

VOL. 3

NO. 2

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.  
TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last when the Supreme Court brought down its decision on the offshore, down the street, as it were, the National Energy Board handed down a decision on the application by Hydro Quebec for a permit to export energy to the New York Power Authority. Now, Mr. Speaker, government had thought that we might make a detailed comment with respect to this discussion, but in view of, as the Throne Speech indicated yesterday, the sensitivity of the negotiations with the province of Quebec and in the interest of these negotiations, government is going to refrain for the present time, or defer for the present time a detailed comment. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I will table a copy of the news release and the reasons for the decision, which is dated January 1984, although, coincidentally, it was just handed down on Thursday.

And I just say I have only one copy here now but if any hon. members are interested in it, I am sure that all they have to do is advise the Clerk of the House and then we will arrange to get other copies for them. But in the meantime, as I say, I want to make it clear that because of the sensitivity of the negotiations we are not going to make any comment on it until a more responsible and acceptable time.

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

MR. BARRY: Just a brief response to that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the people of the Province and this House would be interested in knowing, and I believe that they should be told, as to the level at which negotiations are proceeding, whether it is at the level of Planning and Priorities Committee to Quebec Hydro Board of Directors or the Planning and Priorities Committee of the Quebec government, or whether it is at the level of the Newfoundland Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) to the Quebec Minister of Energy.

MR. BARRY: or whether it is merely the Public Utilities of each province discussing the matter. I believe that the minister should make it clear, if it is the latter case, whether there are any guidelines set by government under which the Utilities are discussing this important issue.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in rebutting what I had said in my few remarks about the offshore, the court decision and so forth and so on, the Premier indicated, at least to my way of thinking, a change of position; they changed their stance somewhat. And he said that he was prepared to negotiate tomorrow and sign a deal. Now, if the hon. gentleman means what he says and if he is sincere, why has he not gotten in touch with the Prime Minister or with the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) with a view to getting back to the negotiating table at as early a date as possible?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the Leader of the Opposition heard the open line show from 1:45 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: If he did, he would realize that his party is in danger of extinction if they do not start changing their position on some of the fundamental issues that face this Province, I am going to tell you right now, Mr. Speaker. A lot of people out there are very concerned about this issue and are very, very agitated about it, as I am, and as all hon. members are, I am sure.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been for the last year or so, but we sat down with the Government of Canada back in the Fall of 1982 to negotiate and we advanced exactly the same position as I advanced yesterday. So how the Leader of the Opposition can say this is a new position absolutely escapes me. We advanced the position in the Fall of 1982, the Winter of 1982 to January, 1983 which was exactly identical to the position advanced yesterday - exactly, precisely, to the 't' or the dot of the 'i' - and that was and is that we would, and did, sit down at the negotiating table and agreed with the federal authorities to put the question of ownership aside and to negotiate a management agreement and a revenue sharing agreement. Unfortunately, the federal

PREMIER PECKFORD: government, first of all, put a condition on those talks - talk about preconditions - put a condition on those talks that nothing would be in writing, 'We will just talk.' So even though we were only going to talk and verbalize, it was meant, as Mr. Chretien said at the time, to create a framework to see whether there were enough common threads from both sides so that later you could get to writing something down. So we agreed to it and the minister responsible, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and Mr. Chretien sat down and they talked, Mr. Speaker, and they talked and they talked and they talked. And at the end of the day, it seemed as if there was a framework for an agreement, and the minister at the time more or less indicated that. Then, when we had the framework which was verbally agreed to, it came time to start putting that down in writing, and so we began to put our position down in writing within the framework that had been verbally agreed upon by both ministers. We put it down in good faith, honestly, straightforwardly. Then we took the initiative again. We were the first to put it in writing - they did not want to; they were waiting on us - so we had to take the initiative, we had to go the extra mile and we did. Then, of course, we had to ask them to respond to us in writing. And, as they started responding to us in writing, there was a decidedly different position being put on the table than what had been agreed to verbally in that framework to make sure you had the right environment to put it in writing, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And so what came out of those discussions, and those negotiations was a position by the federal government which said, 'No say in management.' So that was the management agreement. It was the same administrative proposal that was put on the table about twelve years ago or ten years ago, and they had not moved one iota, not one inch. And on the revenue sharing proposal, the response that they put on the table was marginally worse - our experts went and used our computer model and got a bottom line on it - and it was marginally worse than the Nova Scotia agreement on revenue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the last three or four days, Mr. Chretien, in the House of Commons, indicated, you know, 'Come on, Bill, boy, come on, Brian, boy, back to the table. You know, we want to help Newfoundland. We only want to do what we can.' But he went on to say, under some questioning, that he was looking at an agreement like Nova Scotia's. Now the Nova Scotia government and the federal government in their study demonstrated that the Nova Scotia agreement is not going to make Nova Scotia financially better off, that there is very little too it. Of course, now, Nova Scotia has got to protect their \$589 million they get in defence, they could not lose that and a few other things, and they are in a different situation as it relates to the volume of the resource, in any case, or the value of the resource.

So there has to be created, Mr. Speaker, and we will go back and use Mr. Chretien's words, 'An environment in which there is the probability rather than the possibility -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. member for Port au Port on a point of order.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it very clear, before I start my point of order, that we on this side understand that the Premier's remarks are important.

Mr. Speaker, you know, this is the beginning of a new session; we have a half an hour for Question Period. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) merely asked a simple, straightforward question about getting back to the bargaining table. The Premier is using the opportunity to make a speech. Now, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne says that answers should be as brief as possible. Page 131, Section 358. And, you know, are we going to have to go through this? If this House means anything, then we must be able to get as much information on this side of the House as we possibly can. Are ministers going to play this game? I wish ministers would sit in Ottawa where they have about three-quarters of an hour to ask questions and sometimes fifteen opposition members can get up and ask questions.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that points of order also come out of Question Period that is why we rarely ever raise them, but this is the beginning of a new session and we want the ability to be able to ask as



MR. HODDER:

many questions of as many ministers as possible and we want the government to be strong enough to be able to take whatever we have to give them. And those long-winded speeches, which could be condensed and more concise, are unnecessary.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that was a very nice lecture by the hon. gentleman. We appreciate it very much to try to get us off in the right tone in starting off the session. If the hon. gentleman wants to quote Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, page 131, paragraph 358 No. 1 says: 'Such questions should', and then the hon. gentleman can come down to '(e) not be of a nature requiring a lengthy and detailed answer'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), he asked a question of the Premier of this Province with respect to perhaps one of the most important issues that is confronting this Province today in all of its import. and all of its seriousness. He asked the hon. Premier, the Leader of the Government, as to when the Province, if the Province, was going back into negotiations. Now the question is, is the hon. Leader of the Opposition serious when he asks the question? Does he want a response? Does he want a full response, does he want a half response or a quarter response? Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the question which was asked is one which requires an obviously lengthy answer. It either has to have a lengthy answer or no answer because there would be a complete misinterpretation. So, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen want to ask questions that require instant answers, they should really be instant questions. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked was a question that required a lengthy, and, I must say, a very full and complete answer, as he is getting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman,  
of course, playing with words, distorted the whole thing  
completely out of proportion and I would like to put it back  
in its proper prespective, Mr. Speaker. My colleague raised  
a point of order under Section 358 of Beauchesne, No. 2,  
'Answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should  
deal with the matter raised, and should not provoke debate',  
Mr. Speaker. Now the hon. gentleman yesterday said he was  
prepared to negotiate tomorrow and sign a deal. And I  
asked the hon. gentleman, if he

MR. NEARY:

meant what he said, why has he not been in touch with Mr. Chretien or the Prime Minister to get back to the negotiating table?

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a simple question. The answer that came back from the hon. gentleman was something about a hot line or an open line. I understand they were burning the midnight oil last night trying to get twenty-five or thirty recruits, the Tory open-line brigade, to line them up to talk to the Premier today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier wants to play that kind of a game, according to Professor Mark Grasser it is the Premier who is in danger of extinction in his own Tory stronghold of St. John's.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The Chair recognized the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) speaking to that point of order. Certainly he is straying somewhat from speaking to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

MR. NEARY:

Well, anyway, the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to play the mug's game with the hon. gentleman. There are rules that have to be followed in this House, they apply to both sides of the House, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. colleague was quite justified when he raised a point of order on Section 358, Oral Questions where it states beyond any shadow of a doubt that the answers to questions should be as brief as possible and not provoke debate. All we are doing is asking Your Honour to enforce that rule.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Justice to that point of order.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the point of order raised is an extremely interesting one and one which, as the hon. gentleman who raised it pointed out, points of orders do take up the time of the House and of the Question Period, but being such an important one, it is, I think, worth and indeed necessary to give it the fullest consideration.

Now hon. members have quoted from page 131 Beauchesne, Section 358, and the first few lines of 358 put it in a context, "In 1964, the Special Committee on Procedure" - that was of the House of Commons "recommended the following guidelines, which were subsequently concurred in by the House, to be used by Members in asking or answering oral question." This was in the House of Commons in 1964 and they are still operative. And it deals with asking questions and answering questions because obviously the two have to go together; the question to a large extent determines the nature of the answer. That is very obvious. A number of the subsections there have been referred to, but there is another one which I think is very applicable as well and that is that questions, and it says, "should not raise a matter of policy too large to be dealt with in an answer to a question." Now, you know, my own view is that it is difficult to say. You know, I am not sure that I agree myself personally with the suggestion that questions should not raise a matter of policy of such a large nature, but it certainly follows that if a question does raise a matter of policy of very important nature, then obviously

MR. OTTENHEIMER: the answer is going to be partially conditioned by the nature of the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) did a great job of trying to confuse the whole issue, but I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is another guiding principle here. I have visited other jurisdictions across Canada and I have visited the House of Commons in Ottawa and watched Question Period on many occasions, and I would ask government members opposite, and particularly the government ministers opposite, are you afraid to answer our questions? Is this going to be the little game that you play, such as you are now playing, by opening the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: - two or three weeks later than normal, you are trying to get out of the House - the budget comes down on Tuesday, we will probably never see the Throne Speech again - are you afraid to face the Opposition?

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: I take exception, Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I was in the process of answering the question when the members of the Opposition raised the point of order. Are you afraid for me to answer the questions?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

The point of order raised by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) is basically a valid point of order. The Question Period is designed to ask as many questions and to receive as many answers as is possible. However, it is also true, perhaps, that sometimes the very nature of a question requires a rather lengthy answer and maybe the fault for that might lie with the Chair in that any questions that the Chair considers to require lengthy answers perhaps the Chair should direct the person asking the question to put them on the Order Paper rather than ask them in the House. But I would remind hon. members that questions and answers should be as brief as possible.

MR. NEARY: Excellent ruling, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have not finished my answer.

MR. NEARY: The Speaker just ruled that the hon. gentleman was out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair ruled on a point of order raised by the hon. the member from Port au Port and did not rule the Premier out of order. I would ask hon. members to keep their questions short and hon. members to my left to keep their answers short. I would ask the Premier if he would sum up his answer very briefly.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Thank you very much,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that ruling.

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, before I was rudely interrupted by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), the whole question of what our position is relative to the offshore, our position today is exactly the same as it was in the Fall and the Winter of 1982 and January 1983, and that is that we were prepared to sign a management, revenue-sharing agreement with the federal government concerning the offshore and put the ownership aside for all time. And at that point in time the federal government did not live up to its verbal agreements with the Minister of Energy for Newfoundland (Mr. Marshall) the Minister of Energy for Canada (Mr. Chretien) the other day in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am going to sum it up. I am summing it up, Mr. Speaker. - has reiterated that there is no other position on the table from the federal government only an Nova Scotia type of agreement. We have to have a framework and an environment in which there is the possibility, yea, the probability, of signing that agreement, not to get sucked into negotiations, build up the hopes of Newfoundlanders that there is an agreement, only to have the rug hauled out from under us at the last minute.

