

VOL. 3

NO. 29

THIRD SESSION OF THE  
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 2, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural,  
Agricultural and Northern Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement with respect to recent reports of a gasoline shortage on the Coast of Labrador from Cartwright to Red Bay. As hon. members are aware these reports arise each Spring and the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) has brought the matter to my attention. I have not received any complaints from any other source. My officials have held discussions with the hon. member referred to.

In view of the perennial nature of this matter officials of my department in Labrador have instructions to monitor the possibility of shortages of any kind and they have kept a close watch on the situation this year in advance of any reported shortages.

It is important to emphasize that my department, and in fact this government, is not in the business of retailing gasoline, fuel, or other supplies to residents on the South Coast of Labrador. Fuel is provided through Ultramar in the Strait area, Labseaco and Woodward's Oil along the rest of the Coast. There is ample storage capacity at the site of their dealerships to carry residents through even the most severe Winter. The storage of adequate fuel supplies is, or should be, a straight business arrangement.

MR. GOUDIE: It may well be that sufficient fuel should be provided on consignment to the respective dealers, or through some other business arrangement, to prevent recurrence of the annual Spring uncertainty.

While there is a shortage of gasoline for sale at Mary's Harbour, Fox Harbour, William's Harbour, Port Hope Simpson, Charlottetown and Lodge Bay, I am informed that a substantial number of residents have private stocks. There is no shortage in the Strait area or at Cartwright. Ample supplies of diesel fuel are available for the fishery.

The snowmobiling season is almost over but many people use gasoline during the salmon fishery which starts

MR. GOUDIE: about mid-June. As there is no ice in the Straits, supplies could be brought in from L'Anse au Loup should they be required. I have asked my officials to contact the suppliers and also to continue to monitor the situation in the best interests of the residents of Coastal Labrador.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I notice from the promotion of the meeting between the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the President of Canadian Pacific that the hon. Minister of Transportation was scheduled to meet with the President of Canadian Pacific today to discuss the regional air service in Newfoundland and Labrador. Could the hon. minister inform the House if the Cabinet have yet rescinded their boycott, if they have rescinded the order that public servants are not to travel on Eastern Provincial Airways? Did the hon. gentleman inform the President of Canadian Pacific this morning that that Cabinet directive has been rescinded?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, that is a question that was asked in that manner by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) before on several occasions. As in other matters of fact he is not correct, or the facts that he is trying to quote are not correct, that we never issued a Cabinet directive suggesting that we would boycott EPA. What we did was rescind a preference order made some time ago to assist Eastern Provincial Airways in a small way by suggesting that, when government officials and people travel where they had a choice they would choose to fly with Eastern Provincial Airways, which is our regional and

MR. DAWE: local carrier. That order has been rescinded, which means that public servants now who are travelling on government business, if there are two or three alternative means of air travel then they choose themselves which is the most convenient for them.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a rose by any other name smells just as sweet. The hon. gentleman does not call it a boycott; I do not know what else you could call it. The hon. gentleman talks about being correct, yet he refused to give information to this House that he gave to The Evening Telegram about his use of chartering Labrador Airways aircraft that was 100 per cent

MR. NEARY: correct when we made the accusation from this side of the House. We will deal with that at another time. But, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman how are the public servants now travelling? Are they flying Labrador Airways, the majority of them? Are they renting cars or are they flying EPA?

MR. ROBERTS: The ministers are going in chartered aircrafts.

MR. NEARY: I know how they are going. We know how the minister is travelling.

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that perhaps public servants, when they are travelling, I am sure that there are some of them using all the available commercial air travel. There are some of them who from time to time have to hire cars from various agencies that do that sort of business. There are others who use public means of transportation in that we do have some cars available in the various departments either owned directly by the departments or for the purposes of general use in a car pool system. Some of them, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, from time to time walk to where they are carrying out business. Others, I am sure, as I have from time to time, taken the CN bus. I understand, Mr. Speaker, some time ago there was an experiment at least by one individual who was carrying out government business and used a horse. There are, I am sure, occasions when others have used the various means of water transportation. There are those who, again including myself, Mr. Speaker, who have from time to time used snowmobiles in areas of the Province where that was applicable to get from one community to another. And wherever possible, Mr. Speaker, the people -

MR. MARSHALL: There are some of us who use bicycle.

MR. DAWE: Yes. I am reminded as well by

MR. DAWE: my colleague that there are those of us who travel by bicycle from time to time both for business and pleasure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I think it is reasonable to say, and the facts do speak for themselves, that public servants and officials of this government when they travel use whatever means that is applicable for the situation, as economically as it can be done, as efficiently as it can be done, but at the same

MR. DAWE:

time, Mr. Speaker, remembering that the primary purpose of the civil service and of government is to serve, our prime objective is to make sure that we bring government and the services of government to the people of this Province, and we will do it by whatever means possible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised the hon. gentleman did not say that the Premier was walking across the harbour on water these days. That will soon happen.

MR. YOUNG: He will do it. In time he will do it. Give him time.

MR. NEARY: He will soon do it, I know. He will soon be doing it. Hon. gentlemen think that he will soon be doing it. I do not mind the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) being dense and refusing to answer the question, but his arrogance, Mr. Speaker, the arrogance of the hon. gentleman really comes through from that side of the House.

Let me put the question to the hon. gentleman again, In case the hon. gentleman is too dense to understand the question, let me ask again. How are the majority of public servants travelling these days? Are they travelling on Eastern Provincial Airways, or are they travelling on the airline promoted by the Premier, Labrador Airways? Are they travelling on the aircraft that the hon. minister charters, the company that he charters from? How are they travelling, the majority? Because the Premier did leave the impression that the public servants were not to use Eastern Provincial Airways.



MR. DAWE: No, he never.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I beg your pardon, the hon. gentleman did.

MR. DAWE: That is where you are wrong.

MR. NEARY: Now could the hon. minister tell us how the bulk of the public servants are travelling? Is it EPA, or is it the airline that the hon. gentleman charters the planes from, Labrador Airways?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, you talk about being dense. Well, we have on this side of the House various ministers and myself who have answered some of the questions put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. It is very difficult most times to try and formulate an answer to a non-question. We do try. And from time to time we have been successful in getting the information through but that aspect of it has been very limited.

The bulk of civil servants who travel by air use aircraft. The bulk of civil servants who travel on the ground use vehicles, cars, trucks, pick-ups, this sort of thing. The bulk of civil servants that travel by water use boats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is really smart. The hon. gentleman obviously will not answer the question because they have something to hide, Mr. Speaker. He either does not know the answer or they are trying to cover up for something. So, Mr. Speaker, I see I am not going to get the answer from the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, for some unknown reason.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should be able to answer that question, it is a simple question; he either does not have the information, or, in his ignorance he is trying to bluff his way out of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman about the passenger service on the Quebec-North Shore Railway. Hon. members are aware that an application has been made to the Canadian Transport Commission to drop that passenger service. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House what steps the administration that he is a member of have taken to intervene, if any, into protesting the dropping of that service to the people of Labrador West?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, finally a question that has some meaning to it. Yes, we are very much aware of the situation as it relates to the request from that particular railway to abandon the rail passenger service from Sept Iles to Schefferville, and that would include, of course, Labrador West.

My colleague, the MHA for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) and myself have had several conversations about it. Our officials have been in touch with CTC. There will be a formal, written intervention in the hands of CTC in the next few hours. As well, Mr. Speaker, we have gone further than to voice our real, genuine concern as it relates to abandonment of a service that provides the only alternative to air travel, from a passenger point of view, out of Labrador into other parts of mainland Canada, and that will be the prime argument we will be putting forward.

As well, Mr. Speaker, we want the opportunity for the people in Labrador to voice their concerns and have indicated to CTC verbally, and we

MR. DAWE: will be doing so in writing in the next few hours, as I indicated, that we want a public hearing to take place in Labrador so that the people in the area, the councils and individuals can have an opportunity to voice their concerns first-hand to the CTC.

MR. SIMMS: Good answer.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a final question for the hon. gentleman in the transportation field. Can the hon. gentleman tell the House if the environmental impact study on the Trans-Labrador Highway has started yet? Is it correct, in the news reports that I have heard, that it may delay the construction of the Trans-Labrador Highway, the road to Happy Valley - Goose Bay, by as much as two years? Will the hon. gentleman give the House a few details on that particular matter?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, after we have gotten rid of the dribble we are finally getting into some sensible questions.

