain degree of enchantment because it would enhance our personal lives

DR. TWOMEY: and our standard of living. Yes, it did it at the beginning. We have been able to open up the Province. We have achieved a reasonable degree of education, health services, justice, transportation. But then, everything seemed to stop again. It stopped because of some change in Ottawa. They probably felt that we had emerged too quickly; they probably felt that 'maybe these people should be kept subdued for a long, long time to come'. We have received verbally and in a most practical way, some very unkind treatment from the present government in Ottawa. I have been amazed that a minister of the federal government would go to Corner Brook and act as a type of an agent provocateur, where he suggested that the Fisheries College could go over there. He raised the expectations of the people, he caused discontent and he caused expense to that community and to the West Coast.

Over the years we were left dangling here in the capital city as to whether we would get our synchrolift. We never knew because we had to depend on the good graces of Ottawa. We had to depend on them in every other way, that humanity would really suppress some of the very unusual laws that we have been subjected to over the past years. I would not call it gentlemanly genocide but certainly there has been suppression of our race. There have been greater ones, but only a few by comparison, a certain tyrant who is still alive and fighting, I believe? his name is Pol Pot, unleashed total genocide.

But it can be done otherwise.

DR. TWOMEY:

It can be done legally under the umbrella of law, under the umbrella of interpretation of laws, under the umbrella of national patriotism. I think that a sum is as good and as important as the whole, and that is why I feel Newfoundland could play an equal part in this Confederation of ours.

In our effort to secure by negotiations a part in the offshore activity, we have come down from total ownership down to the third step. How far more are we going to go? Are we going to prostitute ourselves? When I talk of ourselves, I speak about our Province. It is our duty as a government, it is our duty as people, it is our duty as voters to look and become provincially nationalistic, because if we cannot do that we cannot hope to take our place in this great Confederation.

In arguing for the present I think that the Premier and his ministers have done an admirable job. They are really trying to do what the predecessors of Lougheed had done for Alberta, of Devine for Saskatchewan of Pawley for Manitoba and of Davis for Ontario. I do not think that these aims and ambitions should be frowned upon. We should not be considered overambitious. And if we are not supported, if the whole Province does not support this concept, I feel that we as a Province and we as a people will always be the undertrodden people of Canada.

I felt at times a little uncomfortable when it has been said from the other side, when we have been reminded of our dependency, that half of our income comes from the federal government. Half our salary comes from the federal government, half our social insurance

DR. TWOMEY: comes from the federal government. And to be reminded every day that you are a serf, that you have no rights and privileges, that you are spancellor by the laws and interpretation of these laws by the federal government.

I would feel proud of any government in this Province which could not alone raise the expectations of our people but bring us up to a standard that would make us at least equal to all Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY: If we do not, I can only think of a poem that would express what all Newfoundlanders can look forward to, the poem by Housman. I will recite a verse that might be appropriate at this time; 'Now hollow fires burn out to black,/And lights are flickering low:/ Square your shoulders, lift your pack,/And leave your friends and go./Oh never fear, lads, nought's to dread,/ Look not left nor right:/ For all the endless roads you tread/ There is nothing but the night./'

And before I sit down, if there were any message, one single message I could give to this House it is the message of a man, whom I greatly admired and he said that history has proven that those who can inflict the most always are not victorious, but those who can preserve the most will reach final victory.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, ~~Mr.~~ Speaker. The House has just paid a very rare tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Exploits (Mr. Twomey). I do not mean the desk thumping, the seal-like flapping of flippers which hon. gentlemen opposite do - that is just a form of whistling as they walk pass the graveyard - but it has done him the very rare tribute of listening to what he had to say with undivided attention. I think that was merited. I think the hon. gentleman was speaking from the heart, he was speaking from his head, he had thought through what he wanted to say and he spoke not only with sincerity but with eloquence. I do not doubt for one moment that he believes every word of what he said. I know the hon. gentleman well, I have seen him in this House on many occasions, I have seen him outside the House, in fact, a number of years ago, when I was the Minister of Health, he worked for me, in that he was the Senior Medical Officer in Botwood at the cottage hospital - a very good Senior Medical Officer then and I suppose now, As far as I know he is still the Senior Medical Officer in the hospital. In fact, we even amended the Legislative Disabilities Act to allow the hon. gentleman to take his seat here, a seat to which he was elected by the people of the district of Exploits, and to carry on at the same time his work at the hospital, and fair enough.