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: I am not sure whether I understand the hon. gentleman correctly or not. Is the hon. gentleman saying that he is prepared to return to the negotiating table, to accept Mr. Chretien's invitation to come back and to bargain at the negotiating table? Is he saying that he is prepared to drop any pre-conditions in order to get the negotiations started again?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there are no pre-conditions but there has to be, in the same way as there was in the Fall of 1982, an environment and an atmosphere in which there is the real possibility, as I said probability, that it is going to be successful. We do not want to get into the same charade as we were in the last time where we went in with our eyes open, we were prepared to start negotiating without putting anything in writing, only to find that the rug was hauled from under us at the last minute. So we need to see some seriousness on behalf of the federal government that they are willing to consider the whole question of offshore Newfoundland in a management, revenue-sharing agreement superior to the one that is now in place in Nova Scotia. To go back to the negotiating table in the environment where the phrases and comments are being used, that it is an administrative



PREMIER PECKFORD:

arrangement, that it is like Nova Scotia and that kind of thing, does not create an atmosphere in which there is a real chance of success, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Chretien is trying to have it both ways; he is trying to signal to the Canadian people and the Newfoundland people that, Oh, yes, he is willing to sit down and negotiate, and at the same time he is not willing to sit down and negotiate, he is just willing to try to get us into a pressure situation between ourselves and the Canadian Government where we cannot walk away from the table and then have to sign something which is not in the long-term best interests of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a question. There was a statement given after the Throne Speech yesterday, I believe, to one of the television stations, where the Premier indicated that he believed that the federal PC Party would be reviewing its position on offshore resources. I would like to have the Premier confirm whether this is the case. Is it a fact that he has been informed that the federal Progressive Conservative Party will be reviewing its position on the offshore?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think what I said yesterday, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it the federal Conservative Party has a number of task forces established dealing with monetary policies, fiscal policies, social policy, economic policy. I am not aware that they are specifically reviewing their present position on offshore resources. But I know that they are engaged and have quite a few people working on policy positions

PREMIER PECKFORD: leading up to the next federal general election. I am not aware that they are reviewing the present position that they now take as it relates to offshore, which is to treat the offshore the same as if it were onshore.

MR. BARRY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if in fact these ongoing reviews are taking place with respect to important aspects of the federal Progressive Conservative Party's platform and policy, will the Premier be seeking a written commitment from Mr. Mulroney, the Leader of the Federal Progressive Conservative Party, before the next federal election?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said there is a review on economic policy, social policy and the other policy issues. The policy of the Conservative Party is clear, it has been repeated by the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie), the finance critic in the Opposition Party in Ottawa right now, and

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not foresee any change in that and, you know, we look forward to the Conservative Party being elected the Government of Canada and then confirming and getting on with the job that was set in motion by Prime Minister Clark in the letter that he wrote us at that point in time. So we do not perceive that we are going to need written assurances. We believe that the policy of the P.C. Party will continue to be in Canada what it is today, that is that the offshore will be treated the same as is onshore, and I must say, that is a much better policy than the present policy of the Liberal Party of Canada, to which the hon. member adheres.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has indicated that there have been certain supportive statements made by Mr. Crosbie. Now, I am sure all of us here would have liked to have seen Mr. Crosbie win the leadership campaign and become the leader of the federal party, but in fact that is not the case, so I would like to ask the Premier whether he has in any form, written, verbally or otherwise, communicated with Mr. Mulroney to request that he state his position on the offshore and whether or not he has requested that that position be put in writing?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think the hon. member can be assured that in the very near future, the Conservative Party of Canada, if it needs to be done and if the hon. members on the other side wish it done, that they will be reaffirming their position as it is now, that the offshore should be treated the same as if it were onshore. I would call upon the members opposite to get the same

PREMIER PECKFORD: kinds of assurances out of the Liberal Party of Canada as we have of the Conservative Party of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted that the Premier did not answer - which is his right - my last question.

MR. BARRY: I asked the Premier whether he had communicated with Mr. Mulroney in any fashion to request of Mr. Mulroney that Mr. Mulroney - not Mr. Crosbie, not Mr. McGrath and not any other member of the PC caucus - but whether he has communicated with the Leader of the federal PC Party to request that that Leader set forth his position on offshore resources? I believe this House deserves an answer to this question, a direct answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party is presently the Government of Canada and I call upon the hon. member, and all hon. members opposite, to have their Party adopt the same policies federally as the Conservative Party has. That is what the hon. members opposite should be doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, again it should be noted that the Premier has refused to deal with the question and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, one must conclude that the Premier has made that communication and that Mr. Mulroney has refused the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows, or he ought to know, that these are supplementary questions, this is not the time for speeches. Certainly not a time for speeches from the hon. member at any time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!  
To the point of order raised by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), indeed a supplementary should not require any preamble whatsoever and the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was proceeding to get into debate.

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it was a new question. I was setting the background, Mr. Speaker, for a new question, the background being that I assume that we must conclude from the Premier's refusal to answer the question that the communication has been made to Mr. Mulroney and that that has been rejected by Mr. Mulroney, the Premier's request has been rejected. And, therefore, I would ask whether the Premier is at any point before the next federal election going to take the same approach with

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Mulrooney as he took with Mr. Clark and put him on the spot publicly by requesting publicly that Mr. Mulrooney give a written commitment as to his position on the offshore?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I find it extremely ironic that the hon. member, a member who left one party where it was consistently stated that the offshore would be treated the same as onshore and goes to a party which does not believe in treating the offshore the same as onshore, that he would ask such a question in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker.

The Conservative Party of Canada has been known for its principles, has been known for its consistency, and the Liberal Party of Canada has not been known for its consistency or its principles - it changes from day to day - and I can only lament the fact that the hon. member would see fit to leave a party which supports offshore being treated the same as onshore and go with a party that does not want to give Newfoundland anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Minister of Justice. Mr. Speaker, in recent developments, in the past twenty-four hours or so, I understand that Atlantic Lotto has been issuing letters or threats to small business outlets in and around the St. John's area who are selling Atlantic Lotto tickets, and

March 13, 1984

Tape No. 42

NM - 2

MR. WARREN:                      has told them that if they  
sell any other lotto tickets, such as the Canada Games  
tickets, that they will have their licence taken away from  
them. Has the minister been approached on this matter,  
and what is the minister going to do about it?



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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), because there are interprovincial agreements governing these lottos - like Lotto 649, Atlantic Lotto and whatever they are - that there is going to be a meeting of the ministers responsible for these interprovincial lottos within the next couple of weeks. I should point out that they come under an intergovernmental agreement among provinces and they are not related to lottery licencing within a province. They are part of an intergovernmental agreement. With respect to the hon. gentleman's allegation that there have been threats, no, I am not aware that any confectionery store owners or other outlets have been threatened by Atlantic Lotto, or whichever outfit it is that the hon. gentleman is suggesting is threatening people. If the hon. gentleman has a copy of any such letter, obviously I would be glad to see it but I have not heard any complaints with respect to that.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if the minister saw Here and Now yesterday evening or listened to the CBC report this morning, a fellow by the name of Noel Parsley was interviewed and he told the public that he has been advised by Atlantic Lotto that if he sells other lotto tickets, in particular as pertains to the Calgary games, that he would lose his Atlantic Lotto licence. Could the minister assure all those small outlets throughout the Province that are selling the various tickets that they will not lose their Atlantic Lotto licence because they are going to partake in selling other lotto tickets?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I can certainly assure the House that I will look into the matter and report thereon. I do not think, certainly at this time, I can give the assurance the hon. gentleman is asking for, any more than, I suppose - and I am not necessarily justifying what the hon. gentleman is alleging is going on, I really do not know, I will have to check on it - than if Garage X has an agreement

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

to sell, like us say, only Fords, to the exclusion of certain other vehicles, you know, it depends on what kind of an agreement people have entered into. But I certainly will give the hon. gentleman assurance that I will have the matter looked into and see what precisely is the nature of the complaint and of the alleged threat.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report, 1983, of the Liquor Corporation.

MR. NEARY: o o o  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before Your Honour calls Orders of the Day, I have concurrence from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to rise in my place today to pay tribute to a former member of this House and a former member of the House of Commons, a distinguished Newfoundlander in the person of the late Thomas G. W. Ashbourne, who recently passed away.

Mr. Ashbourne had a long career in both provincial and national politics. He first entered politics in 1924 and represented the district of Twillingate until 1928. In 1947, he again was elected to represent Twillingate as a delegate to the National Convention which had been set up to decide Newfoundland's future constitutional status. He subsequently was a member of the first delegation appointed from the Convention to travel to

MR. NEARY: Ottawa and interview Canadian officials as to what the position of the Canadian Government was if the Newfoundland people decided to join Confederation.

After Newfoundlanders and Labradorians finally chose to become a part of Canada in 1949, Mr. Ashbourne was elected as a Liberal member of Parliament for the district of Grand Falls - White Bay - Labrador and held this seat three terms until 1958. As an MP, Mr. Ashbourne strongly pushed in Parliament for the cause of fishermen and was instrumental in securing unemployment insurance benefits for fishermen while he was Chairman of the House of Commons Fishery Committee.

Mr. Ashbourne was also a veteran of the First World War, having served in the British Army with the Royal Garrison Artillery, and was a prominent community leader and businessman. In Twillingate, he was a Justice of the Peace for over fifty years. Mr. Ashbourne helped to establish the first hospital, the Notre Dame Memorial Hospital, and was a commissioner of Newfoundland Hydro after his retirement from politics in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like, with the concurrence of my friends there opposite, to pay tribute to another distinguished Newfoundlander who passed away since the House last met, a former member of this House in the person of Mr. Jack Forsey. The late Mr. Forsey was a prominent insurance salesman, as many members know, and represented Humber East in this House from 1956 to 1962.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of all hon. members of this House of Assembly I would like for Your Honour to extend to the surviving families of both Mr. Ashbourne and Mr. Forsey our sincere condolences on their sad passing.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we on this side would certainly associate ourselves with the expressions of sympathy expressed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Mr. Ashbourne had a very distinguished career as was outlined by the Leader of the Opposition. He represents, incidentally, what amounts to now a decreasing number, I guess, of members of the House of Assembly prior to Commission of Government. There are very few of those around; two of them who immediately come to mind, of course, are the hon. P.J. Lewis and the hon. W.J. Browne, both of whom are in very good health. And I know members of the House see them from time to time, because they reside here in St. John's.

Mr. Ashbourne, in his last years I understand, resided with his family in Toronto. As I say, he had a very distinguished public career in the Province of Newfoundland and we certainly join with the Opposition in extending a unanimous expression of sympathy to his family.

At the same time, too, Mr. Speaker, with respect to Mr. Forsey who represented us provincially in more contemporary times, and I think a lot of people in the House knew Mr. Forsey and knew him personally, he represented, as the Leader of the Opposition said, the Corner Brook area in the House of Assembly. After 1962 he maintained an interest in public life and public affairs, because from time to time we used to see Mr. Forsey expressing opinions and proffering his opinions in the papers, and they were all very well reasoned and very well taken opinions. So Newfoundland really

MR. MARSHALL: has lost two very distinguished citizens since the last session of the House and we join in an expression of sympathy to the families.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members will join with me in an expression of sympathy for another distinguished Newfoundlander who recently passed away. This is a gentleman whose life also was a life of service, not in elected service but in appointed public service, and I am referring to the late Chief of Police Browne. Early in his life the late Chief of Police served in the Royal Navy and was decorated for valor upon returning to Newfoundland. He joined the Constabulary and worked his way up through the ranks as a constable, an NCO, a Commissioned Officer, up to Deputy Chief and, of course, finally to Chief of Police.