Yes, for the past months, a year and a half or so, we

MR.DAWE: number of months, a year and a half or so, we have been dealing with the issue as it relates to the Trans-Labrador Highway. After many, many years of trying to solicit co-operative funding from the federal government we were successful in doing that, and we are now into a three year phase to build a Trans-Labrador Highway beginning in Labrador West and running, first of all, to Ross Bay and then a route that will be decided finally through an environmental assessment process. That process is well underway. There have been numerous meetings between officials of the various departments and agencies, both federal and provincial, who have some concerns as it relates to the building of roads through virgin territory. There have been a number of meetings with the MHA representing Menihek (Mr. Walsh), the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), the minister to my right, my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) whose Wildlife Division has some particular interest in that.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.DAWE: As well, Mr. Speaker, we have had involved in those conversations my colleague the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) . We have discussed the issue fully. I have talked as recently as yesterday, by phone, to one of the mayors of one of the communities directly involved in Labrador West and have assured him, as we have been assured by the people who are carrying out the various studies, that the process is in hand, it is ongoing now. Some of the studies have been activated and will be completed. The only delay,

MR. DAWE: as I indicated yesterday, that may be an obstacle to that road being completed will be if the federal government does not come forward with the second phase of the cost-sharing programme. The environmental process was designed to protect the environment in this Province and it is a very positive piece of legislation that we on this side of the House are very proud of. It is not intended to stifle development or to slow it down, it is intended to compliment development by making sure that progress in that particular area of transportation, or some other developmental aspect, goes ahead but at the same time protects the environment adequately so that future generations can look back and see what positive and worthwhile legislation the people who are represented on this side of the House now put forward.

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

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before I carry on with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), who I am sure will look forward to enlightening us even further let me ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), a question or two about the negotiations between the Police Brotherhood, representing the members of the constabulary on one hand -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Is somebody ill on the other side, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: They are all ill.

MR. ROBERTS: - and, on

MR. ROBERTS:

the other hand, I believe it is the Treasury Board that represents the government in these matters. We understand that negotiations were underway and that they have now broken off. We have not asked any questions, obviously, before this, but I wonder if the minister could perhaps bring us up to date on this. Could he tell us whether negotiations have broken off, if so, why, and when will they resume?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not aware that negotiations have broken off. Although they may not be going on today, they may be adjourned to a certain day, but, to my knowledge, they have not broken off.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it may be that I am aware and the minister is not, or it may be that the minister is aware and I am not. I wonder if he would agree to look into it and let the House know, tomorrow or Friday, whenever it is convenient to him. I think he is nodding acquiescence. If he wants to answer I will yield to him.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will certainly do that. As I said, to my knowledge there is no break-off in the sense that that means, you know, they may not be meeting today or have met yesterday or be meeting tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister and I certainly am not referring to an interruption today, you know, an adjournment or anything like that. I can only tell him that so we understand on the basis of our information that may or may not be correct, I am not warranting it. That is why I ask him here in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CARTER: You have spies?

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. CARTER: You have spies?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from St. John's North that the age of the brown paper envelope and the phone call is back again. That is how we know, for example, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is using government aircraft to go to his constituency and the Premier is using government paid aircraft. That is how we know these things, and that is why I wanted to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), as I have.

MR. CARTER: Are these paid spies?

MR. ROBERTS: I assume, Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend from St. John's North, they are paid by the public, they are not paid by us. They get their pay in good conscience in knowing they are serving honour and decency, unlike my friend from St. John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me come to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). Yesterday, as he may recall - I do not want to interrupt the minister, but he is reading something.

DR. COLLINS: I am listening.

MR. ROBERTS: Alright, he has the ability, Sir, to read and to listen at the same time. I only wish he

MR. ROBERTS: had the ability to speak and to think at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the minister, yesterday, as he will recall, I was asking him some questions about this new policy under which 'Wallace' is robbed to pay 'John', under which the Minister of Health (Mr. House), under certain circumstances, will pay -

MR. SIMMS: Very good!

MR. ROBERTS: It is very good, I say to my friend from Grand Falls. Much of what we say is very good, as is much of what he says. It is too bad that what he says in the House is not very good, but that is another story.

Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) indicated that under certain circumstances, the Health Department will provide additional funds to enable the RST to be paid on the purchase of an item that some group donates to a hospital. Fine.  
~~minister could tell us when the~~



MR. ROBERTS: I wonder if the minister could tell us when the policy first began, and, secondly, would he agree to table the guidelines which I have no doubt were written to embody this policy so that the whole Province can know about it?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asks a question which is exceedingly imprecise so it is almost impossible to respond to it. He first of all says it was a new policy; I am not sure what new policy he is referring to. Then asks when it began. That, of course, presupposes that there was a new policy and I am not sure what he is talking about when he says a new policy. So it is very difficult for me to respond to an imprecise question like that. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would just ask the hon. member if he could, in some way or other, phrase his question in the way that it is understandable.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I assume Your Honour will grant permission, but, Sir, trying to phrase something in a form that is comprehensible to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is a little like King Canute telling the waves not to come ashore, it is so difficult it is to be impossible.

Let me then ask him if he would be kind enough to table, would he agree to table in the House - whether it is kind enough or not; and I ask him either as Minister of Finance or in his other capacity, since I understand he is acting Minister of Health; the Minister of Health (Mr. House) is not with us, unfortunately, so the Minister of Finance is doing double duty down there - if he would agree in either of his capacities to table a list - I am not concerned about the amounts - showing

MR. ROBERTS: in each case what piece of equipment was purchased, when it was purchased - to the month, or, if he wants to be precise, the day to the hour and to the minute, whether he is operating by standard time, and, if it is in the Labrador portion of the Province, is it by Atlantic time as opposed to Newfoundland time, and, when it comes to the Western Labrador portion, Menihek district, whether it is on Eastern as opposed to Atlantic as opposed - to use the kind of tactics that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) uses in his obfuscation attempts, and he is a very obfuscated fellow indeed. Now to come back to the Minister of Finance, who is not capable of obfuscation, would he agree to table a list showing the times when this policy has been applied, the instances when it has been applied, the minister who has approved it, and, generally, the number and variety of instances in which this new policy of robbing 'Wallace' to pay 'John' has been put into place? I can tell him there are a great number of people who are interested and I can also tell him, Mr. Speaker, that there are a great

MR. ROBERTS:

number of groups around the Province who will be making application to take advantage of this new beneficence of the minister and his colleagues.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, again the hon. member is referring to policy but he does not outline what policy he is talking about. I am not quite sure whether he is talking about a policy whereby government funds in whole or in part equipment or similar type of material to institutions such as hospitals, or whether he is talking about some policy related to the acceptance of gifts from private individuals for government institutions. You know, quite honestly I do not know what policy he is referring to, it may be some other policy, but those are the two areas that, right off the top of my head, I think he may be referring to. If he could only in some fashion or form, perhaps in writing, if he wishes, or if he sends me a note - he can do it in Braille if he wants to - but in some means whereby it is understandable what exactly he is getting at, I will be only too glad to respond.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I confess that I may be imprecise. My difficulty is that the only knowledge any of us has of his policy is what the minister has said. Trying to understand the minister is like trying to grab a fistful of blancmange; you know there is something there but there is nothing of any substance you can get hold of. So I shall write to him and I shall make the letter public. It will not be in Braille but it will be, I hope, clear. It will be difficult to use language of words of more than one syllable. Perhaps the minister could tell us whether his vocabulary is beyond the 300 word limit, that is, the Dick and Jane readers he uses in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, with your leave, Sir, I would like to ask the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge).

MR. SIMMS: You just asked him a question about Dick and Jane or something.

MR. ROBERTS: Dick and Jane. It is Jhick and Dane as far as he knows. I will undertake to use words that I think the minister can understand, Mr. Speaker. That may be difficult but I will try.

May I ask a question of the Minister of Education, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Education can read and write. If only the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could add and subtract we might get an honest budget for a change.

Now let me ask the Minister of Education whether her department is prepared -

MR. BAIRD: You took your nasty pills again today.

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on or we will put you on ice, 'Ray'.  
Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question of the Minister of Education, if the hon. gentleman opposite will be so kind as to allow me, in my own humble and ineffective way, to lay my pearls of wisdom before the feet of the hon. lady. Could she tell us whether her department is prepared to extend funding in the form of an amount equivalent to the RSP to any voluntary group that is prepared to make donations either to the University or the DVSS and the College of Trades, the

MR. ROBERTS: Fisheries College and to the other educational institutions throughout the Province? Is this now something that groups can look to the department for?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, groups may certainly look to the Department of Education for exemption from the requirement of paying sales tax on items of equipment they wish to donate to schools directly operated by the department, the vocational schools, or for that matter to educational institutions operated outside the department - the university, colleges, school board schools. Those requests would be forwarded to the Department of Finance. But, yes, certainly groups may request exemption from sales tax. I would like to encourage any groups who consider making contributions to our schools.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The hon. lady, I think, was not with us yesterday - physically, I mean, I am not trying to be smart for once - she was not with us yesterday -

AN HON. MEMBER: She was here.