The only word I can find is pathetic - not the hon. gentleman, he is not pathetic, no. But I find the speech pathetic because he did believe it. And perhaps that sums up the gist of what we are talking about in this resolution. Now the resolution itself, which my friend the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) moved, is utterly unobjectionable.

MR. ROBERTS: We have moved an amendment and we are now speaking, as I understand it, on the amendment and the amendment is utterly unobjectionable. In neither case will the vote reflect the merits of either the amendment or the motion. We are going to vote in favour of the amendment and I venture to predict that hon. gentlemen opposite will vote to a man and to a woman against it.

MR. WARREN: I do not think they will today.

MR. ROBERTS: And we are going to vote, as we agreed in caucus, against the motion to a man, and, if we had been fortunate enough to have a woman among our ranks, I would hope to a man and to a woman against it.

That is the trouble with this whole debate on the offshore, Mr. Speaker. It has gone beyond reason into the sort of pathetic, bathetic - that is beginning with a 'p' and a 'b' - sentiments and beliefs and feelings which the hon. gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) exemplifies. What we have here is a political dispute between the two orders of government in Canada. We live in a federation, we have a political dispute. The present Premier, for partisan purposes - which are not sins, but let them be revealed for what they are - has chosen, deliberately and with a considerable degree of skill, to manipulate this into the issue he used to win a general election, the issue which in all likelihood will defeat him in another election, but he used it with considerable skill to win a general election two years ago almost to the day. Many gentlemen opposite benefitted from that. They would never have seen the inside of this House from the floor of this House had it not been for the Premier's skill. They came in on coattails, Sir, and they will go out on coattails. I saw that happen with one other

MR. ROBERTS: Premier in Newfoundland who, with equal skill in 1966, developed a general election campaign and elected thirty-nine of forty-two members. We would have had the fortieth with a little more scrutinity. The only two who survived were down in the East end of St. John's. The hon. member, as he then was, from St. John's East, he now represents Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) : has migrated around and represented Waterford - Kenmount, St. Mary's - The Capes and Cambridge since then in equal parts, the only member of the House who has ever sat overseas, our overseas territory, much as St. Pierre and Miquelon, are overseas territories of France. There were three; from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) and, of course, the gentleman from St. John's Centre, Mr. Ank Murphy, who on his sixty-fifth birthday took his retirement from public life and is, I understand, in the

MR. ROBERTS:

best of health and may he long continue to be so. What has happened is simply that the Premier, as part of his build-up to the election, chose to ignore the legal advice he had been given and forced into the Court of Appeal of Newfoundland on a reference, using a power granted to all the Premiers we have had for years by this House in the Judicature Act, to make a reference, and he did it only for political purposes, it was part of a build-up.

MR. CARTER:

That is unfair.

MR. ROBERTS:

It is unfair to the people of Newfoundland, I say to my hon. friend for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), it is also true. It is perfectly true. It is part of the great partisan build-up. I remember watching the press conference where he announced the reference. I thought for sure he was announcing a dissolution, but, no, instead he was at stage one of the campaign. And, of course, he was hoisted on his own petard when the judges of the Court of Appeal gave their opinion. And we are not here to debate the merits of it, although it is perfectly proper to debate the merits of it, but they gave their opinion; they heard argument, they considered the case, they delivered written reasons for judgement with unanimity.