It was during the late Chief Browne's tenure that the new Royal Newfoundland Constabulary Headquarters were designed and planned and brought to fruition. And also, of course, during his tenure and due largely to his involvement and interest and tenacity the designation 'Royal' was given to the Newfoundland Constabulary which, if my memory is correct, is one of seven police forces in the world to have that designation. So certainly the late Chief also played a prominent role in the life of the Province through a life of service, as I say, not elected but appointed public service. He is survived by his widow and a number of children, and, of course, he has a son who is now serving in the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary. I know all hon. members join with me in expressing an expression of condolence to the late Chief's surviving family.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House would like to join with members there opposite in paying tribute to another prominent and distinguished Newfoundlander, a former Royal Newfoundland Constabulary Chief, the late John Browne who recently passed away. As the minister indicated to the House, the late Chief Browne had a long and eminent career in our local police force and became it Deputy Chief in 1972, and, as the hon. gentleman indicated, was Chief in 1976. It was during his tenure, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman pointed out, as Chief of the Constabulary that it received the designation of 'Royal', which I am sure made the late John Browne proud and happy. And moving in, of course, to their present spacious and modern headquarters was a major accomplishment under the leadership of the late John Browne.

Mr. Speaker, to his surviving family, we also would like to join with hon. gentlemen there opposite in extending our deepest sympathy from all members on this side of the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1. Address in Reply.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, one of the most crucial, probably, I would say, the most crucial problem facing the province today is not the offshore situation, it is not the fact that by the poor planning and poor strategy of the government that the offshore case has been lost, that can be remedied if the government is prepared to take a sensible approach, accept the generous offer of the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) to sit down immediately without pre-conditions, without anything other than a willingness to try and get an agreement. Mr. Speaker, there you have a problem that is in the government's own hands. The solution of the offshore problem is in the government's own hands. It can sit down and negotiate.

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we have a more serious problem, and I wonder whether the solution is, at the present time, in the government's hands. It should be, but because of a lack of a proper fisheries policy, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are very concerned that the crisis in the fishing industry is, to a large extent, being ignored by members opposite, by the government, by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). To a large extent there is an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to paper over the real tragedy which is occurring in our Province today, a tragedy of many young Newfoundlanders who are not afraid to take a risk, who are not afraid to lay their futures on the line, who are not afraid to make an investment in the fishing industry listening to the government saying that there was a bright future for the fishing industry, listening to the government say that there would be policies in place to ensure that people could



MR. BARRY: live in rural Newfoundland and made a good living the fishing industry. And what is the result today? What is the situation that we find these aggressive risk takers in in our fishing industry, these young men with stars in their eyes wanting to make a contribution to our Province? We see, Mr. Speaker, most of those facing bankruptcy today and facing bankruptcy, to a large

MR. BARRY:

extent, because of the utter incompetence of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), the utter incompetence! And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier mentioned something during the course of the Throne Speech with which I agree totally, and that is that he has young members in the backbenches of his government who are hot on the heels of his Cabinet ministers. And the time is long past, Mr. Speaker, for one minister to be ejected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Come on! Come on! The time is long past, Mr. Speaker, for a Cabinet shuffle.

It will be only switching deck chairs on the Titanic, but the time is long past to see that Minister of Fisheries replaced and either the member who spoke and moved the Address-in-Reply, or the seconder, either one of those two fine gentlemen would do 100 per cent better than the Minister of Fisheries. They would not be going up to Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and coming back crying.

MR. MORGAN: I am going to get you yet.

MR. BARRY: You are going to get me.

We have threats, Mr. Speaker. We have threats.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: They would not be going to Ottawa and doing a deal with a federal minister, his federal counterpart, and then the next day having to come back crying that the agreement was not accepted by the Premier or his government.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, either of those gentlemen, the mover or the seconder of the Address-in-Reply, Mr. Speaker, would do 100 per cent better than the minister. Who would have the utter arrogance, or is it that he just does not know, to come back after being rejected not once - like Christ and St. Peter was it? - rejected not once, not twice but three times by his government.

MR. MORGAN: I did not go home crying to get in the Cabinet like you did.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the member opposite, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), says that he did not come home crying. No, he cried, Mr. Speaker, in front of the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane)! He cried in front of the Federal Fisheries Minister! He broke down, Mr. Speaker, he said, "I cannot go home. They will not let me keep my Cabinet seat if you do not let me change that agreement."

MR. MORGAN: Lower your decibels, boy!

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep your cool.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Whatever about losing my cool, I am losing my voice. I had better reduce my decibel level, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: I have a bit of a cold and I am losing my voice, so I cannot speak loud.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we have a sad situation in the fishing industry and what is the approach of government? The approach of the Provincial Minister of Fisheries has been, once he has come back to the bargaining table after walking away from the restructuring deal because he was not getting his own way with the Premier, the approach

MR. BARRY: has been now to hold up restructuring as the solution to the ills of the fishing industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) whether he supports the new approach to collective bargaining taken by government in this Province today? I am glad to see the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) listening because I want to hear from the Minister of Labour whether this is a recommendation of his department, this new approach to collective bargaining as witnesses by the Premier's letter

MR. BARRY:

to the paper workers in Grand Falls where, before there was any mention of money, before there were any demands at all made by those union members in Grand Falls, we have the Premier warning, sending a letter to them and threatening them, warning them not to make unreasonable demands. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) whether that same letter is going to go out to the fishermen of this Province? Has the same letter been written yet, Mr. Speaker, to Mr. Cashin to warn him that he had better not make any unreasonable demands? Has the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker - the people in this Province want to know, the fishermen want to know - has the Minister of Fisheries done anything to encourage the restructured company to get to the bargaining table with our fishermen? They have added - what is it? - five cents over the last two years to the price of fish. The real incomes of our fishermen, Mr. Speaker, have gone down, have gone down not just in the last couple of years, but since 1978, I believe it is, or 1979. The real incomes, the earning power of our fishermen has gone down. I want to know from the Minister of Fisheries when he get up to speak - I am glad that he is going to be following me. I am quivering in my boots, Mr. Speaker, I am shaken by the threats of the fisheries minister to get me - what I want to know is, is he also out to get the fishermen of this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, yes.

MR. BARRY:

Is he out to get the fishermen of this Province in the same way the Premier was out to get the paper workers, to try and force them into not making any unreasonable demands when they had not made any demands with respect to money, Mr. Speaker?

MR. BARRY: Now maybe the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) would prefer to respond, or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), but somebody on the government side, Mr. Speaker, must answer the question; will the fishermen of our Province be threatened by the full force of government authority not to seek increases in their income level? Is the government saying that the income levels of fishermen is to be frozen, that these levels are to be frozen for one year, two years, or how long? Are members opposite saying that our fishermen are now receiving sufficient income? Is the Minister of Fisheries saying that freezing the price of fish is going to help these fishermen save their boats, which they are now losing or about to lose, because they cannot meet the payments, Mr. Speaker? And not only their boats, Mr. Speaker, they have made commitments. They have borrowed money which they have to pay back. Mr. Speaker, if they lose their boats, is the bank going to be after them to take their homes? Is this, Mr. Speaker, the position that the Government of Newfoundland and the Minister of Fisheries support? Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a delay in collective bargaining. The fishermen have not had the opportunity to find out just what this new restructured company is willing to pay or is able to pay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we have the situation where we do not know at this stage what the restructured company is in a position to pay our fishermen. Now I would ask the government to immediately see that the new company is in a position to commence negotiations. To a large extent, again, it is in the government's hands.

March 13, 1984

Tape No. 48

ah-3

MR. BARRY:

There has to be a board of directors appointed , there has to be a chief executive officer appointed ; any delay rests with government. Government has the opportunity

MR. BARRY:

to see these directors appointed and should be acting with all speed and haste to ensure that that is done so that our fishermen can get to the bargaining table. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to also indicate whether, when our fishermen get to the bargaining table, if they should find that the restructured company is not in a position to pay them a sufficient amount to help them not just pay their expenses, not just save their fishing vessels but to earn a decent income, has the Minister of Fisheries any policies for meeting any shortfall that might exist, if that in fact might be, or is the Minister of Fisheries merely going to point to Ottawa and say, 'Oh, we cannot do anything, We have got to ask the federal government to do it'? Mr. Speaker, the Fishermen's Union have an information campaign going around the Province and, Mr. Speaker, there is some very good information that is being supplied. We have, Mr. Speaker, the Fishermen's Union stating that basically what has been happening is, with the approach of the Kirby Commission, while everybody agrees that the fishing industry must be economically viable and everybody agrees that at some point in time we must be able to see that profit is made in that industry -

MR. TOBIN: What about the Bank of Nova Scotia?

MR. BARRY: Yes, what about the Bank of Nova Scotia? Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will tell about the Bank of Nova Scotia, which for several years, Mr. Speaker, was the only body in this Province or in this country prepared to meet the needs of fishermen to carry insolvent companies, Mr. Speaker, That is typical of the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), that he would make an implication that I, in my personal capacity, who have, Mr. Speaker, the



MR. BARRY: honour of representing an institution that has more rural branches around this Province, that has more at stake around this Province than any other financial institution. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the member to ask some members of his own caucus whether they feel that acting for a bank is not somehow improper or reprehensible. Mr. Speaker, the member opposite should start standing on his feet and start talking a little policy from time to time, and let us not have these personal digs. I have yet to hear the member from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) get up and say anything in the way of a proper fisheries policy for this House and, Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for the member, and we will enjoy a little give and take during this Session, but the member should get on his feet and let his constituents know where he stands. Does he support the Premier dictating to the fishermen that they should not ask for any increase? Is that the position? Tell the residents, Mr. Speaker, of Burin - Placentia West whether that is what he supports. Be a man and answer that question.

Mr. Speaker, we had a situation last year where things were floating along in the fishing industry; the industry was belly up, but nobody was doing anything. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bank said the time has bloody well come, after several years the time has come for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to accept his responsibility, for the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. DeBane) to accept his responsibility. Otherwise it would still be floating along, and our inshore fishermen would still be in a position of not knowing if they were going to have plants to buy their fish, and a Minister of Fisheries not doing one single, solitary thing! Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union has stated that everywhere they turn this year they see government not just

MR. BARRY:                   having a policy of over a period of time making the fishing industry viable; no, they are taking the position that whether it be a wharfage fee, whether it be the price of fish, wherever they look all of a sudden the fishermen has got to make the fishing industry viable. The position taken by the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is, 'Oh, the industry is viable now because we have a restructured company, we have a company that can operate.' When was the last time you heard, Mr. Speaker, you heard the Minister of Fisheries make any recommendation that would deal with fishermen's incomes?

MR. BARRY: When was the last time, Mr. Speaker, you saw the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) do anything to assist fishermen in getting a decent income?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries has yet to do anything for the fishermen on fishermen's incomes. He has yet to do anything and, Mr. Speaker, the time has come -

MR. MORGAN: Has the hon. member ever taken our side on fisheries? Enough is enough!

MR. BARRY: Go ahead and discuss what has gone on in caucus if you wish! Go ahead!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not done a thing to deal with fishermen's incomes. He has now taken the position: 'Oh, we have a restructured company now. We have a company which has received certain financing.' We already, I think, have had indications from Mr. Kirby and Mr. Nicholson that there are problems in the amount of financing available. We have already had indications that they may not be able to pay a decent income to our fishermen. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the position? Does the provincial Minister of Fisheries believe that you can have a viable fishing industry when all the fishermen are bankrupt but the companies are being financed?

MR. TULK: How could that happen?

MR. BARRY: Yes. How can there be a viable fishing industry if the people right at the front end, the catchers, the people who go out and catch the fish, if they are bankrupt, if they are not earning a decent income? How can it be?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we do not yet have a policy put forth by our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that deals with that point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: There will be much more to say, Mr. Speaker, when my learned friend's resolution comes on the Order Paper on tomorrow, Wednesday. We will have much more time to debate this crucial, important issue, an issue that is threatening the livelihoods of our thousands of fishermen around the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: We recently, Mr. Speaker, had the opportunity of seeing a Province-wide address by the Premier on the economic state of the Province.