MR. ROBERTS: She was here! Well, she made her usual impact in the House then. Obviously, then, she did not hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) say it was not an exemption. What happens is the minister of the funding department, in this case Education, makes an additional grant to the institution - this is what the Minister of Finance told us - and that money is then given to the donating group and the donating group puts it with its own funds, pays the RST, buys the object and makes the donation to the hospital or whatever. So I appreciate what she said and I have no doubt there will be an avalanche, and so there should be, of requests as she is now on a new path. But could she tell us

MR. ROBERTS: whether her department is prepared to do as the Health Department. we are told by the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) does, and that is to fund these groups in an amount equivalent to the RST so that they can pay the RST and use their own funds for the purpose of purchasing it from a vendor?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, similarly I can assure the member opposite that I and my department would be quite happy to consider that arrangement should an offer of a donation materialize. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any donations of equipment to educational institutions having been made in my time as minister -

MR. ROBERTS: This will encourage them.

MS. VERGE: - where the question of sales tax arose. In any case, I am not aware of any instance of a donation of equipment to a school in the Province. But should one be made, when sales tax is an issue, then I

MS. VERGE:

would be quite happy to consider with my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), an appropriate arrangement for the payment of sales tax on that equipment whether it is by way of an exemption from the requirement of paying tax or whether it is by way of compensatory payment from the department to the institution receiving the gift to take care of the 12 per cent tax.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir, That is very helpful, I say to the minister. Can she tell us whether she is familiar with the exemption process, whether it requires an Order-in-Council, or whether it can be done by the authority of a minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, clearly that is a question that should be directed to the Minister of Finance who is responsible for retail sales tax.

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

MR. ROBERTS: There is no point asking the hon. Minister of Finance because there is a two syllable word in there which he will not be able to understand. I wonder if the minister could tell us the guidelines which she will apply in considering whether these donations will now attract the 12 per cent grant-in-aid from the government to enable the RSP to be defrayed? What are the guidelines? I mean, if I want to give to the school at St. Anthony, run by the Vinland Integrated School Board, the Verge Trophy for oratorical excellence in tribute

MR. ROBERTS: to the hon. lady, and it is going to cost me \$100 to buy this at my friendly trophy shop, and I only have \$100, but if I pay \$100 there is the \$12, and if I only have \$100 to buy an \$89 trophy, Mr. Speaker, which of course is not worthy of the hon. lady, it is gilt and not gilded, so I wonder if she could tell us the guidelines. I will tell the hon. lady the Verge Trophy hangs on her answer.

MR. BAIRD: We do not have to worry about you spending \$100 on any donation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am awfully glad my friends in the lower right hand corner, and it is very low indeed in the lower right hand corner, do not work for Revenue Canada. But I will say to my friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) that there are many who would donate a great deal to see him in the House, and many who would donate a great deal more to see him out.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. lady if she could give us the guidelines, the considerations which she will use in determining how to apply this new policy that her colleague announced yesterday in the House.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, any guidelines will be formulated in consultation with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the officials of the Department of Finance. But the fact of the matter is that to my knowledge there have not been donations or offers of donations to the school which contained any question about sales tax.



MR. TULK: There will be. There will be.

MS. VERGE: In fact, there have been donations from parents, from Parent-Teacher Association but those donors would have paid the sales tax in the normal way. When and if questions arise about sales tax on gifts to schools, then guidelines will be articulated to the would-be donors.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the hon. Lady. She has confirmed, of course, there are no such guidelines. And I would like to give her the opportunity to be sure that that is what she meant to say, that there are no guidelines, because, of course, there have never been any to such donations, and, of course, there never was any such policy until the minister, not the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), I hasten to say, but the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) blundered into it again yesterday. But if she would like to differ with me, I give her the opportunity, subject, of course, to Your Honour, that there never have been any guidelines, there are no guidelines for these donations. Could she confirm that, please?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance was quite clear in his answers to the hon. House yesterday, and what he said applies across the board to all gifts and bequests coming to government departments and institutions. What I have said, consistent with what the Minister of Finance said yesterday, is that

MS. VERGE: there simply have not, regretably, been all that many instances of gifts coming forward, and I am not aware of any instance of an offer to an educational institution within the jurisdiction of my department where the question of sales tax arose.

MR. TULK: But it will.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I wish to table answers to questions no. 39 and 41, asked by the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts).

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Member's Day, we shall proceed with motion No. 14. I understand that the debate was adjourned last day by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) who, of course, is not in his seat today.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was just about to say that the hon. the member for Eagle River, who adjourned the debate, is in his riding.

MR. ROBERTS: He was in Cartwright yesterday.

MR. NEARY: He is in Cartwright. He is down trying to look after the interests of his constituents, the gasoline and so forth. I might also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the member who introduced this resolution is serving overseas at the present time and will not be here this afternoon to wind up the debate. He is

MR. NEARY: travelling through Europe on urgent matters, Mr. Speaker. And so if hon. gentlemen would not mind, Mr. Speaker, and with the permission of Your Honour, I would not mind having a few words on this resolution myself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen will recall -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon member for St. John's North on a point of order.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I stand to be corrected, but since the mover of this amendment is not here surely we should move onto the next topic to be debated and the hon. gentleman should sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member persists in making a nuisance of himself in this House.

MR. ROBERTS: He does not do it intentionally he does it accidentally.

MR. NEARY: Accidentally or otherwise, I do not know if it is deliberate or accidental. Now this resolution was written, Mr. Speaker, before the Gallup Poll became public yesterday. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the resolution just to jog hon. gentlemen's memories a little bit because there is something in this resolution that would give you the impression that the member who wrote the resolution-

MR. SIMMS: We are on the amendment now.

This is out of order.

MR. NEARY: So what?

MR. SIMMS: Read the amendment.

MR. NEARY: That is what I am debating.

MR. SIMMS: You were going to read the resolution.

MR. NEARY: I am going to read the resolution, if the hon. gentlemen do not mind, and then I can deal with the amendment after. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be interfered with by hon. gentlemen there opposite. The hon. gentleman has forgotten the rules. You would swear, Mr. Speaker, that the member who wrote this resolution had a crystal ball and that he could look into the future. I will read the resolution.

WHEREAS the Supreme Court of Canada has recently decided in favour of the Federal Government concerning ownership and jurisdiction of offshore resources;

AND WHEREAS this followed a decision of the Newfoundland Court of Appeal which was brought prematurely to the Court and was not properly prepared;

AND WHEREAS the Premier of this Province has indicated that he intends to keep on fighting until there is a change of government in Ottawa rather than now returning with the Federal Government to the bargaining table;

AND WHEREAS the present Leader of the Federal Progressive Conservative Party has refused to commit himself to provincial ownership and jurisdiction of offshore resources and our Province's two Progressive Conservative Members of Parliament have made conflicting statements on this important issue;

AND WHEREAS - listen to this , Mr. Speaker -

AND WHEREAS recent polls create great doubt whether the Progressive Conservative Party will form the government of Canada after the next election;

MR. NEARY: Now this resolution was written several weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, and several weeks ago the polls were favourable towards the Tory Party of Canada.

MR. SIMMS: Not when he wrote that.

MR. NEARY: When this was written. Mr. Speaker, I did not think hon. gentlemen were that dense. When this resolution was written the Tories were leading in the national Gallup Poll.

MR. SIMMS: There was slippage. They had fallen.

MR. NEARY: They had fallen slightly. There was seven percentage points in the difference, Mr. Speaker. And now the situation has completely reversed itself. And so, Mr. Speaker, the editor of this resolution really knew what

MR. NEARY:

he was talking about. He must have had the inside information, because now, after all the misguided assumptions on the part of the Premier, the Premier operating under a false premise, now, lo and behold, the hon. gentleman discovers that we should not take for granted the fact that the Tories may form the next government in Ottawa. The whole situation has reversed itself in a very short while. My advice to the hon. gentleman is not to put all his offshore eggs in one basket, Mr. Speaker. As I said yesterday in his absence, when he was over wasting taxpayer money in Nova Scotia, Mr. Speaker, my suggestion when the hon. gentleman was absent from the House was that what the administration should do is to take the Chretien package that is on the table and use that as a basis for future negotiations.

PREMIER PECKFORD: There is no package on the table.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier is trying to tell us there is no package on the table.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No.

MR. NEARY: Well, what was his Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) doing up in Montreal for three months behind closed doors with the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien), making great progress in negotiations until the Premier went in and stationed himself in another hotel and had the carpet pulled out from under the feet of the provincial Minister of Energy?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I was never in Montreal during those negotiations.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, not only was the hon. gentleman in Montreal, but he would leave people with

MR. NEARY: the impression -

PREMIER PECKFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon.

the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is making incorrect statements about my presence in a place called Montreal during the last set of negotiations and I have to correct the hon. gentleman. I was not in Montreal for any of those negotiations and I would ask and implore the Leader of the Opposition to please be factual in the presentation of his arguments.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule that there is not a point of order. The hon. member took the opportunity to correct certain statements.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was passing through Montreal -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - on his way to or from -

PREMIER PECKFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is untrue. That is completely untrue. I was not passing through Montreal. I had nothing to do with Montreal whatsoever. The Leader of the Opposition got his facts wrong and for the sake of clarity and accuracy in the Hansard of this House, and for the sake of the press who are listening and those people in the gallery, I have to inform the Leader of the Opposition for the second time that he is incorrect.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To that point of order, I rule it is more a point of clarification, not a point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: The next thing, the hon. gentleman will be telling us he was not in New Brunswick last week and he was not in Halifax yesterday. That is the next thing he will be doing.