Shortly thereafter, after the reference, before the decision had been rendered by the judges of the Newfoundland Court Appeal, the Government of Canada, for their own reasons which they stated at the time, using the power they have referred the matter to the Supreme Court of Canada, which in turn heard argument. Seven judges heard it. The late Chief Justice Laskin heard it but took no part in the decision because illness overtook him. And what a loss to Canada, including Newfoundland, Bora Laskin's death is, what a loss! But on that matter,



MR. ROBERTS: three mile limit. And I may add that the three mile limit question was decided by the Queen and Keyn in 1878, a century or more ago, in England. It is still a good law. It was cited in the British Columbia case and, if I recall correctly, cited in the Newfoundland reference, the one decided very recently. It was certainly cited in our Court of Appeal reference. We have no right and we have no ownership rights. The ownership rights are vested in Canada. Whether hon. gentlemen like it or not, it is the law. And by putting it in the court all that the Premier achieved, other than winning a general election - and that was clever; a clear

MR. ROBERTS:

case of a man satisfying the interests of the Province for partisan considerations - but other than winning a general election the Premier achieved one result only by his deliberate, coldly reasoned decision, and that was to confirm the Newfoundland position, which is that we have no legal rights. The Premier did that and it will go down in history. The Premier, I understand, is terrified of signing any agreement with anybody because he fears that there may happen to him what happened to Joe Smallwood. Joe Smallwood never signed the Churchill agreement but certainly it was his administration that gave, through this House, the rights to the Churchill. It turned out to be a hideously bad deal, although nobody at the time, Mr. Speaker, John Crosbie or anybody else, nobody at the time said anything other than hallelujah when the Churchill deal was put into place, including, I venture to say, my friend from St. John's South (Dr. Collins), if he were even conscious of public affairs in those days as he allegedly is today.

Nobody, Mr. Speaker, said the Churchill deal was a bad deal, all said hosanna and hallelujah. It turned out, with the benefit of some hindsight, to be a hideously bad deal for this Province, and that is why we on this side have supported the efforts of this administration and will continue to support them to try to remedy that.

DR. COLLINS:

You should take your share of the blame.

MR. ROBERTS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier's problem, of course, is that he is pathologically insecure and afraid to sign a deal with Ottawa for fear that someone down the road will criticize him. Well, that is the Premier's

MR. ROBERTS: problem. It is only when he makes it the Province's problem that I become concerned. And by forcing the matter into court that is what he has done. And today we are at the place where we either have to negotiate or we hope - the other hope the Premier had-that there would be a Progressive Conservative government in Canada, Brian Mulroney would be the Prime Minister, and all would be well. And, of course, that hope was exploded a week or so ago when Mr. Mulroney made his statement. The Premier now is left with nothing. That is where the man has brought us on the offshore.

MR. DINN: And that is your fault.

MR. ROBERTS: That is my fault, is it, that the Premier has nothing? My friend the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) says it is my fault. I was called a traitor in this House for daring to advocate that the government set aside ownership and try to negotiate a deal on jurisdiction. Oh, no! That was treasonous. What is it? "Treason doth never prosper; what's the reason? /For if it prosper, none dare call it treason." It is not treason now because the government have come to this, but too late. They have come to that position only after the Premier, by his callous, cold, partisan, uncaring decision, uncaring for the future of this Province, the Premier has sacrificed all in an effort to win a general election, and then carried on. He had taken the fatal decision and had to carry on. He had done his deal just as Faust did with the devil. Faust sold his soul to the devil. The Premier sold his soul and sold Newfoundland's soul on this matter to win an election, and that is why we are here today.