Now, I know all of us, members opposite, members on this side, the general public, were hoping for and praying for and expecting some sort of positive statement, Mr. Speaker, and one that the Premier has in his own hands to give when he gets down to the bargaining table seriously with the Province of Quebec. We are now into the sensitive stage of negotiations. Does that mean that the Premier is still setting forth pre-conditions and the pre-conditions are sensitive, or is he actually involved in negotiations? We do not know. Hopefully we will get responses to these questions, Mr. Speaker. And I guess it should be noted that the Premier, who prides himself on being one to answer a question, has in the very first session Question Period, day one of the House of Assembly, we have question number one unanswered. Now, we will keep a tally-and the Premier will have other opportunities to answer that question - we will keep a tally and see just how many questions will

MR. BARRY: remain unanswered in this session of the House of Assembly.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one question which I believe the Premier could answer for the people of this Province is, When can we expect a deal on the Upper Churchill, a deal with Quebec? And, Mr. Speaker, When can we expect the income flowing into the Province as a result of such a negotiated settlement, when can we see the employment opportunities that would result from other hydro developments in Labrador? It is with members on the other side, it is with the Cabinet, it is with the Premier to get a deal, Mr. Speaker. It is in their hands. And such a deal could see,

MR. BARRY:

instead of the Premier going on coast-to-coast television to put on the doom and gloom hat, instead of telling all our public employees that they are going to have to bear the burden, Mr. Speaker - I guess the only reason we can assume that this was done is because the Budget is going to be such a pure and utter disaster this year that the Premier was trying to save the overworked Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), we all know that he is a hard worker, and we all know that he needs a little bit of assistance to get him through these hard times, the Premier was trying to soften the blow. The Premier was trying to soften the blow because it is going to be such an utter disaster.

The Premier seems to relish, he seems to enjoy bad news. Last year's deficit I think was \$28 million - \$28 million. It started with and, Mr. Speaker, it was more than doubled by the end of the year - the deficit which at \$28 million is more than government's likes to see. I can recall government would always try and keep the Budget around a \$10 million to \$15 million surplus on current account, Mr. Speaker, because otherwise you are just borrowing to pay your bills and you keep going deeper and deeper in the hole. So we have not just a movement from a \$15 million surplus to a \$28 million deficit, Mr. Speaker, which was projected at the beginning of the year, no, we have that deficit more than doubling than.

Now the Premier has indicated that we can expect, even with these Draconian measures that are being brought in for the public service, our Budget to go from \$100 million deficit to \$75 million. Now that is at the beginning of the year. Presumably these are

MR. BARRY: the figures that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is going to be dealing with later on this month when he brings down the Budget. But the people in this Province would like to know just how accurate are those projections. Are they going to be as close as they were last year? Are we going to be looking at a deficit which is going to more than double again? Are we going to be looking at, in other words, a deficit on current account of \$150 million by the end of the fiscal year 1984-1985?

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day in this Province when we have to look at the figures that are put out in the Budget Speech and at the end of the year we have to say they bore no more relation to reality than chalk does to cheese - no more, Mr. Speaker, relationship to the actual reality of what happened than chalk to cheese.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that I am being given a notice that I am running out of time here. Mr. Speaker, before I forget I would like to , Mr. Speaker, because of the utter lack of confidence which I know that the people of this Province, and the members of this House, have in their hearts and souls in this government, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) that all the words after 'that' be deleted, in the motion before the House, and the following words substituted therefore: 'This House deplores the failure of the government to prepare and present measures adequate to deal with the problems of unemployment, lack of business opportunities, and inadequate public services confronting Newfoundland and Labrador today and demands that the government immediately take all measures possible to alleviate these problems.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we knew we had to get this in today because we know hon. members opposite are very eager to see the House closed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: And we know, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

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

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I may have a copy of the motion? Mr. Speaker, as I heard it, this is an amendment to the Address in Reply. And I quote, Mr. Speaker, page 153, Amendments, Paragraph 425, 'The object of an amendment may either be to modify a question in such a way as to increase acceptability or to present to the House a different proposition as an alternative', 426 is most germane, Mr. Speaker, it says: "It is an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed." Now the hon. gentleman has proposed an amendment which reads: 'That all words after 'that' be deleted and the following substituted.' This House deplores the failure of the government to prepare and present measures adequate to deal with the problems of unemployment, lack of business opportunity, and an inadequate public service confronting Newfoundland and Labrador today and demands that the government immediately take all measures possible to alleviate these problems.' Mr. Speaker, I might suggest to the hon. member, in view of the fact that amendments have to be relevant, it would be improved perhaps by putting a 'whereas' before the resolution, which could read, and I propose if he would accept it, WHEREAS I lost the 1979 leadership -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



MR. MARSHALL: - and could not accept any leadership but my own.' So, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would consent to that amendment we would certainly say that this resolution is very relevant and germane.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: If I could speak to that point of order, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMS: He is trying to take over from his House Leader now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - that motion, Mr. Speaker, is similar to many that have gone through this House before, I refer back as far as 1978 at least when similar motions were accepted as being proper motions of non-confidence, Mr. Speaker. I submit that the member will have his opportunity to amend any resolutions that are put before this House by members here, and I might say that he might put in that, 'Whereas my willingness to subject the people of Newfoundland to the hardship that my policy on offshore oil and gas, on hydro-electricity, and so forth, that that comes, Mr. Speaker, from the cynicism I developed when I was tossed out of the Cabinet by Frank Moores.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To the point of order raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), I have to rule that there is no point of order. And I rule that the motion moved by the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BARRY: Hear, hear! What a Speaker!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that was sadly lacking in the Premier's address, and he had a marvelous opportunity - he had the Province wired for sound, televisions flashing from here to Cape Chidley, Mr. Speaker - he had a marvelous opportunity to bring forth something positive. He had a marvelous opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to motivate our people, to inspire our people, to get our people working, Mr. Speaker, to get business opportunities going in this Province, to see our people employed. And instead, Mr. Speaker, we have a black poll and miasma, Mr. Speaker, of gloom and doom laid on the Province, laid that thick,

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, from here to Cape Chidley. It is like the Premier got one of these paint rollers and went out and he spread gloom and doom, Mr. Speaker, from here to the tip of Labrador.

MR. BAIRD:

For what you are spending now you need insurance.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member throws out of his mouth from time to time I am sure is what I will spread. The member can throw it out and I will spread it.

MR. BAIRD:

You sure can, all over your face.

MR. BARRY:

Whenever we want it we will squeeze his head.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier was elected to govern. The Premier is there to govern. The Premier is there not to discourage, not to create despair, not to cause our people to go around with bent shoulders, with head down low, feeling that the fault of their situation is somebody outside the borders of Newfoundland, that somehow the fault lies with those dirty devils in Ottawa, you know, who are out to get Newfoundland - they are out to get Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker! Mr. Speaker, it is time that we all in this Province, every member in this House, every member of the Premier's Cabinet, the Premier, indeed every member of the general public of Newfoundland, it is time that we started to accept responsibility for our own destiny. It is time we started, Mr. Speaker, to have some self confidence. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we stopped being afraid to make a deal because we are afraid it is going to be like a deal that might have been made in the past where there were mistakes, Mr. Speaker. It is

MR. BARRY: time we started to have some courage, some confidence in our own ability to excel, Mr. Speaker. It is time we started to put our fellow citizens in Canada on notice that Newfoundland has arrived, that the people of Newfoundland are not to the stage where they overreact to a Newfie joke because they are afraid that there might be some truth in it. Mr. Speaker, the people of our Province are proud, self-confident, and the only, Mr. Speaker, reason for despair that they have facing them is the government which is in this House right now. Their despair, Mr. Speaker, does not have to come from their ability. They are an able people, Mr. Speaker. When Newfoundlanders move outside this Province for employment, as I will mention a little later on, they have to in ever increasing numbers, when Newfoundlanders move outside, Mr. Speaker, they compete with the best of them, and they do well, Mr. Speaker, they excel. And we have to get back in this Province to encouraging excellence. We have to get back, Mr. Speaker, rather than spreading doom and gloom, we have to start spreading some hope. We have to start showing our people that we can, through our own industrious activity, through our own endeavours, through taking responsibility ourselves for our destiny rather than blaming it on big bogeymen away, Mr. Speaker, take responsibility ourselves and we can make this Province a shining jewel in the North Atlantic.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity since I have crossed the floor to speak with a lot of members in my district, Mount Scio, a lot of people living in Mount Scio, and I have also had an opportunity to speak with a lot of people right across this Province, including —

MR. BAIRD: Leo the lion hearted.

MR. BARRY: - as the member knows, a very enthusiastic series of audiences in his own riding.

MR. BAIRD: I heard about it.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if the member heard, then the member trembles. And what I am hearing, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of this Province are sick and tired of excuses, they are

MR. BARRY: sick and tired of their government giving excuses rather than getting on with the job of improving conditions for them. The people in Corner Brook expect, Mr. Speaker, their government to do more than say, 'Oh, to hell with Bowaters! If they do not want to stay here we do not want them here! Get out!' before they have got anybody to replace them.

MR. BAIRD: Lies! Lies! Not true!

MR. BARRY: I watched the Premier on television. I watched the interview, Mr. Speaker. I listened carefully. I saw it, I heard it.

MR. YOUNG: You do not know what you heard.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, everybody in this Province hopes that more will be done for the people of Corner Brook than was done for the people of Labrador West. What we saw done for the people of Labrador West, Mr. Speaker, was to provide a couple of thousand dollars to them so that they could move. Move where? Move where, to what jobs, Mr. Speaker? Where is the employment for these people?

MR. DINN: What are your buddies in Ottawa doing for them?

MR. BARRY: What is the minister responsible for employment, the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn), done to see that these people in Labrador West get jobs? I hope that there is more done, Mr. Speaker, for the people of Corner Brook than has been done for the people of Labrador West.

MR. HODDER: You realize they have to move before they get the money.

MR. BARRY: That is right. That is right, Mr. Speaker. They can only get assistance if they move. They can only get money if they move.

MR. DINN: Of course, that is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the point is that there was nothing done, there was not a single thing done to provide alternate employment for these people, not a thing! And it is a scandal!

MR. DINN: It is what I thought it was.

MR. BARRY: I can understand the minister trying to shout me down, because if I were him I would be ashamed too! I would be ashamed!

MR. DINN: I would resign and run in Mount Scio if I were the member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Come on!

I would be ashamed too, Mr. Speaker, if I were the minister responsible for Manpower, if I had done no more than that minister has done for the people of Labrador West. He has done nothing, Mr. Speaker. He has done nothing. He supplies statistics, Mr. Speaker, statistics on the increasing rate of employment.

MR. MORGAN: On that side you are all incompetent.

MR. BARRY: Well, yes, you are. There is no question about that, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), if we could have a minute for confession here, for self-confession, could we say it again? The minister said we are all incompetent on that side, the Minister of Fisheries. If that is his assessment, I will take it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Be a man! Resign! I will resign and beat you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if that were to happen then the member would not be able to run in Bonavista - Trinity - Conception against Mr. Rooney, as all the people know he is going to do. I guess the polls show that they

MR. BARRY:                    have some difficulty. So the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker, realizing that he has got himself into a black pit, that he has no policies to offer the fishermen of this Province, has decided he has got to bail out, Mr. Speaker. Well, here is one fellow who decided he would not bail out to a soft federal seat. The job has to be done here, Mr. Speaker, and we will see whether the Minister of Fisheries has the guts to go out and fight, as he bails out, knowing he has no policies for the fishery, no policies for the fishery!



MR. BARRY: I have yet to see a policy come from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. MORGAN: He never would discuss things with the fishermen! He practiced law instead. Oh, the insincere gentleman!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, one thing about practicing law is that you always will be able to find employment if you ever decide to leave the House. And I hope the Minister of Fisheries is as lucky and that he will be able to find something to do when he is flung out in the next election. And maybe that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that he is being re-elected so often, because they know he will be like a naked babe in the snow, if he is ever thrown out of the House of Assembly, in terms of survival. It is sympathy, sympathy and pity. It is the kindness of the good people of Bonavista South, the sympathy. They know, Mr. Speaker, that he would be incapable of looking after himself because he is sure, Mr. Speaker, incompetent and incapable of looking after the fishermen of this Province.