PREMIER PECKFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I wish to inform the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), I was in New Brunswick last week and I was in Halifax yesterday, so if the Leader of the Opposition is trying to create the impression that I was not in New Brunswick last week and was not in Halifax yesterday, it is incorrect, I was so in New Brunswick and I was so in Nova Scotia!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, I rule it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, it would appear that the hon. gentleman does not know if he is coming or going.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, when he pulled the carpet out from under



MR. NEARY:

the feet of the provincial Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) who was negotiating with Mr. Chretien -

AN HON. MEMBER: There was no package on the table.

MR. NEARY: - there was a package on the table and the package was a very generous package indeed.

MR. SIMMS: There was not package on the table.

MR. NEARY: There was a package on the table.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order. Before I leave, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) once again is inaccurate. There was not ever a package put on the table by the federal government in the last set of negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, I rule there is a difference of opinion.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman last week came in with a Ministerial Statement in this House rebutting the statements that had been made by Mr. Chretien about the package that was on the table.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, are they losing their memories over there? I think they are all senile, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: They are all senile, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Well, they have selective amnesia. Mr. Speaker, there was a package

on the table and the hon. gentleman cannot deny that. The provincial Minister of Energy -

MR. MARSHALL: There was nothing, nothing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wish I had my files with me.

MR. DAWE: You cannot have any files there because you do not have any facts.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here is a Telex, 'Please deliver immediately', it says, a Telex back in January 26, 1983 from the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) here in this Province to the hon. Jean Chretien, Mr. Speaker. And here is a reply, January 26. There are all kinds of Telexes back and forth talking about the proposals that were on the table, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN: What does the Telex of January 26 say?

MR. NEARY: I am not going to waste my time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, everybody knows they are making fools of themselves over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will tell you what happens. The Premier goes into the caucus and like sheep they sit there and listen to him as he says, 'Listen, boys, here is the way it is'.

MR. DAWE: Why should you bat more than a thousand at being wrong today?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, was I wrong on the chartering of the aircraft, the hon. gentleman's abusing and misusing the taxpayers' money? The hon. gentleman should be forced to repay the money that he used to take him home on chartered aircraft.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say this:

MR. HODDER: And at the same time commercial aircraft were flying.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Now after making complete jackasses  
of themselves now the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I  
be heard in silence or are we going to have a bear pit here,  
Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I remind hon. members of the  
House that the hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Now, after making complete fools  
and jackasses of themselves, Mr. Speaker, after the Premier  
standing on his high wall for five years throwing hot, boiling  
tar down on the backs of Ottawa, the other provinces, the  
oil companies, after doing that for five years, now he comes  
down off the wall and he decides to make a cross-Canada

MR. NEARY:

tour to scrape the tar off of the backs of these people that he has been throwing the tar on for the last five years. Now, Mr. Speaker, is it working? Is the hon. gentleman's little gimmick, his little ego trip, is it working? Well, following the prepared address that the hon. gentleman made in New Brunswick they interviewed people who were at the meeting, who listened to what the hon. gentleman had to say, and the majority of them said, 'Look, he is too late. He should have been doing this years ago.' In Nova Scotia yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the same thing happened. The people who were interviewed, who sat at the meeting and listened, said, 'Yes, of course we respect the speaker, but he is too late. Too little too late. He should have been doing this before he put the matter to the Newfoundland Appeals Court, before the matter went to the Supreme Court, before he burnt his bridges he should have been making this cross-Canada tour that he is making now.' That is the general reaction. Mr. Speaker, so far the assessment of the Premier's latest jaunt across Canada, his crusade of apologizing to all of those he has been throwing the hot tar on for that last several years, is it has been a failure.

MR. HODDER: Is he not paying for the meals?

MR. NEARY: He is paying for the meals, he is paying the expenses, he has a captive audience, Mr. Speaker, we understand that the expenses are being paid, the whole thing has been orchestrated, and we would like to know how much that is costing the taxpayers. But so far, Mr. Speaker, it has been a spectacular flop and failure. Nobody is biting, nobody is being bluffed by the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is about time that the Premier stood in this House and told the people of this Province that he is not going to waste any more taxpayer money, that he is

MR. NEARY: not going to try to bluff the people who sit in at these meetings, that he is going to give up this wasteful tour and that he will shrug off his laziness, his temptation to get out of Confederation Building, to get out of this House and get out of Newfoundland, to get into a climate where he does not have to do very much except read a prepared speech. It is about time he gave up this wasteful and extravagant waste of taxpayer money, Mr. Speaker, and picked up his phone and did the honourable thing, did the sensible thing, and that is to call the hon. John Chretien, federal Minister of Energy, and say "Look, Mr. Chretien, that offer or that proposal, that package that was on the table was a very generous package indeed," Mr. Speaker, and make that the basis of further negotiations.

MR. CARTER: Put it on the record.

MR. NEARY: You can put it on the record all you want. Now that is a courageous thing to do, that is the sensible thing to do, bring an end to the havoc, bring an end to the misery and suffering that has been caused by this administration's opposition to the Government of Canada and to the other provinces of Canada, the national business community and the international business world Mr. Speaker. Their opposition to all of these activities in the last five years have wreaked havoc on the Newfoundland economy and have caused untold pain and suffering to the people of this Province, and it is time it was brought to an end.

And Mr. Speaker, let me remind hon. members there opposite that they are only sitting there by virtue of the fact that they went to the people in 1982 in a one promise election, they made one promise only, and that promise was to negotiate an offshore agreement. The promise was not to put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, or to fight it in the Supreme Court, the promise they made was to negotiate an agreement. And up to now, Mr. Speaker, they have failed. As a matter of fact, they do not want to see or hear tell of that promise any more. How can they sit there in all honesty, with straight face day in and day out, knowing that they are reneging on the promise that they made to the people of this Province? They are asking the people to hang tough while they themselves live in the laps of luxury down in Tiffany Towers in a rent-free apartment,

MR. NEARY: the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and the Premier charter planes at public expense to take them home on weekends, \$1500 and \$1600 for a charter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Hang tough, they are saying. While the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) jaunts around the world and lives in the laps of luxury in posh hotels in Europe and in the United States, while the unemployed back home are asked to hang tough.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: He will do as much as he wants to. We know what they are doing, Mr. Speaker. We know the arrogance of hon. gentlemen there opposite, their dictatorial attitude. Mr. Speaker, I make one last appeal to the hon. gentleman, and I say that the people of this Province are fed up with hearing about the oil. The Premier has oil on the brain and the people are fed up with it. All the other industries in Newfoundland have been neglected; the woods operations, the pulp and paper industry, the mining industry, the inshore fishery, the construction industry, all have been neglected. They have oil on the brain. You would not know

MR. NEARY: but they had oil for breakfast, dinner and supper and they dream about oil, Mr. Speaker. And it is about time that they faced up to their responsibilities.

MR. TOBIN: You do not want Newfoundland to gain anything by it.

MR. NEARY: 'You do not want Newfoundland to gain anything by it.' Listen to the trained seal over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the time you had dinner on St. Pierre.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the rudeness and the arrogance of hon. gentlemen there opposite is something to behold, is it not?

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the dinner at St. Pierre.

MR. NEARY: I will tell the hon. gentleman a few things about himself if he wants me to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the dinner at St. Pierre.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should forget his rudeness; the people down on the Burin Peninsula are pretty angry and upset with the hon. gentleman's rudeness in this House and his rudeness in the Province. And the hon. gentleman is getting - he is not getting, he has a reputation of being the most rude member in this hon. House, Sir.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about the dinner at St. Pierre.

MR. NEARY: He should go take a course from Dorothy Dicks.



MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, I can only make one last appeal to the hon. gentlemen there opposite because people are fed up with hearing about oil. They want to know about the fishery. What about the fishery? What about the inshore fishermen? What about Gander? What about Corner Brook? What about Labrador West? What about Bell Island? They turned their backs on Bell Island during the sleet storm, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: You turned your back on Bell Island, did you not?