Now there is only one course of action and that is to negotiate. Negotiation does not mean signing a deal. If we cannot get a deal that the administration

MR. ROBERTS: feel they can accept, then they should not sign it. But, I tell you, we will never get a deal the way we are going now. All we are doing now is heading into a blind wall. We are hitting ourselves on the head with the hammer. We are just carrying on. The only justification for it is masochism. But where it is coming out, Mr. Speaker, and this is what concerns me far more even than the offshore question, is it is coming out in an anti-Confederate form. And that is the next step. I believe that the next step, and the hon. gentleman from Exploits (Dr. Twomey) exemplified it, this feeling that somehow Ottawa is a foreign enemy. The Government of Canada is as much the Government of Newfoundland as is the Government of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick or Quebec or Saskatchewan or British Columbia or anywhere else. And, Mr. Speaker, unless we negotiate there is no way out. We were hoping for a PC win, that may or may not happen. Watch the Gallup and watch what happens and we will see. But we put all our hopes in that. And then Mr. Mulroney says, "But the law is the law. I, Brian Mulroney, even as Premier of Canada cannot give it away." An amendment to the Constitution will take fifty and seven.

The Premier thinks Section 43 will apply. He has not any legal advice that he can produce, he has had an oral conversation, a verbal briefing. That is not what the advice, as I understand it, say. If the Premier will bring it in we will debate that. But that is where he has brought us.

Brian Mulroney has closed the door, the courts have slammed the door, and now we either negotiate or we go nowhere.

MR. ROBERTS: And that is why I would be prepared to support this resolution were it not for the fact that it has been turned by hon. gentleman opposite - and I do not think my friend from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) meant it to be; I think he is acting in good faith and in his honest beliefs and I respect him for both of those - it has been turned into yet another attack yet another attempt to prop up the sagging political fortunes of the Peckford administration. They put it all on the dice and they have lost. They have sacrificed everything for the general election in April 1982 and now it is coming back to haunt them. They have sown the seeds of their own destruction, and they all know it. That is why they are so vicious in the House, that is why they are so nasty, that is why we are getting these not just these anti-Trudeau or anti-Liberal attacks - who cares? that is politics - we are getting attacks that go to the very fundamental basis of Confederation. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) went down - was it to the Board of Trade of the Northwest Rotary Club? - and made a speech that if Major Peter Cashin were alive it would have warmed the cockles of his heart, an anti-Confederate speech, a speech calling into question not the basis of a particular policy but a speech which was anti-Confederate, a speech which said we should not be a part of Canada. And that is the next step, it is being built up whether they know it or not. What we are seeing today in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what we saw in Quebec in the early 1960s. There the separatists were a crackpot fringe, just as my dear friend, Charlie Devine, politically is the crackpot fringe. The thing has exploded in the air, but those who followed behind are not the crackpots. I do not know who will be their Rene Levesque. Somebody will be. It will not be my

MR. ROBERTS: friend from St. John's South (Dr. Collins); he has neither the mental nor the moral nor the intellectual capability to do that, but there will be a Rene Levesque. He will come. It will not be the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter). He has not the stature other than physical; he has the physical stature but he has no other stature to do it. But somewhere in this Province there is such a man or a woman, and that is the next step. Because this government, having put itself in the trap, having sold its soul to win the election, can now see no way out. Well, there is a way out, Mr. Speaker, and that way out is this, that way out is simply to negotiate without pre-conditions. You do not have to sign. The hon. the member for Exploits (Mr. Twomey) quoted - I believe it was Churchill but I could be wrong - but he quoted an eloquent poem and an eloquent statement.

Let me close, because my time I think has come to its end now, let me close by quoting John Kennedy's inaugural address, "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate." And if the Premier and the administration want to know the way out of this there is their answer: "Let us never negotiate out of fear, but let us never fear to negotiate."

Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the amendment gladly; if it is defeated I shall vote against the resolution equally gladly. Sir, thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I sent my colleague to the Editor of Debates a few moments ago to see if we could get the statement made by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter). I thought it would be ready by the time I got up to raise my point of order, but the Editor of Debates said now it may not be ready until tomorrow morning. But Your Honour I believe heard the very unparliamentary statements that were made by the member for St. John's North. And I do not want to cut into the hon. gentleman's time, by the way, in closing the debate, but I believe this is a very important matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will just make a comment on that, because it is 5:40 p.m. I did hear remarks, the words 'six party hacks'. I heard the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) ask a question of some hon. member, if he thought the Supreme Court judges were six party hacks. I did not hear an affirmative answer but I would like to see Hansard tomorrow on that point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: I will give you the answer, Mr. Speaker, because I heard it clearly. It was the member for St. John's North and he said, 'Yes', no question about that.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I did not hear an answer but I will see what is recorded in Hansard.