MR. MORGAN: I have met certain clients of yours who have not got a good word for you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Any client, Mr. Speaker, whom I have acted for, I am happy to say, have gone away happy, have had a good job done for them, Mr. Speaker, which is more than I can say for the fishermen who are suffering under the yoke of that oaf.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: The Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, is going to have to run federal because he has got himself into a hole which he will never dig himself out of. The fishermen of Newfoundland are wising up, they are wising up because they see that the money is not there to pay for the boats that they were encouraged to buy by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). They relied on the Minister of Fisheries and they now find themselves in a position facing bankruptcy, facing insolvency, and the minister is not showing them where to turn. He is going to run federal just to get out of the mess that he has created. And we will all be watching, Mr. Speaker, to see where he runs.

MR. MORGAN: Grand Falls-White Bay, they would not have you up there.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, actually that poll was very good. That poll was excellent, Mr. Speaker, so I have heard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: I did not wait for it but some of my friends told me about it afterwards, so I have obviously, Mr. Speaker, given up a very safe and secure federal seat. But the job has to be done here in the Province. How could someone leave? It would be like coming upon an automobile accident, seeing barely moving bodies strewn all over the highway, and walking by. Because that is what the members opposite are leaving in this Province, they are leaving the ravages of our population behind them, Mr. Speaker. They are leaving the unemployed in Labrador West, Mr. Speaker. They are leaving our insolvent and bankrupt fishermen.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, they are leaving our small businessmen, who are finding themselves insolvent, no retirement incomes, no pensions and nowhere to turn in terms of new business opportunities. Everywhere they turn, Mr. Speaker, they are wreaking havoc. And if I were to run federal, Mr. Speaker, it would be like walking past that automobile accident with those twitching bodies on the side of the road.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): A point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as much as I enjoy the remarks from the other side, my hon. colleague there can take care of himself I am sure, but, Mr. Speaker, if you allow this to continue then the decorum of the House will deteriorate rapidly. What we are hearing now is not witty remarks or interjections from the other side in rebuttal to what my hon. colleague is saying, but you are hearing shouting from numerous members, and even from the doorways, Mr. Speaker, and they must think they are in a beer tavern somewhere. This is just not allowed. It is not permitted in this House, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. colleague should be allowed to make his speech in accordance with the rules of this House. Now we have seen too much of this, Mr. Speaker, too

MR. NEARY: too much arrogance from the members there opposite, Mr. Speaker, and I ask Your Honour to enforce the rules of the House so that my hon. friend can continue with his magnificent speech that he is making.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, of all people in this House who should be lecturing the members of this House about decorum, the last one in the world who should be doing it is the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Because if the decorum in the House has deteriorated, it is because of the actions of members on the other side and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that you are quite capable of dealing with what is happening.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I would remind hon. members that the person speaking has the right to be heard in silence. There has been a fair amount of interruption and dissension on both sides.

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point I wanted to make - and I will make a deal, I will not yell if members opposite will not yell - the point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier had this great coast to coast hookup and had this marvelous opportunity to inspire and motivate our people, to get this Province turned around again, to get business booming, get employment going and instead we saw doom and gloom laid on with a shovel, Mr. Speaker. Now, the one thing lacking in the Premier's statement was reference to how the government was going to generate new income. Mr. Speaker, not a single reference to how government was going to increase government

MR. BARRY: revenue, it was all on the expenditure side. The Premier said, 'We have got to cut, cut, cut, cut everything and start off by cutting the disposable income of our public service employees.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is only one side of the coin. Everybody knows that the Premier and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) have a difficult job and they have to cut expenditures. I might go on to ask the question why is it necessary to cut expenditures? It is necessary to cut expenditures not only because there is an economic recession world-wide or in Canada, other provinces have suffered from this same recession, other countries have gone through it, they are now in an upturn. Mr. Speaker, we have the Premier himself in his statement, if I remember correctly, admitting that the improvement in the Newfoundland economy was going to go - he projected a 1.5 per cent increase, I think it was, the Minister of Finance can correct me, a projected improvement of 1.5 per cent increase in the Gross Provincial Product for this coming year, 'And' the Premier said, 'the rest of Canada is going to be from 3 to 5 per cent'. Now that is a confession of failure. That is the Premier himself, in his own words, saying it is not just the economic recession in other provinces, in Canada or in the Western World generally. He has admitted by that statement that it is the effects of the recession plus his government policies. That is what has created a greater recession in this Province than in other provinces, this is what has led to a longer recovery period for this Province. We have the doom and gloom, the fiscal mismanagement, the lack of development policies of the Premier and his Minister of Finance and his government, that is what has forced them, that is what has forced government to start cutting expenditures. Now, Mr. Speaker, apart from the expenditure side there is, of course, the other side; if you

March 13, 1984

Tape No. 56

MJ - 3

MR. BARRY: do not have enough money in  
government, if you cut expenditures to the bone, then you  
have to start generating

MR. BARRY: new revenue. You cannot go out and borrow and borrow and borrow and borrow, any homeowner knows that. It does not take any great knowledge of finance to know that you cannot continue to borrow yourself out of the hole.

MR. MORGAN: You are an expert on fisheries, an expert on the offshore, an expert on finance.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the member just made a deal that I would not have to shout at him. Now I am going to start shouting at him again in a minute.

MR. MORGAN: An expert on the offshore, an expert on Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that the government, the Premier and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) should be proposing measures to see new business opportunities created in this Province, and from those new business opportunities we would see corporate profits which could be taxed, an additional corporate taxation. We would also see employment, we would see additional income for our people and, again, additional income taxes and more money for government coming in from these sources. But, Mr. Speaker, not a word, not a single word on how to generate new dollars. Now, that is such an obvious and terrible gap in any Premier's address on the economy I do not understand why the media has not risen up, and why the people have not risen up and said, 'What is going on here?'

Now, I think by the time this session ends if there is any one thing we will do it is we will bring out that message that there is no new income foreseen by this government, that there are no new policies for the generation of new business opportunities, of new jobs being planned by this government. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not just a matter of

MR. BARRY: government spending to generate jobs, we can also see jobs generated, business opportunities generated if we saw an improved business climate.

Mr. Speaker, picture yourself as a businessman in Nova Scotia, or say he is in Toronto and he has an option between setting up in Nova Scotia and setting up in Newfoundland, suppose he can operate equally well in either province, and he says, "Well, you know, I can operate just as efficiently, I can get the same quality of work force, trained people in Newfoundland, trained people in Nova Scotia, I can get the same financial arrangements, I can get everything the same, I wonder what the approach of the two governments is like?" And he starts comparing the approaches, and I just use Nova Scotia as an example, it could be New Brunswick, it could be PEI, it could be Alberta, it could be any province, Mr. Speaker, we have a government which is discouraging business because of its negative statements with respect to business, discouraging business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, EPA is an example. I agree, Mr. Speaker, and I will not support the concept that Mr. Steele should not supply information to government. I believe that any large corporation in this Province has a responsibility if there is going to be a decision taken by that company that is going to affect the livelihood of many Newfoundlanders. I believe there is a responsibility to keep government informed and to inform government as quickly as possible, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Steele looked somewhat bad by what appeared to be an unwillingness to give information to government.

MR. TULK: Look at the way they went about it.

MR. BARRY: Exactly, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Steele is a man who has had to show the self-reliance, the independence that all Newfoundlanders possess, Mr. Speaker, except, unfortunately, the members in government, because it is not self-reliance we





MR. BARRY:

that that is the cause of all the ills of Newfoundland. Now, it is funny that the government puts forth that it is important for this government to be involved in off-shore development so that the people can have the closest possible input into the way the resource is developed but the government does not put forth the same argument in Labrador when they take a decision on the harvesting of the Georges Lake - is it? - caribou herd, the Northern caribou herd or when they apply social services rules and regulations, which I agree have to be applied fairly and equally to everybody, but which, I also suggest, might be viewed in terms of whether they are appropriate for a particular area of the Province, whether they are sensitive to the needs of the people in a particular area of the Province, people with a particular culture, for example, a different culture, And I ask myself, why is it that the government does not seem to take the same approach to local control and local involvement in Labrador on those types of issues as they do with respect to the offshore? Is it just power? Is it just the Premier saying, "I want to have the power in my hands rather than Ottawa having any power."

Everybody supports, Mr. Speaker, everybody supports the notion that Newfoundland should control its resources to the degree necessary to be able to see a healthy, viable, vibrant provincial government here, but I know the members opposite dread the day, Mr. Speaker, when they would see an offshore oil agreement, they dread the

MR. BARRY: day when they would see a hydro agreement, they dread the day when they would see an agreement with respect to the Northern cod because they would have nothing to blame their failure on at that point in time, they would have nothing to blame their incompetence on at that point in time, they would have nothing to blame for their unwillingness, Mr. Speaker, to do something to improve the conditions of our people.

Mr. Speaker, there was a provincial forum on unemployment sponsored by the Youth Advisory Council in July of 1983, and I have a copy of a paper that was presented by a Mr. Robert Dornan, who at that time was the vice-president of the student council, and it is called Whilst Time Is Burning. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent little paper on the relationship between the level of education and the level of employment. Mr. Speaker, I have not seen any special measures being taken by the Department of Education, but in the course of debate - the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) may be inside in the Common Room. If she is, I hope she is listening or I hope one of her colleagues would raise it to her attention. Maybe she has responded to this report, I have not seen her response if so, but it relates the opportunity for employment to the level of schooling, the level of education. For example, for St. John's, representing the district of Mount Scio I know that there are many of my constituents who are suffering from unemployment.

MR. BARRY: The level of participation in the labour force for somebody who has less than Grade IX is 37.2 per cent, with a university degree it is 83.2 per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a direct correlation between the level of education and the opportunity for employment and I would hope to see in addition to the government taking some positive measures to stimulate the economy so that our young people can get out and get to work, I would hope that the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) commences a programme immediately to impress upon our young people now in school the importance of their staying in school. Many of them may have no choice now, there are no jobs available, but, Mr. Speaker, they should be given an incentive, they should be given a motivation, they should be shown that if there is any way of getting employment in these hard and difficult times, with a government that is not doing its job to create employment, the way of doing it is to get the greatest possible level of education, whether it be university, whether it be College of Trades or whatever. The College of Trades post-secondary, non-university education levels show participation rates up in the 70 per cents as opposed to the 80 per cents, Mr. Speaker. There are figures here for the Province as a whole, and everywhere you look you see the same correlation. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the things that the Minister of Education should be doing is getting some programmes in the schools right now to make sure that anybody who is hovering, any student that is having difficulty with their grades, impress upon them how desperate they are going to be when they get out there and there are no jobs to find and how they will have a better chance if they have a better level of education.

Mr. Speaker, one of the most frightening things that I have seen, which unfortunately is again a direct result of the policy of this government, is

MR. BARRY: contained in this recent report of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. It is called Persistence and Change. Now, Mr. Speaker, the press release that was issued, I do not know if it was intentional, I do not know if it was an attempt to gild the lily, the press release stressed how people seemed to be staying in the rural areas more now than they were in the early 1970s. The report stressed that the level of population in the rural areas is growing more quickly than the level of population in the urban areas. But, Mr. Speaker, we did not see a single mention in that press release, and I wonder if any government members opposite might comment as to whether they had any involvement in the release. - It was released by the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the Research and Analysis Division - I am wondering if the government had any input in terms of trying to improve the cosmetics of the essence of this report, because when you look on page 11 of this report, Mr. Speaker, it says that the world-wide trend over the last decade has been a net migration to peripheral areas from the industrial core areas. In other words, in recent years, rather than people moving into the cities and into urban areas, people have been moving into a more rural life style.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, between 1971 and 1976, this Province as a whole lost 8,210 persons. There was a net migration. In terms of the people who came in and the people who went out, there were more people who went out of this Province to stay out, to live out of this Province, than came in to live. And the number was 8,210, a brain drain, young people going away looking for work. But, Mr. Speaker, between 1976 and 1981, that net out migration grew to what? Take a guess. Do you think it would be as much as double? Mr. Speaker, it more than tripled. Between 1976 and 1981 we had 27,209 more people leave this Province than came in. They are being driven away. There is no employment.

MR. NEARY: They are being forced out.