MR. NEARY: This is what they want to know. They want to know about these problems.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!  
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Before recognizing the hon. minister, I would like to welcome to the gallery the Deputy Mayor from Labrador City, Mr. A. Snow, and the Town Manager from Labrador City, Mr. C. Vincent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. SIMMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was somewhat hesitant, as a matter of fact, in participating in the debate today because we had numerous members on this side of the House who wanted to participate in the debate and to re-emphasize the positions that have been taken by this government with respect to this issue in the last couple of years in particular. But having heard the silliness coming from the mouths of the people on the opposite side, in particular the most recent speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that that particular member has a

MR. SIMMS:                    tremendous amount of gall to stand  
up in this Legislature and to use the tactics that he is using,  
to use descriptions that are considered, and can only be  
considered to be silly , wrong, incorrect, of no substance,  
hypocritical, and I can think of all kinds of terms, Mr. Speaker,  
to describe the kind of argument put

MR. SIMMS:

forth by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).  
It is obvious to anybody, Mr. Speaker, I guess, who is  
observing the debates in the House -

MR. NEARY:

Speaker.

A point of order, Mr.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

the Leader of the Opposition.

A point of order, the hon.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that  
the hon. gentleman, who is a former Speaker of this House,  
should be well aware, indeed he should be more aware than  
anybody else in this House, that you cannot use  
unparliamentary language in this House. 'Hypocritical' is  
an unparliamentary term, Mr. Speaker, and I ask Your  
Honour to direct the hon. gentleman to withdraw that word  
and apologize to the House for his rudeness.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that

MR. SIMMS:

of order.

Mr. Speaker, to that point

MR. SPEAKER:

Culture, Recreation and Youth.

The hon. the Minister of

MR. SIMMS:

I would submit to Your  
Honour that what I used in the debate was the term that  
his remarks were hypocritical. I recognize that to call  
an individual parliamentarian a hypocrite is unparliamentary,  
and I would not do it, but there is nothing unparliamentary  
about arguing that an individual's remarks are hypocritical.  
And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the best that the hon.  
the Leader of the Opposition has put forth in this point of  
order is that it is perhaps a difference of opinion but  
certainly not a point of order.

I would submit to Your

MR. NEARY:

order, Mr. Speaker.

Further to that point of

MR. SPEAKER:

Opposition.

The hon. the Leader of the

MR. NEARY: It is well known in this House, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot say via the backdoor what you cannot say through the front door. And I would submit that the hon. gentleman is completely out of order when he uses that term. It is unparliamentary. The hon. and sanctimonious former Speaker of the House should have better sense. It can do nothing but lower the decorum of the House. And I believe that Your Honour is obliged to direct the minister to withdraw his unparliamentary and rude remarks and apologize to the House for making such unparliamentary statements.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMS: To help Your Honour, if I may, just one further point. If Your Honour would refer to Beauchesne, Fifth Edition, page 110, the bottom of the page, section 3, it says: "Since 1958, it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions:" And if Your Honour will then turn over to page 112, he will see that the term 'hypocrisy', 'hypocrites', in fact, have been ruled parliamentary in debates held December 20, 1975, and October 25, 1966. So again, Your Honour, I would suggest that to refer to a member's comments as being hypocritical comments is certainly not unparliamentary, but I recognize that if you were to call somebody a hypocrite, which I would not do, that would be unparliamentary, and I did not do that. I suggest, Your Honour, that there is nothing here only a difference of opinion and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is concerned about the stinging attack that I am about to make on his debate and he is just trying to waste the time of the House and my time.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not concerned about the stinging attack at all, but I am

MR. NEARY: concerned about the decorum of this House.

MR. SIMMS: Read your references.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I have the reference here in front of me.

So far in this session, Mr. Speaker, we have had nothing but insults and personal attacks from hon. gentlemen there opposite. One day in the House we thought we would have to start wearing hard hats, when things were being flicked across the House.

MR. SIMMS: Stick to this point.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am sticking to this Point.

MR. SIMMS: Cite a reference.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Chair in this House, and I believe the hon. gentleman when he was sitting in the Chair, and his successors, right up to the present time, have ruled that 'hypocrisy', 'hypocrites', and 'hypocrite' are unparliamentary.

Now, if Your Honour rules today that you can use that word in this hon. House, well, that will create a precedent.

MR. TOBIN: He did not say you were a hypocrite.

DR. COLLINS: You are not threatening His Honour?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not threatening His Honour, I am just saying it will be something new, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: We all know what you are, anyway.

MR. NEARY: Now, I could understand the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) using that kind of word, because he has a reputation for being uncouth.

MR. TOBIN:  
that in describing you.

I would use worse than

MR. SPEAKER(McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY: He has a reputation of being uncouth, Mr. Speaker, and has no finesse, but the hon. minister who is now speaking does have a little finesse, is a former Speaker who should know the difference, and all the hon. gentleman can do is to lower the decorum of this House. If it is going to be a name slinging contest, or if we are going to start hurling insults back and forth across the House, so be it. But I believe Your Honour has a duty and an obligation to see to it that all unparliamentary language is ruled out of order and in this case the hon. gentleman has used an unparliamentary word and the hon. gentleman should, man-fashion, he should be man enough, as former Speaker of this House, to admit he was wrong and apologize to the House.

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, I will not let this particular matter rest because a precedent could be in the making here, and I think it is important that the Chair and the members of the House understand the words that I used in the debate. I sincerely believe, I do not want to question the integrity of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) - but I sincerely believe he knows the difference in this particular point. I did not refer to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition as a hypocrite, I referred -

MR. NEARY: It is the same thing.

MR. SIMMS: No, it is not, Mr. Speaker. That is precisely the point. There are lots of words, Mr. Speaker, I submit, that are unparliamentary words, but if you use them in a certain context they certainly are not unparliamentary. So it is silly to say a word is unparliamentary. Again to assist Your Honour, I notice the Leader of the Opposition in his argument has never put forth any references or anything

MR. SIMMS: else in any of his debate, it is simply a tactic by him, knowing that on Private Member's Day every member has only twenty minutes to debate a particular issue, and he is concerned, of course, that I am about to put forth some arguments and facts to counter those that he put forth, he does not want to hear them, he is trying to waste my time, and I would suggest to Your Honour that you refer, in addition to the reference I gave Your Honour earlier on page 112, where it has been ruled parliamentary to use the word 'hypocrisy', I also refer to page 114 of Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, paragraph 324, under UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE where it says, "(1) It is impossible to lay down any specific rules in regard to injurious reflections uttered in debate against particular Members, or to declare beforehand what expressions are or are not contrary to order; much depends upon the tone and manner, and intention".

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. SIMMS: Section (2) says, Mr. Speaker, to shoot down the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) argument about the word 'hypocrisy' being ruled unparliamentary many times before in this House, Section (2) says, "An expression which is deemed to be unparliamentary today does not necessarily have to be deemed unparliamentary next week." And that comes from Debates of Hansard, July 23, 1955. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition once again is simply trying to waste my time and does not have a valid case and I suggest as well that he knows it.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

I have heard enough argument on this. I am quite satisfied that the remark;

MR. NEARY: No final submission?

MR. SPEAKER: No.



MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): 'hypocritical comments' that was referred to was not out of order.

I call on the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. NEARY: That is something new.

MR. SIMMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, You are upholding the traditions of this hon. House and I am pleased to see that you have done so.

MR. SIMMS: So to repeat then, Mr. Speaker, what I said, What gall from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary)! What gall! His remarks were nothing but silliness! His remarks were totally hypocritical! His remarks were, in my opinion, insincere. I do not think he was really sincere in what he was having to say. And I do not say that in a derogatory fashion or to question his sincerity, but they were silly. There were a lot of incorrect comments made during his arguments. Everybody recognized them. Everybody in the Province recognizes them. Everywhere he goes in the Province, everybody recognizes that his arguments are very, very weak. I think it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the member for LaPoile is in a tremendous amount of trouble in the district of LaPoile and he is using every tactic that he can to try to get some coverage or to try to hide from the fact that the people in his district cannot find him anywhere.

MR. TOBIN: He is looking for a district to run in.

MR. SIMMS: He is over there now and they refer to him as 'Steve Who'. That is the latest word that I get.

The other thing I notice, Mr. Speaker, in the arguments put forth by the Leader of the Opposition - and you frequently see it, anybody who observes the debate in this hon. House will frequently see it - he lacks substance in any of his arguments, totally lacks substance. So what tactic does he then take? What tactic does he then take when he has no substance? Well, Mr. Speaker, he uses his usual tactics,

MR. SIMMS: innuendo, sensationalism and, of course, the ultimate weapon in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) debate performance usually deals with personal attacks - personal attacks on ministers, on members on this side, but particularly, of course, on the leader of the government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I remember very, very well, a little over two years ago, I remember very, very well those same tactics being employed by the Leader of the Opposition's predecessor. And we know what happened to him in April, 1982, Mr. Speaker, as a result of his employing those tactics.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making incorrect statements -

MR. TULK: Falsehoods.