MR. NEARY: I am glad Your Honour interrupted me. I do not want

MR. NEARY: to cut into the hon. gentleman's time -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, stop the clock if need be.

MR. NEARY: - but I do not want to sit on my rights either, so we can deal with it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Well, the point of order has been raised and I will reserve ruling on it.

MR. NEARY: Okay, thank you very much,

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

I must say I am honoured to conclude debate on this resolution, a resolution which has seen a very high level of debate from both sides, some excellent points made from both sides, perhaps one of the best, if not the best debated resolution that I have heard debated in my short term in the House.

A few points brought up by the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) -

MR. ROBERTS: Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. HEARN: - Strait of Belle Isle, I am sorry. I usually hear him referred to as 'the stranger from the Straits'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: He quoted, in closing, Churchill, when he said, 'Let us never negotiate out of fear -

MR. ROBERTS: Kennedy.

MR. HEARN: - Kennedy, I am sorry - Kennedy: 'Let us never negotiate out of fear but let us never fear to negotiate.' I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should never negotiate out of fear but neither should we negotiate

MR. HEARN: for the sake of just negotiating to look good.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: We must have some kind of position in mind. We must know for what we are negotiating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: I think a close examination of the resolution, as put on the Order Paper by myself, will show that there is nothing spelled out there that says there are conditions to our negotiating. What we are saying is that we must obtain a fair deal for Newfoundland, and all the hon. gentlemen from both sides of the House who have spoken. have agreed with that. So I do not see why there is any dispute.

The amendment moved by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) basically says BE IT ALSO RESOLVED that the above not be considered as pre-conditions - these are not, I submit, Mr. Speaker, pre-conditions to negotiations, they are positions, a position, a path towards obtaining for Newfoundland a fair and equitable settlement as it relates to the offshore.

We heard a fair amount of poetry quoted this afternoon. We have some extremely intelligent members, apparently, on both sides.

MR. HEARN: The member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) quoted a poem by Robert Frost, "The Road Not Taken," and he stated, "Two roads diverged in a wood, and I - /took the one less travelled by, / And that has made all the difference."

He was sort of intimating that the Government of Newfoundland took the less travelled by road and that has made all the difference. Yes, perhaps it has, but what difference are we talking about? The road less travelled by does not necessarily mean the wrong road. Sometimes the road less travelled by is the hard road, the road which may not be expediently popular but which may be the road that leads to successful resolution. If we want to talk about poetry we can go back to a poem called, "The Cow Path" and he talks about a young calf that wanders off and follows zigzag trail, and the next people who follow the calf follow the same trail, and gradually the trail becomes a road and then a highway and it ends up in a zigzag course. The Government of Newfoundland is not on such a zigzag course. It is on a direct path to obtaining a beneficial resolution for the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: Today on my way in from my district I was listening to Mr. Chretien as he was speaking on open line. He mentioned a couple of things that are of interest to this resolution. One was the fact that an agreement had been reached, an agreement between himself and the Minister of Energy for the Newfoundland Government, Mr. Marshall. We have already been told, 'Yes, these gentlemen did reach a negotiated settlement. Yes, they did verbally.' Nobody has denied that. The Minister of Energy has stood in the House and said, 'Yes, we had an agreement.' Mr. Chretien

MR. HEARN: is saying the same thing. What he has failed to say, however, is that the same agreement was put in writing and then the Minister of Energy for Newfoundland (Mr. Marshall) refused to sign it. He did not say that same agreement was put in writing because it was not. We realize that the negotiated agreement that these two gentlemen reached was never put in writing and consequently what was put in writing could not be agreed to.