MR. BARRY: They are being forced out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will be very interested when the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brings down his budget whether he can have some figures on net in-migration or out-migration. Are the people of this Province still being driven away since 1981? Are they being driven away to go to work in other provinces in ever-increasing numbers? I suspect you might find in 1982 that not as many were driven away as in the previous year because the employment was not out there in Alberta any longer, the employment was not in Toronto, so you probably had some slight improvement.

MR. NEARY: Saudi Arabia is where a lot of them are going.

MR. BARRY: Saudi Arabia, make a few dollars over there. I suspect you would see that there was an increase in the migration into Newfoundland because Newfoundlanders who had gone away to work were finding difficulty in those other provinces. But I bet you would

MR. BARRY: also find, Mr. Speaker, that when those people came back here they did not have jobs. You will also find, Mr. Speaker, that these people had to go either on welfare when their unemployment insurance went out, or they had to leave Newfoundland again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a sad commentary -

MR. NEARY: When you think about the 40,000 jobs they were going to create.

MR. BARRY: Yes, I was getting to that. That was my next point. It is a sad commentary. The Premier in 1979 projected 40,000 jobs would be provided and in 1981 he said the job was done. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when he brings down his budget, to indicate how many of those 40,000 jobs have been lost since 1981.

MR. NEARY: The 40,000 jobs were over in Halifax, Nova Scotia; that is where he created them.

MR. BARRY: I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, how many jobs have been provided by government since 1981. I believe that the Minister of Finance will owe a duty to this House and to the people of Newfoundland to identify just exactly what is happening today. And it is a sad commentary, Mr. Speaker, when we get to the stage when we see every year more and more people having to leave our Province. Now, the curious thing, Mr. Speaker - and it is not so curious, it is understandable - with the change of government in 1972, very soon after that you saw for a time a net in-migration, there were more people came into the Province than went out. I think it was within the next year, was it not?

MR. DINN: No. It never ever happened.

MR. BARRY: There was a period there.

MR. DINN:  
was 205 net out.

The lowest it went down to

MR. BARRY:

Two hundred and five people?

MR. DINN:

Yes, net out.

MR. BARRY:

Yes. Mr. Speaker, you saw, in any event - and I would have to check my figures. I am sure I saw there a few years ago the difference -



MR. BARRY: in any event the point is made, If it balanced out, I think we would be satisfied, if we had it equal between people leaving and people coming in. But the minister would agree that you saw an improvement in the migration patterns. And I believe, again, the same was true after the 1979 election to a certain extent, was it not? There was some improvement. And what it shows, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a feeling of hope generated when you see some new policies being brought in by a new government. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in Newfoundland today has happened before. What it is is a tired government. It is a government that has run out of ideas. It is a government that is not doing anything to stimulate the economy. It is a government that is not doing anything to encourage. It is not doing anything, Mr. Speaker, to give reason for hope, whether it be between Newfoundlanders and Newfoundlanders within the Province, or whether it be hope in Newfoundlanders outside the Province that conditions are going to improve so that they can come back to be able to work with their families right here and live and earn a gainful employment with their families in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard the Premier and his government talk a lot about management, talk a lot about wanting to be involved in the management of the offshore. Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a very interesting article in The Telegram, I forgot to write the date down but within the last week or so, entitled 'Management - Just What Is It?'. And it was written by Dr. James G. Barnes, the Dean of the Faculty of Business Administration at Memorial University. Mr. Speaker, what do you think he identified as the essence of management? He reviewed the literature, all these experts who talk about management and give seminars and they counsel businessmen on how to manage, how to improve

MR. BARRY: their management. And what do you think this gentleman concluded was the essence of management? He said, 'The principle characteristic which these various people identified among successful organizations' - the organizations that manage properly - ' was a tendency to do something. In other words, a bias for action.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the record of the government opposite. Is this a government which has shown itself capable of management? Is this a government with a tendency to do something? Mr. Speaker, one must conclude that this is a government which cannot manage, it is a government which does not have a tendency to do something. Just the opposite. It has a tendency to do nothing. It has a tendency to blame the ills and the worries, whether it be in the Marystown Shipyard or whether it be in Labrador West or any part of this Province where people are unemployed - it has a tendency to do nothing.

MR. TOBIN: That is not true Leo, and you know it is not.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it has a tendency to do nothing. It is a government which cannot manage. It is a government which is, Mr. Speaker, leaving itself open -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: You have to wait your turn after after Morgan.

MR. NEARY: You are a one term member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, members opposite may be interested in nastiness, but members on this side of the House are interested in debating the issues. We are interested in dealing with the real concerns of the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. And one, Mr. Speaker, of the things that has come clear -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: My voice is going. I will not try to yell over the racket.

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

MR. BARRY: When they finish, Mr. Speaker.  
One of the things, Mr. Speaker, which is becoming obvious with respect to the government opposite, Mr. Speaker, is that, and it is a very common characteristic of any government, Mr. Speaker, that has become stale, it is a very common characteristic, Mr. Speaker, of any government that engages in high-flown rhetoric, but, Mr. Speaker, the people know is doing very little for what is really important to the ordinary person in the street, and what is that characteristic, Mr. Speaker? That characteristic is a losing touch with reality, and I submit that the hon. members opposite have lost touch with the reality of this Province. Mr. Speaker, they have lost touch with the reality of this Province.

And, you know, there is a reason why this government has lost touch with reality. It is a reason which might not be apparent to anybody who is not working closely with government, is not spending a lot of time inside this Confederation Building, and, Mr. Speaker, the reason for government losing touch with reality is that we have a situation. — I think it is

MR. BARRY: called the yes-man's syndrome, the yes-man's syndrome - we have a situation where the Premier and Cabinet-and members opposite know of which I speak -the Premier and Cabinet have reached the stage where they only want to hear good news and they identify good news as being information which agrees with the government position. Mr. Speaker, more and more I saw,when I was minister and subsequently,more and more I saw a tendancy within the public service to be intimidated, to feel that their jobs were being threatened, even their very integrity as Newfoundland citizens, that they were going to be accused of being traitors if they happened to point out the other side of the coin on an issue where the government had taken a party line, public servants who dared question whether a particular programme was going to bring about the objectives that were sought. Everybody agrees with the objectives. And I hope there is one thing that we will not see in this House this session, this attempt to perpetrate a fraud on the people of this Province that somehow there is a difference in the objectives, that somehow members on this side are going to be less Newfoundlanders because we question whether they are going to get the objectives which we all share. And it was the same little

MR. BARRY:

trick that was tried by the Premier this afternoon. I am going to be very disappointed in him if he attempts to play it because the people are not listening, people know better. The Premier, his government, members opposite are not going to get away with questioning our integrity as citizens, our sincerity in trying to achieve the objectives which every politician in Newfoundland is trying to achieve, namely sufficient control over our resources to ensure they are developed for the maximum benefit of the people of this Province. So let us get past that. That is why I had no problem moving to this side of the House. I know that the objectives that are here, carried by my colleagues of the Liberal party, are fine objectives. They are good objectives, they are proper objectives to have for politicians in this Province. But I also know that they are prepared to question how do you go about getting those objectives? Do you go about getting control over your offshore resource by going to court before you have to, by throwing away the little bit of bargaining power you might have had from having a legal case, by tossing it down the drain? Do you get closer to an offshore agreement by doing that? Members opposite know that you do not. Members opposite know that instead, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN:

What did you say in 1982?

MR. BARRY:

And the member opposite will read the extract from Hansard where, in the heat of debate in trying desperately to put the best face on government policy, I am in there trying to defend the stupidity that enveloped the government every time that issue was raised. But, Mr. Speaker, I will ask members

MR. BARRY: opposite, I will ask members of caucus , I will ask members of government, I will ask the Premier to get up and deny whether the advice given by myself was followed.

MR. MORGAN: You gave no advice.

MR. BARRY: Get up and deny whether the advice I gave was ignored with respect to when to go to court and when not to go to court.

MR. STAGG: The hon member was silent.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) either was not there or is attempting to mislead this House. I give the member, Mr. Speaker, better credit and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, before he takes a position - and I welcome the member for Stephenville getting up, as I hope every member opposite will - and whatever these little games that the Premier plays he has not met this main point, that I advised him against going to court when he did. It was unnecessary. The Federal Court of Appeal did not decide on the offshore case. Now members opposite will get up and talk about - I think the member for Stephenville's term is 'selective hindsight.' Mr. Speaker, that was foresight. Nobody can be sure whether there are right or whether they are wrong when they give advice, Mr. Speaker, but the time comes when you have to ask, if the advice is not followed time, after time, after time , you have to ask, is there judgement over there? And I am glad that the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) brought it to my attention and I would ask him to get up.

MR. BAIRD: It will be brought to your attention many times.

MR. BARRY: I will ask him, Mr. Speaker, to get up and deny, as a man of honour, that what I say is correct. I ask him to get up and deny that.

MR. BAIRD: You must have dreamt that.

MR. BARRY: I ask them, Mr. Speaker, to deny that the Premier knew, he had the advice, that it was unnecessary to go to court with the reference to the Court of Appeal. He could have had it prepared and he could have had it all ready to go, and, if the federal Court of Appeal brought down a decision deciding on the offshore question, he could have had the reference in the Court of Appeal in Newfoundland that same morning, the same morning that it was brought down. No, Mr. Speaker!

MR. MORGAN: That is not true.

MR. WARREN: It is true. It is shocking!

MR. BARRY: I hope the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), who follows me, as a man of honour, deals with that point, Mr. Speaker. And I want to see, Mr. Speaker, whether the great principles of members opposite are that this House will not be misled by any statement of any member given in this House.

MR. MORGAN: What are you doing now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: I want to see whether members opposite are so desperate to cling to power, so terrified by the prospects that they see facing them in the next election, I want to see, Mr. Speaker, whether they are prepared to get up and attempt to revise history.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Because I was, Mr. Speaker, naive, and expecting the members opposite had sense enough to change their policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I raised, with respect to the offshore case, the question of why it was that, in going to the Newfoundland Court of Appeal, several crucial cases were left out of the Province's presentation. And, Mr. Speaker, that in no way was intended to reflect upon the competence or the ability -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I in no way wanted to reflect upon the competence and ability of the lawyers presenting the case but, Mr. Speaker, there was a very



MR. BARRY: complicated and extensive amount of material that we had been preparing.

MR. DINN: The expert did not (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: And the expert, the one person who most knew what it was crucial to extract from that material, Mr. Speaker, did not have the opportunity of dealing with -

MR. WALSH: He denied that.

MR. BARRY: And that is the point, Mr. Speaker, he did not deny that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: He denied, Mr. Speaker! We had the games being played, the same games today when the Premier refused to answer our question in Question Period; we had the same gamesmanship being played by the Premier and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), unfortunately, where the Minister of Justice released a statement, by the gentleman to whom I referred, that he had not told me that he had been frozen out. Mr. Speaker, did you hear the Minister of Justice say that that gentleman denied that it happened? No, Mr. Speaker, you saw games being played.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: And I want the Minister of Justice, I want the Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) to get up and tell this House point-blank, Mr. Speaker, whether or not that consultant had the opportunity to look at the final presentation and advise whether all the cases were in there that should be. I know that he did not, Mr. Speaker, and nobody over there has denied yet that he did or stated that he did. Nobody has denied what I said. They have attempted to mislead the press, by the games that were played, by word games, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask the press to go back and put the question again to the Minister of Justice: Has the Minister of

MR. BARRY: Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) obtained a denial, as to what I said, from the gentleman mentioned? Has the gentleman mentioned confirmed that he was consulted with respect to the final form - and I am not talking about at the beginning of the preparation of the case, I am talking about when the presentation was in its final

MR. BARRY: form - the factum was prepared and ready to go to our Newfoundland Court of Appeal. That has not yet been denied, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite cannot deny it.

MR. STAGG: We deny it.

MR. BARRY: Yes, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would deny anything, obviously. The member for Stephenville is ready to do anything that might see him get a Cabinet post; he will deny, he will agree, he will do whatever he wants. Now the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) here has said that he has issued him an invitation to come on over because at least he will get a shadow Cabinet post over here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member is a shadow of his former self.

MR. BARRY: The ghost who walks and talks.