MR. NEARY: - uttering falsehoods in this House. And I believe if the hon. gentleman is to give any credibility to his argument, Mr. Speaker, that he should give the House an example of a personal attack that I have made on the Premier. I challenge the hon. gentleman to give the House one example of a personal attack that I made on the Premier or any minister in that administration. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman cannot do it, then what he should do is withdraw and apologize to the House. Now, 'getting a rent-free apartment' is not a personal attack, that is taxpayers' money, or 'a minister chartering a plane at public expense', that is taxpayers' money, that is not a personal attack. Now, if that is what the hon. gentleman means by a personal attack, then he should

MR. NEARY: get up and apologize to the House, because the hon. gentleman knows the difference, that I have not made any personal attacks on anybody on that side of the House, including the hon. gentleman. And he should be man enough to get up and admit that and apologize to the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN: To that point of order, I submit to Your Honour that there is no point of order, it is certainly a difference between two hon. gentlemen. The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) is standing here in the House today defending the position that he has taken by citing examples of the way the member for the district of LaPoile, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been conducting himself in this House. Everything that the minister has said, I submit, Your Honour, is indeed true and factual and there is no point of order whatsoever, It is certainly a difference between two hon. gentlemen.

MR. NEARY: I would not waste my time responding to that.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, there is no point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, that is certainly very, very accurate. We will let the people of the Province be the judge of the accusation that I made, and time will tell. The Leader of the

MR. SIMMS:

Opposition (Mr. Neary) expects that that time will come this Fall. I hope it does, but I have a funny feeling it will not come for a little while because, first of all, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, of course, are in the midst of a provincial leadership campaign. I do not know if everybody has forgotten about that. The provincial Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador called a leadership campaign in October of 1983, seven months ago. And, Mr. Speaker, to this point in time, of course, they do not even have a candidate. A seven month leadership campaign underway and not even a candidate.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

I hate to be continuously raising points of order to try to correct the hon. gentleman and keep him on track. He just made a statement that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador called a leadership convention for October 1983. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is completely false and untrue.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon.

Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I expected that the Leader of the Opposition would have listened a little more closely. Obviously he did not hear what I had to say in the earlier points of order that he raised, but I consider it to be a breach of privilege to suggest that I said something that I did not say. I did not say that they called a leadership convention for October of '83. I said, 'Last October they called a leadership convention.'

MR. NEARY:

Seven months ago.

MR. SIMMS: That is right, seven months ago, and so you did. I submit there is a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): I do not think there is a point of privilege to discuss.

To the point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. SIMMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been ruled out of order, incorrect, wrong, silly and continues to use hypocritical remarks and I guess he will continue to do so.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much time I have left, probably not very much. The Leader of the Opposition knows there is only twenty minutes of speaking time, I say this for the benefit of anybody who might be listening, on a Private Member's resolution.

MR. NEARY: By leave.

MR. SIMMS: Oh, good, Mr. Speaker.  
Thank you very much.

MR. NEARY: We will give you enough time.

MR. SIMMS: I have not gotten into the speech at all yet on what I was going to say.

The Leader of the Opposition referred in the opening of his debate, in his remarks, to the resolution. Now this resolution was put forth by the non-elected Liberal, an aspirant, I guess, to that leadership of the Liberal Party opposite. I sincerely hope he is not successful, quite frankly. I sincerely hope that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador will see fit to keep the present Leader of the Opposition. I disagree

MR. SIMMS: with the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) on this who wants to see the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) sent to the Senate. I want to see the Leader of the Opposition stay on in his role as Leader of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador. And I shall do everything in my power, Mr. Speaker, to see that he does do just that.

Anyway, this resolution was drafted by his new-found friend and colleague, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). And he refers in the resolution, of course, to some of the whereases, so let us refer to some of the whereases in the resolution. Now he talks about the Supreme Court of Canada has recently ruled in favour of the federal government - we all know that, there is no argument with that part of the whereas. 'AND WHEREAS this followed a decision of the Newfoundland Court of Appeal which was brought prematurely to the court and was not properly prepared' - the member for Mount Scio has the gall to put that in writing in his resolution. The gall! Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio has been quoted - it is in Hansard, it has been made public - as saying that we had absolutely no choice in referring that particular matter to the courts.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SIMMS: Now he says in his resolution, It 'was brought prematurely'. More hypocritical remarks, Mr. Speaker. It must be flowing, oozing. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition has picked it up from the member for Mount Scio. 'WHEREAS the Premier has indicated that he intends to keep on fighting' - well, I certainly hope he does, Mr. Speaker, and I know that everybody on this side of the House hopes he does and I think that everybody

MR. SIMMS: in the Province hopes that he will keep on fighting, But the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Russell) tried to ridicule that, talked about him on his speaking tour, what a waste of time, yet his own colleague, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) a few weeks ago wanted to go with him. Now if that is not hypocritical remarks, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what are.

Here is the interesting one.

'WHEREAS recent polls created great doubt whether the Progressive Conservative Party will form the Government of Canada after the next election.'

AN HON. MEMBER: Very recent.

MR. SIMMS: Very recent, but when this was drafted, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that the polls indicated at that time that the Tory Party was slipping and that the Liberal Party was coming up a little bit. That is what was there when he submitted this. Three weeks ago, though, after the last poll, it indicated the Tory Party had made a considerable jump and, of course, that argument would not have held any water at all. Now, because of some typographical error, I suspect, they would walk into the House of Assembly wearing red roses, because Gallup has made a typographical error and suggested that the Liberal Party has made a turnaround, the first time in sixteen years that Gallup has ever made such a major change, they are all excited and elated over it. But just wait, Mr. Speaker, until June 1 when next Gallup Poll results come down in the heat and midst of the Liberal Leadership Convention and we will see what will happen.



MR. SIMMS:

And then,

'WHEREAS the Federal Minister of Energy has indicated a willingness to immediately recommence negotiations with the Government of this Province on offshore resources.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, when did he do that? When did he indicate a willingness to immediately resume negotiations? We wrote him a letter a year and a half ago, he has not even replied to it. We were the ones who put the points on the table, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Chretien could not deliver on those points, subsequently he could not even respond to the letter or reply to the letter. So there is certainly no indication from the Federal Minister of Energy to this Government that he is willing to sit down and discuss and debate the offshore issue.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me then just conclude, because I only have time to conclude, that was the resolution that has since -

MR. CALLAN:

By leave. By leave.

MR. SIMMS:

I thank the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). That was the resolution that has since been amended by my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and the amendment reads - now that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has read the resolution which is no longer in effect because actually we are debating the amendment, not the resolution - the amendment reads - "Delete all the words after the second "WHEREAS" - which we agreed with, there is no problem with that, there is no problem with that - and substitute the following, "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House condemn the federal government

MR. SIMMS: for weakening our bargaining position through its approach to the offshore issue; and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED".

MR. CALLAN: Who moved the amendment?

MR. SIMMS: It was not the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), but you would not know it by reading it because it sounds like something he said two years ago. "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this House demand that the federal government reconsider its present position on the offshore question." Mr. Speaker I submit that this amendment is a reasonable amendment, a strong amendment, one that members opposite will have no difficulty agreeing with, and I would urge that they consider seriously the views of the people of the districts that they represent, and if they do that, Mr. Speaker, they will have no

MR. SIMMS:

choice but to support this amendment and to defeat the resolution that was not ably presented by the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: What a man!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this amendment let me, first of all, deal with some of the comments that were made by the member for Grand Falls, the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms). There was only one part of his speech that I found entertaining, I found that none of what he said really showed any knowledge of what he was talking about, but I found one part of his speech entertaining, namely the -

MR. PEACH: We are not here to entertain you.

MR. TULK: Well, you would swear that the member for Grand Falls was here to entertain according to his speech.

MR. SIMMS: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) interrupted me.

MR. TULK: I only find one part of it entertaining, no information in any of the rest. I find it entertaining that the member for Grand Falls would mention the latest Gallup Poll and try to attribute as he said at one time, the decline of the Tory Party, the indication, the trend there that the Tory Party was slipping. Then he next said it was a typographical error what had happened in the last month. I find that amusing, and only somebody with a sense of humour like the member for Grand Falls could come up with such nonsense. I want to suggest to him that in June the trend will be there, the trend that he is looking for.

MR. TULK: But I want to come to some of the other things he said. He really said nothing about why the government has the position that it has.

MR. SIMMS: I never had a chance.

MR. TULK: You did not have a chance. He was given leave on two occasions, Mr. Speaker, to go on and to say whatever he wanted to say. The fact is he had nothing to say in any case. But he did show us the prime example of this government's approach to problems in the Province. He did show us that. He showed us that they cover up their own inadequacies by talking about what seats they hold, what seats they are going to hold, by talking about the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) being in danger in his seat, as if that was of great importance, and it probably is because the member for LaPoile is the watchdog in many cases, of the public purse in this Province. But that is all he can talk about is if somebody is going to lose his seat. He talks about the provincial leadership convention of the Liberal Party. And he had the gall to say that the Premier would not call an election this Fall because we would probably be in the middle of a leadership convention.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take him back, I believe it was in 1979, and tell him how famous the Premier is for pulling any dirty little political tricks that he can pull out of a hat, namely calling elections when there are leadership conventions on. We would not be surprised.