We also heard him mention Come By Chance, which is of extreme importance to the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). We heard Mr. Chretien refer to it as a rusted, run-down, refinery. If that is the case and if it is the truth, then I suppose we have no reason to complain about it being dismantled. If that is not the case - and even though I was there at the opening of the refinery, the official opening, today I am not in any position, and I do not know whether anybody here is, to say that it is not a rusted, run-down refinery - but if it is not, then perhaps a second look should be taken at such a facility which maybe down the road could be of extreme importance to this Province of ours.

Mr. Chretien's most controversial remark today which was remarked by several people who called in following him, that he wants to see the development of the offshore beneficial to the people of Newfoundland. We all want to see it beneficial to the people of Newfoundland, but,' he said, 'that does not necessarily mean that it will be beneficial to the Government of Newfoundland.' He differentiated from the Government of Newfoundland and the people of Newfoundland. We know there is a differentiation, but his follow-up remark stated that many

MR. HEARN: federal programmes can be administered directly. When I spoke last week I talked about the fear I had that too much of a centralized government approach was being used towards the provinces, and particularly to Newfoundland. Here we have from a leadership candidate, somebody aspiring to be Prime Minister of Canada, a direct quote saying that many federal programmes should be administered directly and hinting that they could administer the offshore as it relates to Newfoundland.

In what manner will the administration be presented to Newfoundland, in the form of transfer payments and make-work programmes? I submit, as the hon. gentlemen opposite have submitted, that we do not want transfer payments or make-work programmes. We thank them for them right now because we need them, but that is not what we want. We want to create our own jobs. We do not want handouts. We want to develop our resources, our forestry, our tourism, etc. We want to be able to put money into our transportation system, into our educational facilities, into our hospitals, into our schools, etc. But we do not have the funding. We can get the funding by having a fair share of the revenues from our own resources.

Two major resources in Newfoundland, hydropower and the offshore oil resource, should make Newfoundland a land of milk and honey. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, right now what we have, we have the bees flying off landing the honey in another province as it relates to the development of our hydropower, and as it relates to the offshore we have been told we do not own the cow.

However, the cow is still in our pasture. And while the cow is in our pasture we will have some chance

MR. HEARN: of receiving some of the benefits. I remember our old hockey coach one time told us never to buy a cow when you can get your milk through the fence. So perhaps we should look at that right now. The cow is in our pasture and we still can get the milk through the fence by obtaining a fair share in management and a fair share of revenues. That is all we are asking.

Do we not have a recognized position, do we not have to look ahead? Sure we do. We made the mistake once of jumping at an offer that was made, - once bitten twice shy - and we are still paying for agreements that were signed. Mr. Chretien said Mr. Marshall should have signed my agreement, he should have trusted me to deliver, I could have delivered. If I become Prime Minister I will deliver. Once we sign, Mr. Speaker, they can deliver whatever they want to deliver.

MR. STAGG: Right. That is it. Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: If he will deliver the settlement that was negotiated verbally, yes, we agree with him wholeheartedly. If he will not deliver that, then we cannot agree to sign, because we know once we sign on the dotted line the game is over.

The member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) mentioned the Premier using this one item for the election campaign, that we campaigned on the development of the offshore. To a certain extent that was true. But he mentioned that he went out and campaigned in the schools, Now I presume he was using the school auditoriums for rallies and not campaigning to students. But it was sort of ironic because just last night we were saying to ourselves how do the young people feel about this? How do the school students right now and the younger people of our Province feel in

MR. HEARN:

relation to our government?

A number of us were together, a number of members in this hon. House, and a school teacher approached us and said a strange thing happened during the week. He said, 'We were planning a major debate on the offshore development and the hydro development as it relates to Newfoundland right now and the position of government, and we wanted to set up two teams, we wanted to have the Conservatives and the Liberals, and we searched through the school and we could not find anybody who wanted to represent the Liberals.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

So I do not think there is any doubt how the people of Newfoundland feel about the stand that the government is taking. I do not think there is anybody who has any reservations about the stand, basically, which the Opposition say that they are taking, because, basically, what they are saying is that we are taking the same stand as government, except that you fellows do not know how to go about it.