MR. BAIRD: Where is the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) running in the the next election?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio is going to run in the next election in the place where I will be most - I hope it will be Mount Scio, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You hope!

MR. BARRY: I hope it will be Mount Scio. I understand that a potential candidate is being groomed already, I understand he wanted to have an office set up in the Confederation Building. We will have to check into that because I assume that means we can have the forty-four potential candidates whom we are going to line up, who will be the members the next time around, set up desks in the Confederation Building too to start doing the jobs for the constituents out

MR. BARRY: there that these members opposite should be doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I can assure members opposite wherever I run I will win and wherever they run they will lose.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: I will be running in Pleasantville.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the comment from my colleague behind me, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), is so appropriate. The hon. gentleman who just spoke in debate for his first time as a member of the Opposition is indeed, as the member for Stephenville just said, a shadow of his former self. But more than that, his humility shows so much this afternoon. What a humble person is the man who just left our caucus and crossed the floor because he could not live with the policies and could not live with our caucus under the present situation and he had to leave to cross the floor to join the Liberal Party.

The humble person who just sat down, the humble gentleman is an expert on the budgetary matters, an expert on the fishing industry, he is an expert on the offshore, he is an expert on how to create jobs, he is an expert on how to get investment to the Province, he is an expert on developing the Province, he is an expert on getting the economy moving, he is an expert on everything. Now, Mr. Speaker, the question has to be posed, because it is posed to me in all my travels the last couple of weeks around the Province. The gentleman who left your

MR. MORGAN: caucus, is he sincere? We feel he is not sincere.' These are quotes from the people whom I have met in my travels across the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the question of sincerity. There was a meeting held in St. John's about four or five days just prior to the public announcement of Mr. Barry leaving the PC caucus and crossing the floor to join the Liberal Party, a meeting to discuss politics. A meeting held in St. John's to discuss politics, a very heavy meeting, a meeting on strategy, a meeting on how to put programmes in place, a meeting on how to put policies in place - policies and programmes and strategies of what party?

MR. BAIRD: The Tory Party.

MR. MORGAN: Was it the Liberal Party? No. Guess what? It was the Tory Party. But who was there at that meeting? Who was there at that meeting

MR. MORGAN:

taking part in discussion on planning strategies to get rid of the Liberal Government in Ottawa, taking part in how to put forward programmes and policies to make sure we defeated Mr. Trudeau and his government, taking part in strategies to develop the offshore issue, how to put forward the offshore issue on behalf of the PC Party in the upcoming general election to get rid of Mr. Chretien and Mr. Trudeau, who at the time was still there, and Mr. Lalonde, and others? It was the hon. gentleman who just sat down, would you believe it? Three or four days before. Now, if he was sitting down with a Liberal group and discussing how he was going to arrange to put forward a policy, and like he said in debate back in May of '82, talking about policies of the party he just joined, he said - where is that famous quote? I had the quotes here. Oh, yes, here it is - "There are almost as many policies on the other side of the House of Assembly on any one issue as there are members." That is the same hon. gentleman who stood here and said that. Now, if he was sitting down in St. John's at that time and talking about putting in place new policies from this party he just joined, or was going to join three or four days after, if he was doing that it may have left a little inkling of sincerity on his behalf. But, no, he was not doing that, he was discussing the strategies and the policies and programmes that he wanted to put in place. Now, how was he going to put them in place? Here is the key question - sincerity. He was going to do one important thing in the upcoming general federal election. Guess what he was going to do? He was going to run against the federal minister for our Province. That was his aim.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), his district association was consulted. He held meetings with PC Party supporters about two weeks before he crossed the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Oh, they do not like it. They do not like. Oh, they do not like it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: They do not like it, Mr. Speaker, because the question is posed throughout the Province, How sincere is the hon. gentleman? How sincere is he in crossing the floor on issues in the Province today?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question of sincerity is being posed by the general electorate of the Province, it is being posed by the general populace and I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it is being posed in a very sincere way by the people of the Mount Scio riding. And there is no question in my mind that because of his sitting down with the people in Mount Scio and the planners for the next federal election, for our side, that the people in Mount Scio know the hon. gentleman who crossed the floor is not sincere.

Now is this the same gentleman who stood today in debate talking about what happened on the offshore issue? Is this same hon. gentleman the gentleman who suddenly, in a temperamental mood, made the decision to leave the caucus in the same manner as he made the decision to quit the Cabinet back in September of 1980? Mr. Speaker, I would beg to say that the hon. gentleman, in September of 1981, made a very rash decision, one that he was

MR. MORGAN: so sorry for within twenty-four hours that I was one of the gentlemen, as a Minister of the Cabinet, who was approached by a number of prominent PC party workers at his request, at the request of the hon. gentleman, to approach the Premier to try to get him back in the Cabinet again. He had made a rash decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT: Oh, no! Oh, no!

MR. MORGAN: He had made it in a fit of temper and he was sorry for his decision. He earlier said, 'Oh, the Minister of Fisheries was crying because he could not get an agreement with the federal minister.' The hon. gentleman was crying to get back in the Cabinet, he was actually crying to get back in the Cabinet. 'Talk to Mr. Peckford and get me back into the Cabinet'. Mr. Speaker maybe we can forgive him for the rash decision he made.

MR. SIMMS: Which one?

MR. MORGAN: The rash decision he made to leave the caucus and cross the floor to stand today and condemn the policies and programmes of this government.

MR. SIMMS: That was not rash, that was two years coming.

MR. MORGAN: Now, while I am on the topic, the question is sincerity or insincerity on his part. The hon. gentleman, the day he quit and crossed the floor, he wrote a letter. The letter was written to an individual in our caucus. It was sent to the individual in our caucus addressed. The hon. gentleman, the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart). It was addressed to him. Addressed to him in what capacity?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Chairman of the Caucus.

MR. MORGAN: Chairman of the Caucus. But, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Caucus for over a year prior to that was the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. McLennon). He did not even know who the Caucus Chairman was.



SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, it clearly shows that the hon. gentleman who today is standing up to condemn the fisheries policies, to condemn me as minister, to condemn the various ministers, to condemn the Premier and his policies, and the Minister responsible for Energy and the offshore (Mr. Marshall), condemn all of our policies and what we stand for in keeping this Newfoundland going in the last couple of years - I said earlier across the floor and I will say it again for the record of this House of Assembly, we have had a number of important caucus meetings, caucus meetings convened by the Chairman of the Caucus, mostly at the request of the leader of the party, the Premier of the Province, to do what? To make sure that this is not a government run by one man, number one, because he is always delegating authority and responsibility for the government to the various ministers in committees. That is number one. But, Mr. Speaker, our Premier goes beyond that. He consults the caucus on major issues.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, when we had the big issue of restructuring the deep-sea fishery, the issue he stood and condemned in the House today, he condemned the restructuring policy, 'It is not working,' he said, 'It is not solving the problem of the fishing industry,' let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, the day that we had the most important discussion ever on the fisheries, it was to ratify and to agree for the Premier to finally sign on behalf of the government, as Intergovernmental Affairs Minister and Premier, leader of our Province, to sign with the federal government, we had a major discussion on the fishing industry in the caucus, not in the Cabinet, in the caucus, when we had the members from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), and Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), and Fortune -

March 13, 1984

Tape No. 67

MJ - 3

MR. MORGAN: Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), and all the other members with fishing districts, when we had them invited in to have input and discussion and to become fully aware of

MR. MORGAN:

what was being done by the Government of Newfoundland in dealing with the federal government, did the hon. gentleman then appear? He knew there was a major caucus on fisheries.

MR. MATTHEWS: He did not even show up.

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, that day he did not even show up. Now, how can the same hon. gentleman stand in this House and pretend to be sincere on behalf of the Province, or the fishermen and the fishing industry in this Province, when he could not even find the time to put forward his views and concerns, to discuss with the caucus and with the Premier and the minister and others in the government the problems or any concerns he had, in the fishing industry.

MR. MATTHEWS: Where was he?

MR. MORGAN: I know where he was and caucus members all knew where he was at the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Where?

MR. MORGAN: He was down representing the Bank of Nova Scotia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: And what were they doing?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Mount Scio?

MR. SIMMS: Opening all of the fish plants.

MR. MORGAN: There was a major legal case. I do not want to in anyway say there is anything wrong with representing a bank or any other business as a lawyer, it is straightforward, that is legal business, nothing wrong with that, but here was an issue with a very serious conflict because the bank was doing something we did not want to see them do at the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: What was the bank doing? The bank, upon legal advice and legal opinion, was putting thousands of Newfoundlanders out of work by placing Fishery Products

MR. MORGAN: in receivership. Now that was what was going on that same day. So the big company went into receivership upon the legal advice and the legal opinion of the advisors of, in this case, the Bank of Nova Scotia, which placed one of the major fish companies we had in the Province in bankruptcy. And that is the reason why we did not get any input from the same hon. gentleman who now stands in the House to condemn the policies, and condemn our policy in particular, in the fishing industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate thing is that my friend, and I call him my friend, I worked with him in Cabinet back when Mr. Moores was Premier, I worked with him as a working colleague. He was in caucus, we worked together, we always got along well together but there was one problem, it was that his views and his opinions and his policies and beliefs had to always prevail. He could never be led. And what a very adequate quote was put by one of his constituents, I saw him on CBC television. He was asked, 'What do you think of Mr. Barry crossing the floor and joining the Opposition?' I hope I can quote him properly and adequately. He said, 'Well, Sir' - no I think it was a lady - 'Well, Madam', he said, 'any man who cannot be led can never make a leader'. He was talking to a reporter and he said, 'Madam, any man who cannot be led can never lead or be a leader'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: And you know, Mr. Speaker, that is the whole problem. He is a fine gentleman, an intelligent gentleman and I like him, but the fact is he could never accept the decision of the last Progressive Conservative Party Leadership Convention.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, he only got a few more votes than I got, just a few more votes that is all, but I accepted

MR. MORGAN: the decision. I accepted the decision, Mr. Speaker. I did not come in and say, 'Now, Mr. Peckford, I threw my support behind you at the convention and you are going to do as I say and my views must prevail. I must have my way, I must get my way.' That is not what was done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. SIMMS: Who said that?

MR. MORGAN: But, Mr. Speaker, you see the problem was from that day on our colleague, our colleague in the Opposition, could never accept the fact that he was not the Leader of this Party and he could never be a good crew member, he could never be a good team player and that is the major criticism I have of the hon. gentleman. And I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you, if the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has aspirations to stay on as Leader of that Party, oh, watch the fun coming up in the Liberal Leadership Convention in October, because the hon. gentleman cannot be led. He will go all out to be leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN: And that is the only reason why he has crossed the floor of the House to join the Party, not because he is so strongly opposed to what the Premier stands for. Mr. Speaker, how could the hon. gentleman just after the last election, how could he stand in this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - Mr. Speaker - well, speaking of last elections, the last election we had was a by-election in Terra Nova and I know of one I know of one jubilant character celebrating our victory with us that night who is now over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 13, 1984

Tape NO. 68

SD - 4

MR. MORGAN:

Oh, the insincerity of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. MORGAN:

Now in May of 1982, the hon.

gentleman was standing here not as a minister, as a private

MR. MORGAN:

member, standing here shortly after an election campaign had been very successfully waged and won by the Premier and the party here. And he had been standing for election in Mount Scio district on the same policies and programmes of our government, of the Premier. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if he had opposed the policies of the Premier at that time, he would not be in the House today. He would not be here today as a member of any party. You see, he campaigned quite sincerely, in believing that what the Premier was doing and saying and his policies were right and good for the Province. Now, if they were good back in April of 1982, what have we done? Have we suddenly revamped all our policies? Have we suddenly changed all our programmes? Have we suddenly brought in brand new policies on the offshore? Have we suddenly said, 'Now, Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Chretien, we have a brand new policy here, a brand new position on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and the people of our Province and we want these demands filled right now!?' Have we done that? Did the Premier turn around and say, 'Oh, yes, Mr. Chretien, you can take it all, you can go ahead and do it!?' Did we do that? No. He did not cross for that reason. So why did he cross? And that is the question I am posing regarding the sincerity or insincerity of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman in May, after the election - Newfoundland, speaking of the proposal on the offshore, quoting from Hansard, and this can be tabled as required by the rules of the House. First of all, he referred to the inefficient bungling and stupidity on all economic matters of the government in Ottawa. That was in May.