I also want to question the member for Grand Falls who is continually in this House questioning the Chair, as if he still believes he is the sole authority on parliamentary procedures in Newfoundland. Well, Mr. Speaker, that type of thing is not becoming of a former Speaker, and it is certainly not becoming of a minister of the Crown.

MR. TULK: He speaks about Mr. Chretien not offering to get back to the negotiating table. I guess Mr. Chretien, following the line that has been so firmly established by this government, by the crew that he is negotiating with on the other side -

MR. TULK: do not run off; I want to educate you in one little thing and then you can leave. But in any case the member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador is obviously wrong, completely wrong.

MR. SIMMS: Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador.

MR. TULK: No, you are not running for Grand Falls- White Bay -Labrador. Now do not go after the guy for Menihek (Mr. Walsh). Do not go after him.

MR. TOBIN: Grand Falls- White Bay - Labrador you said.

MR. TULK: But he is not running, negotiations are over, he chickened out. Do you not know he chickened out? Are you not informed of what is happening over there? It is over. They did the poll and they found they could not win it.

But in any case let me take the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) to Mr. Chretien's offer. St. John's, Newfoundland - in the same way the Premier does his negotiations St. John's, Newfoundland, April 5, 1984, entitled 'Statement by the Hon. Jean Chretien on Newfoundland and the offshore.' I will send him a copy if he wants to read it. Does the federal Minister of Energy (Mr. Chretien) offer to get back to the negotiating table? Let me read what he said. "I am ready to meet the provincial government at any time. They walked away from the table and I look forward to their return" to the negotiating table.

MR. SIMMS: Who is that addressed to?

MR. TULK: That is a press release made by the federal Minister of Energy in St. John's, Newfoundland -

MR. SIMMS: Why did he not write us?

MR. TULK: - following the trend that has been so firmly established by this government. So take that, that is your hodgepodge of ideas that you put together to try to cover up your own inadequacies again. But why do you not get back to the negotiating table? Why do they not? It is very obvious why not! Because this government has survived on confrontation, it has survived on the ability to bring red herrings into the political process and to try to stir up the red blood of Newfoundlanders and tell them that some part of Canada, or some part of the world or some part of Newfoundland is 'going to take away your rights to exist as a human being.' That is what this government has survived on. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) knows that is what they have survived on. They know that is what they have survived on. They have brought forward this idea that if you speak against their position you are a traitor.

They have used it very well politically - no argument! - but what have they done to Newfoundland in the process? What have they done to our Newfoundland economy in the process? What have they done to our Newfoundland people? What have they done to building a better nation in this country, this nation called Canada? What have they done? Only last week at an NTA convention I spoke to two good PC friends of mine and one of them looked at me and said, 'You know I am ready to separate from Canada.' A teacher said that. And it has been brought on by the approach of this government to negotiations with the federal government, in particular to negotiations on the offshore. And that, Mr. Speaker, may be in the final process. Regardless of what we get from the offshore or what we get from the fisheries

MR. TULK: or anything else, that may be the greatest damage that this government has done to Newfoundland, to perhaps build a feeling of separtism. And I do not think they did it intentionally, I do not believe that the Premier is a separatist, I do not believe that and I do not believe that anybody on that side of the House is. But the feeling



MR. TULK: is there, and it has been created by the bogeyman of trying to bring in that everybody outside of the forty-three members other than the Premier who sit on that side of the House are traitors to Newfoundland. That is what this government has done. That is its legacy, that is what it has done to Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How? How? .

MR. TULK: By the kind of approach you have taken to negotiations on anything; it has not been negotiation at all, it has been confrontation.

MR. TOBIN: It is certainly not the approach that your party has taken, that of giving everything away, there is that about it.

MR. TULK: Speaking of giving away, I would ask the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) where he was in 1966. I would also ask him where some of the members on that side of the House were. They were sitting in this House, he was not, but some of the members were. And they voted for an agreement -

MR. MARSHALL: Who?

MR. TULK: I do not believe it was the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), but they voted for an agreement that now, with hindsight, we all know was a bad agreement for Newfoundland. But it was a unanimous decision of this House that that agreement be signed and they cannot deny that.

Now, they have developed - and we see this particularly in the Minister of Energy and, I suggest, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - they have developed a paranoia among themselves that makes them afraid to sit down at the table to do any kind of negotiating or to sign any deal for fear that somewhere down the road somebody would look at them and

MR. TULK: say, 'Well, Marshall, Collins and Peckford really made a mess of it.' And that is where we find ourselves in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get to the resolution itself, to the amendment. In speaking to the amendment, I would like to use the resolution to say why I am opposed to the amendment, because the amendment is nothing more or less than just another red herring brought in to condemn somebody else - it does not matter who, it could be in the federal government, it could be Nova Scotia, if not Nova Scotia, it could be Quebec, or it could be the Fishermen's Union or the Teachers' union; like the attack we saw yesterday evening by the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) putting the NTA in the kind of position he knows it is not in, and trying to cover up his own government's inaction by making them appear as rabble-rousers and so on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting to the resolution and why I am going to vote against the amendment: "WHEREAS the Supreme Court of Canada has recently decided in favour of the Federal Government concerning ownership and jurisdiction of offshore resources;" Well, Mr. Speaker, that is obviously correct, there can be no argument anywhere in this world, anywhere in the courts, that the federal government, that Canada, as a whole, does now own the offshore. That has been settled, and the only way that it can be changed, I suppose, is through a constitutional amendment and that, in the long run, may be possible through, perhaps, a different government. I doubt that it is possible for this government that sits on the other side.

MR. POWER: Not with the Liberals Up-along.

MR. TULK: Now, we will come to Liberals Up-along, we will get to that, and we will ask the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) to run off to Ottawa and get John Crosbie's position and Jim McGrath's position reconciled so that everybody in Newfoundland knows where the Tory Government stands. We would ask him to run off to his Tory buddies in Ottawa and get Mr. Mulroney's position. The word from a very well-known minister in Nova Scotia is -

MR. POWER: And Turner's position?

MR. TULK: Now, if the hon. member will be quiet, I will try to educate him. I do not want his hair to move, I do not want him to get upset, but I will try to educate him.

MR. TULK: If he would go and talk some of his counterparts in other provincial governments in this country he would be told that his hope for a future Prime Minister - the hopes are fading - who is afraid to go into British Columbia, he cannot go there because of the inconsistencies of his policy and his caucus and his hope for government, his side, his party, he cannot go into Manitoba because they have no solid position. Now he is afraid to go to Nova Scotia.

MR. POWER: We want to talk about the issues and you are talking politics and you are talking nonsense.

MR. TULK: Well, you asked me to explain it to you and I am doing it.

The word is that he is now afraid to come to Newfoundland. He cannot come to Newfoundland because he has no position on the issue, and that is what we are talking about.

MR. POWER: Therefore we are suppose to turn to Turner?

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to that, but when you are interrupted by the inanities of that man over there, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), who has so many problems on his plate that perhaps he should not be in the House, he should be down trying to do something with Bowater, when you are interrupted by those inanities you tend to stray, Mr. Speaker.

The Premier has taken care of what we are going to get from the offshore. The Premier has laid us at the mercy of both the federal and the provincial Liberal Party, he has laid us at the mercy of the federal Tory Party, and he has laid us at the mercy of that party. There is absolutely nothing that the Premier can do except trust to the good will of Upper Canadians and of the upper levels of government in this country, the

MR. TULK: federal government. In a rash and mad fit he pushed this thing into the Supreme Court. In his inability to negotiate, because of his paranoia, afraid that he is going to give something away, because of his desire to rouse the blood of Newfoundlanders for his own political purposes, to pit them against anybody, it does not matter who, it does not matter who he pits them against, the Premier has taken care of the fact that Newfoundland does not own the offshore, and has taken care of the fact that unless somebody else, out of generosity, at this point, agrees that we should have a good deal on the offshore, then we can no longer gain it.

Mr. Speaker, the serious problem, the serious thing is that the Premier could have indeed used some people that he had with him, used some people who are not as paranoid as the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), who did have an agreement with the federal minister, until a guy in a room across the street, watching with his opera glasses, saw him smile and then went over and pulled the rug out from under him. By using his brain, by adopting certain positions as negotiating positions rather than creating pre-conditions, the Premier of this Province could have had, I believe, a good agreement for Newfoundland. I believe it is still available to him, if he would just go back to the bargaining table rather than saying, Before we come back, here are the positions.