The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) last week, in speaking, said, 'We have no argument with what is wanted.' What we are asking for, as we said, is just a fair and reasonable settlement. They have no argument. What they do disagree with is the approach. It is the approach that differentiates Liberals from the P.C.s. Well, I have two questions for them, Mr. Speaker: Number one, what would they do? And, number two, how would they approach it? If the answer from them is, 'We will put pressure on our federal members; we will put pressure on the candidates for Liberal leadership right now to put on the line their position', which they should be doing - Mr. Chretien, Mr. Turner, all the others, should be right now enunciating their position as it applies to Newfoundland - they should be forced to do so by their hon. colleagues -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

- and should not be guaranteed any support until they do it. If that is what they want, if they want to push for a fair deal - and I say this in all sincerity to my hon. colleagues across the House - if they want to push for a fair deal, a deal that is beneficial to Newfoundland, to the Government of Newfoundland and to the people of Newfoundland, then

MR. HEARN: I suggest to them that there is no differentiation in our approach whatsoever, that it is exactly what we are after.

MR. STAGG: Right on!

MR. HEARN: Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I see no need for the amendment and I ask members to vote for the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on, boys! Come on!

Be Newfoundlanders!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the amendment, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Against, 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

MR. SPEAKER: The 'Nays' have it.  
All those in favour of the resolution, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Against, 'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay.

Division.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there are only three of us here. What I would suggest is, unless hon. gentlemen opposite wish, why do we not put the bar down now and begin the division and not be here all night in this exercise?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to have the vote now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): All those in favour of the resolution, please stand: the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms Verge), Mr. Brett, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Aylward, Mr. Stewart, the hon. the minister responsible for Communications (Mr. Doyle), the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook), the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews), the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Carter, Mr. McLennon, Mr. Baird, Mr. Greening, Mr. Peach, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Cross, Mrs. Reid, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Matthews, Mr. Butt, Mr. Hearn, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Osmond.

All those against the resolution, please stand: the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), Mr. Hodder, Mr. Roberts.

The sum of the division is thirty for the resolution and three against. I declare the resolution carried.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns, I would like to advise the House that at 7:30 this evening, the Government Services Committee will examine the estimates of the Department of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: At 9:30 tomorrow morning, the Resource Committee will continue its examination of the estimates of the Department of Fisheries and at 7:30 tomorrow evening, the Government Services Committee will examine the estimates of the Department of Public Works and Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It now being Wednesday at 6:00 p.m., I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, April 5, 1984 at 3:00 p.m.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

3 APRIL 1984

---

ORDER PAPER 11/84 - MARCH 28, 1984

QUESTION NO. 20 BY M.H.A. EAGLE RIVER

---

*Tabled by Hon.  
Minister of Public  
Works, 3 Apr. '84*

QUESTION:

- (I) HOW MANY POSITIONS WERE FILLED DURING 1983-84 BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION IN THE CIVIL SERVICE?

ANSWER: 603 (AS OF FEBRUARY 29, 1984)

- (II) HOW MANY OF THESE POSITIONS WERE FILLED BY INTERNAL COMPETITION?

ANSWER: 350

- (III) HOW MANY OF THE POSITIONS, WHICH WERE ADVERTISED FOR OPEN COMPETITION, WERE SUBSEQUENTLY FILLED BY INDIVIDUALS FROM WITHIN THE CIVIL SERVICE? HOW DOES THIS COMPARE WITH THE SITUATION IN 1981 - 1982 AND 1982-83?

ANSWER:

29

1981-82 65

1982-83 24

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

4 APRIL 1984

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 19 ON ORDER PAPER  
DATED MARCH 28TH, 1984, ASKED BY THE  
HONOURABLE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

1. Since 1977, how many Issuers of Marriage Licenses have been granted for the Province?

A total of 434

2. Since 1977, how many resignations of same have been received?

A total of 227