Now, let me pose a second question. Has the government in Ottawa so drastically changed their

MR. MORGAN: policies to do good things for  
Newfoundland?

MR. BARRETT: No!

MR. MORGAN: No!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: So he could not have crossed the floor for that. So he has not crossed the floor because we changed our policies. He has not crossed the floor because the policies changed in Ottawa. I would say, Mr. Speaker, there is a motive somewhere, there is a question mark. And that question mark - oh, there is no question in my mind! That question is asked by thousands of Newfoundlanders, and the question mark is posed more strongly by the residents of Mount Scio district. No question.

MR. SIMMS: Right on!

MR. MORGAN: Now, the hon. gentleman kept referring this afternoon to the - I made some notes while he was speaking here, just notes, I have nothing prepared. He talked about the proposal put forward to Ottawa and he talked about the manner in which it has been dealt with since. And reading back into the Hansard and looking at what he had to say - oh, here is a nice quote, Mr. Speaker, this is after the last election: "Mr. Speaker, what we see on the opposite side of the House is a party making the same mistake which led to their utter humiliation at the polls last month."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Oh, what a lovely quote! I will table it, Mr. Speaker. I will table it. The evidence is here.

Now, that is the same party the hon. gentleman has joined, the party that was utterly



MR. MORGAN: humiliated at the polls during the April, 1982 election.

MR. ANDREWS: 'Lord, it is hard to be humble!'

MR. MORGAN: Now, what does he say at the same time in debate on the proposal on the offshore is such a big issue with him today in the House? "The proposal is an acceptable one. It is a reasonable one."

MR. TOBIN: Oh?

MR. MORGAN: That is what he is saying, yes, as a private member of our caucus. Now, the issue at the time was referring the matter to the courts. Now, that was the issue at the time this debate took place and the hon. gentleman was speaking in that debate.

MR. MORGAN:

And he goes on to say, 'what the Province is seeking is reasonable and they should be supported'. And, of course, the people of Newfoundland supported them 60 per cent. He was proud of it then because he just came back from Mount Scio with a victory. I was surprised this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when he condemned the legal opinions and the legal advice on our offshore case in the courts, Today he did. Did he in May? There is a quotable quote, Mr. Speaker, from the same sincere gentleman. There is a quote. 'It is not that this Province is afraid of going to the court. Let nobody underestimate the strength of our legal case!'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: The same gentleman this afternoon stands up and says. We should not have gone to the court, it was a mistake, We did not do our homework, we did not have our homework done to show we had a strong legal case! Now, Mr. Speaker, I heard him a few days ago - oh, I wish, Mr. Speaker, you had heard the Premier's programme today. I listened today and some of my caucus colleagues were listening. I hope the Opposition was listening. Everybody is saying, Oh, the Premier is down in popularity. Because some little professor at the University did a little poll among the Board of Trade members of St. John's -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - they are saying the Premier's popularity is down. Oh, they are all begging the Premier to go to Ottawa to sign a deal. Who cares about ownership? Who cares who owns it? Sign it, we need work. Now, we know we need work, we know it. I am not being unfair to the business community of St. John's, but they are

MR. MORGAN: desperate to get a deal, any kind of a deal and have the Premier take that deal to get things moving now. The hon. gentleman supported the Premier strongly in the last election, but he campaigned more than in Mount Scio. Because I recall him saying a number of times in his speeches, 'we are not going to take the goodies just for now, we are standing firm for the future of our Province.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, in condemning the Government of Newfoundland like he did a few days ago - I hear him in the media say that it was a mistake to refer the offshore issue to the courts. Now, he has been saying it quite often since becoming a Liberal, but what did he say as a private member of our caucus in the debates in the House of Assembly, speaking for his constituents who voted him in on the issue, in Mount Scio? Let me quote the whole thing. 'Mr. Speaker, we were put to the situation where we had no choice. The federal government with its arrogance' - and the same arrogance is still there, my colleague and friend from Mount Scio, it is still there in Ottawa - 'in its refusal to respond with the fact that it was pushing another case in the federal court of Canada, the SIU case, put this Province in a situation where it had no choice but to refer the matter to the Supreme Court of Appeal of Newfoundland.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: So he was recommending that we do it, and now he says we were wrong doing it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who was speaking,

MR. MORGAN: he was of the opinion -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - a few days before crossing  
the floor.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, earlier in  
the day during debate I thought I had heard the Minister  
of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) say something that I considered  
to be unparliamentary, so I asked Hansard if they would  
provide me with a transcript and just this moment it  
has been delivered to me. I could not raise the matter  
until this moment because I had to have a verification.  
Mr. Speaker, "Direct threats which attempt to influence  
members' actions in the House are undoubtedly breaches  
of privilege," page 23, Section 71 in Beauchesne. "They do, however,  
provide serious problems for the House. They are often

MR. HODDER: "made anonymously and it is rarely possible for the House to examine them satisfactorily. The common practice today is to turn the responsibility for investigating them over to the ordinary forces of the law!"

Mr. Speaker, in raising this question of privilege, I might quote Beauchesne. Section 81, which says, "By its nature, a question of privilege is of such importance that it may be raised at any time." Mr. Speaker, as members should know, we can raise privilege when the due execution of the powers of a member of the House is being threatened. And Sir Erskine May has said that 'they are enjoyed by individual Members because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its Members.'

Now earlier in the day, Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was speaking and the transcript shows very clearly that the Minister of Fisheries says, "I am going to get you yet." Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a direct threat.

MR. DINN: And he is certainly doing that right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: That is a direct threat and Section 15, also Section 67, and Section 71 would make the minister's words to be totally unparliamentary and a breach of the privileges of this House.

Mr. Speaker, we are well aware of how low the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is, and we are all aware that the Premier would put the Minister of Fisheries up to follow the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry)

MR. HODDER: because he is the member in this House who will stoop lower than any other person, Mr. Speaker. So I would table the transcript and I would ask the Speaker to rule on that particular point of privilege.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have never in my born days heard such a puerile point of privilege. The reason why the hon. gentleman is bringing it up is that he is smarting while the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is wilting.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, what he alleges by the words, "I am going to get you yet," — Mr. Speaker, all the voters in Mount Scio, as Mr. Patrick Canning did before down in Burin-Placentia, are going to get the hon. gentleman yet. "I am going to get you yet" can mean "I am going to get you in debate" and that is what the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has done most effectively this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the only redeeming feature of the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), as we all know, is he is a semi-expert in karate, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Fisheries, would be making physical threats of such a champion at that great martial arts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, I say to the hon. gentlemen there opposite, do not be so foolish. You are in disgrace in this Province as it presently is, do not heap disgrace upon yourselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The matter of privilege is always a very important matter to be raised and I shall take the matter under advisement and rule on it later.

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I can get fired up again now with five minutes to go. So far I used the question of sincerity and, question mark, sincerity or insincerity, and I left it open. Based on the argument I used I cannot find any reason with any rationale to it why the hon. gentleman moved when he did without any knowledge of most of us in caucus, etc. I wonder was it a meeting that took place in a Newfoundland Hotel? Now this is separate from the meeting of the PC Party on strategy, because once he realized that in Grand Falls-White Bay he was unable to beat Mr. Rompkey, as the polls showed, and once he got little or no encouragement from the PC Party workers in that federal riding to run as their candidate, he started to look around. Well, he did a little poll on the South Coast. Again his popularity was not very good because of the way he was getting on in recent weeks criticizing the Premier and his policies, sniping from within the caucus, etc., so he had little or no showing. So then he had to make a move. And this afternoon I find it more than coincidental that his remarks on the fishing industry are very similar to somebody else I am hearing these days travelling the Province, holding these Unity '84 meetings, political statements attacking the Premier. For some strange reason he was good to me in Bonavista, he never said a word against me in Bonavista, the Minister of Fisheries;

MR. MORGAN: in fact I do not think he even mentioned me in Bonavista. That was wise on his part. But he is attacking the Premier and attacking the Government in Ottawa, moreso the Premier personally. In fact it was a bit much to listen to some of the comments - and I told them that, the union people-to listen to these kinds of personal attacks on the character of the Premier and the Premier's office when it was unjustified. The Premier of this Province has done nothing to hurt the fishermen. He has done everything he possibly can to help the fishing industry, everything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: The Premier and his government put forward in the last few years, over and above the \$31 million gone into the new deepsea restructured company, a further \$30 million into the independent companies, and a further \$21 million into loans and grants to fishermen for boats and equipment for fishing activity.

Now this meeting, it was more than a coincidence to me when I was on my way to Japan with the federal minister - apparently the member said I was crying because I could not get a deal with him. We get along great Mr. DeBane and myself - we were travelling by way of Toronto and I had called the editor of the Globe and Mail no longer than ten minutes before, and I said, Mr. Editor, I tried to reach a certain reporter a few days ago to talk about the restructuring of the fishing industry, his name is Mr. Harris, Michael Harris, and I said I was told, and my PR in the office was also told, that he was on a leave of absence, he is not putting any more stories in the Globe and Mail he is on a leave of absence, he is writing a book. So I accepted that so I did not follow up to contact him on doing an interview on the fishing industry. Lo and behold! when I get in Toronto



MR. MORGAN: there is a story, not about the fishing industry, from a man on leave, came back from leave for a special story. A story about what? Again a personal attack on the Premier of our Province. We all know the story was in the Globe and Mail. Now suddenly that came out of a meeting that took place down in a Newfoundland Hotel, a little gathering.

MR. BARRY: No, no!

MR. MORGAN: I suppose the hon. gentleman from Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is going to say he was not in the hotel that weekend. He did not talk to Mr. Harris prior to the story in the Globe and Mail on the Premier of our Province. But I know he did talk to Mr. Harris, he talked to Michael Harris -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The member opposite is impugning my integrity in stating -

MR. MORGAN: Yes, I am.

MR. BARRY: - and admits it, Mr. Speaker. First of all I did not have a meeting with Mr. Harris in the Newfoundland Hotel. Secondly, I did speak with Mr. Harris, as I told the press when asked. Mr. Harris questioned me, interviewed me as to whether I had any information about the points in his story. And I told him I knew nothing about any of the points raised in the story. Nothing, Mr. Speaker. And I ask - and we have the admission of the minister - I ask that he withdraw that attack on my integrity, withdraw unconditionally, completely and totally right now, and have the guts to deal with the issues rather than with this personal garbage that spews out of him at every opportunity.

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

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

MR. BARRY: It is a point of privilege.

MR. MORGAN: It is a point of privilege.

If by me saying and him confirming that he had talked to Mr. Harris, a reporter, and if that is going to impugn any of his character or anything on his character or against him, if he is guilty by talking to Mr. Harris, what is he guilty of? All I said

MR. MORGAN:

was he talked to the reporter, which was confirmed to me, and suddenly I found this reporter doing a personal attack on the Premier. Now that is one thing. But at the same time he could not find time to cover the issues on the most important industry we have, the fishing industry. That is what bothers me. So it can be easily confirmed. I called the editor of the Globe and Mail, and he can confirm this, and talked to him and he said, 'Mr. Minister, the reporter that covers the issues from Newfoundland is on leave, he is not reporting any issues from Newfoundland.' But yet the next morning here was a story on a different issue. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more to come, so tune in on Tuesday afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, very quickly to that point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: It is not a point of privilege for somebody to say in this House that a person is speaking to somebody else outside the House, but it is getting late now.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, he cannot do that. He finished about ten minutes to six o'clock, according to our calculations, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: He has one hour.

MR. NEARY: He does not have one hour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: He does.

MR. SIMMS: He does on a non-confidence motion.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if I may.

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

Order, please!

There may be others who wish to

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): speak to the point of privilege.

The debate has been adjourned, it is six o'clock and we should perhaps pursue the matter tomorrow.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 14, 1984, at 3:00 p.m..