I think that lengthy telex he sent is here in my desk somewhere. It is so asinine to think that you are going back to the bargaining table and, before you get back, know exactly what you are going to get. That is completely asinine. Surely there may be good positions to go back to the bargaining table with, and you obviously always build in more than you hope to get if you,

MR. TULK:

When you are negotiating before you got to the bargaining table, but you do not do it publicly. You do not send off seventeen or twenty-seven, whatever it is, we loose track of the numbers, the number of things that you hope to gain, you do not put that out publicly, you do not do that if you are trying to negotiate. You set a position that you hope to get and somewhere it is in the middle of the negotiating process, somewhere it is in the middle of what you state to your opponent the first time and what you hope to get. Surely that is the way to do it rather than the way that this government has carried on. Surely that is the way to do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see the Premier saying that he is going to keep on fighting, that he is going to go across Canada to convince Canadians that we need a constitutional change or that we need a bilateral agreement. There is nobody who could argue with that. Somebody brought up just now on the other side the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) saying why did they not take other people along with him. Again there is an indication, A few years ago, when the member for Mount Scio was the Minister of Energy, that was possible. Because I remember quite clearly as a member of this House in 1980 sitting down and listening to the member for Mount Scio say that in a giant conference that both parties held to acquaint ourselves with the position of Newfoundland on the offshore, but it is not possible any more. Because the Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), in their mad quest to be the saviours of Newfoundland nationhood and nationalism, in their mad quest to do that, in their mad quest to be the saviours of Newfoundland's nationhood, trying to stir up the red blood of Newfoundlanders,

MR. TULK: in their mad quest to do that they do not want to see anybody else engaged in the process of getting a settlement for Newfoundland. It has to be on their terms and to their credit, and they have to have the power and the glory and all that there is to come. And that is what has brought us to the state that we are in, Mr. Speaker, They want the political limelight and anybody else who suggests any other method of doing what is good for Newfoundland are called traitors, non-Newfoundlanders, are called the lapdogs of Ottawa -

MR. NEARY: Handmaidens.

MR. TULK: - the handmaidens of Ottawa, I wish the minister would invent some other terms because they are getting rather boring.

MR. NEARY: They are tired and worn out.

MR. TULK: They are tired and worn out.

Mr. Speaker, we have not seen this government hammering out a settlement. We have not seen them trying to do anything with that at all and it is very obvious that the need for a settlement in Newfoundland is there. We have the highest unemployment rate in Canada. We have the highest unemployment rate among young people in Canada. I think it is 43 per cent, is it not, for young people in Newfoundland? We have young people who are desperate for jobs and yet we get the Minister of Energy in this Province afraid he is going to overheat the economy. Mr. Speaker, my time is up but the real truth is that the government is running a colossal bluff and they are keeping up their buster and their bluff to cover up their own incompetence, their own inability to do anything in this Province.

MR. TULK: I heard it said for a number of years of the Moores' Government, I was a teacher, that the government of that day were acting as if they were still in Opposition, they had an opposition mentality, and that mentality is still on that side of the House. It is still on that side of the House and they cannot take a positive approach to anything.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member for St. John's North on a point of order.

MR. CARTER: A point of order; the hon. gentleman's time is up and he should sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair will have to decide when the hon. member's time is up.

MR. TULK: That is right. He is just a general nuisance. Mr. Speaker, I believe my time is up and I would urge this government to realize that they are the government. I would appeal to them to act



MR. TULK:

as a government, to use their brains rather than their swords, rather than their hot words, and end the misery of Newfoundlanders and get back to the negotiating table and sign an agreement that is beneficial to Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear.

MR. PEACH: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PEACH: Thank you very much.

I just want to make a few brief comments on the amendment to the resolution that we have here today and to follow up on a few points that my colleague, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), made and as well some of the comments that have been passed across the House from some of the members opposite. It seemed rather ironic that the member who made the initial resolution was not available to be in the House today and that at the beginning the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) had to get up and apologize for him. It seems apparent over the last couple of days that the Leader of the Opposition has been doing quite a lot of sulking and squirming over there in his seat. As the member for Grand Falls indicated, he is probably in a lot of trouble in his own district. Well, I am not one, Mr. Speaker, who believes or pays any attention to rumours at all, but there are quite a number of rumours on the go in the past few days, and I probably should not even refer to them here in the House, but I think the Leader of the Opposition either yesterday or the day before indicated to the House that he felt he was being slighted in the appointment to the Senate. And I guess most people know now that the word is out that the Leader of the Opposition is not going in the Senate and that the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) looks like he is getting support from his own

MR. PEACH: provincial caucus for that position. And as well, another follow-up to that, it looks like the federal minister, Mr. Rompkey, might probably be passed along to the Senate as well. As well, of course, that leaves a seat open and another rumour that seems to be moving on those days is that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) is quite unhappy where he is. So you never know what might come up.

But to go back to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, I noticed, I suppose, today that in The Daily News, if anyone pays attention to that particular part of the medium -

MR. CALLAN: We do.

MR. PEACH: I am sure, as the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) says, he does - I guess the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was quite happy this morning to see that he did make the front page of The Daily News and at the same time it is ironic that it was only because of the Gallup poll that they put all of their faith now into the offshore and what is going to happen to the offshore, as was quoted yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, since the Gallup poll results of yesterday, which has already been pointed out was an error on the part of Gallup, that now the Leader of the Opposition feels that we should take the Chretien proposal and, of course, that should be the end all and be all of the fate of this Province for generations to come.

MR. WALSH: What proposal?

MR. PEACH: That is a very good question, as my friend and colleague, the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh), points out, 'What proposal?' I have not heard over the past number of days that we have been debating this resolution anybody put forth the proposal. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) attempted there in disjointed comments to read a confidential proposal, I guess, that he had from Mr. Chretien.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon.

member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) said that the thing I read in this House was confidential from Mr Chretien, that is false information. I do not think he intends to mislead this House, but the truth is what I read is available to anybody and has been available for some time.

MR. PEACH:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

I did not intend in any way to mislead the House but if that information is available to the House I am sure the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has no objection to tabling it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is not really a valid point of order. It is certainly a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, our Provincial Minister responsible for the Offshore (Mr. Marshall) indicated very clearly yesterday that if we should accept the proposal of Mr. Chretien, supposedly a proposal, and if we should follow along the route taken by the members opposite that this Province would get very little revenue from an offshore deal like that which was offered to the Province of Nova Scotia and which they have accepted with a stipulation that, if our Province should get a better deal, then they are looking forward to getting the same kind of a deal that we will get.

It should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that The Canada Oil and Gas Lands Administration were quite different in their opinion from that of the members opposite when they indicated very clearly that even at this present time there are many more jobs created in Newfoundland without an agreement than has been created in Nova Scotia which has I suppose, an agreement with which it appears they are happy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment to that motion which was put forth by the member the last day seems to make a lot more sense, and I am sure it is one that echoes the sentiments of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that message came through loud and clear just shortly over two years ago on April 6, 1982 when the people of this great Province indicated the stand that they wanted a government at the time to take. Their selection of a government was very clear and I am sure that the Opposition has been hurting from that ever since, despite the fact that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry)

MR. PEACH: saw fit on some particular day in his life to walk across the House and, as I said earlier, has apparently many regrets for that since.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have to support the amendment as I am sure I speak for all of the people in this Province, and, as a matter of fact, I am sure I speak for most of the members opposite, I am sure the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) really does not think that we should accept the offer that Mr. Chretien had indicated verbally but is not willing to put in writing, so I guess it is only a couple of the members opposite who feel that we should accept such a proposal.

MR. TOBIN: That is right. He is a follower, see. He has to do what he is told.

MR. PEACH: We know there are not many leaders on the other side, as has been clearly indicated, I expect any day now for them to put a proposal to our Public Service Commission that they will probably be looking for a leader for their party. It seems as though the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has sort of died out, his name has not been recognized for a month or more now; in fact, he has even gone out of the Province to try to make some headlines.

MR. TOBIN: He is over in Europe.

MR. PEACH: Some of the comments, Mr. Speaker, that I want to just pass along in the other few minutes that I have, I happened to pick up a few leaflets that happened to be lying around here on my desk, with nothing greatly prepared, but I would like to call the attention of the members opposite to some of those because some people have made some great comments with regards to our position on our offshore. One of those I am sure that the members opposite should have read already, which has been circulated throughout our Province indicating our first, second and

MR. PEACH:

third proposal and our final compromise proposal, a compromise proposal that has been put forth indicating that we have been very fair, we have not been greedy in any way and that we have compromised and we have presented, to the best of the wishes, I am sure, of the people of this Province some of the facts that make our position very clear. As well, one of the former colleagues of the members opposite, Mr. Rowe, in his comments of a month or so ago in the Daily News indicated in the end of his column, 'We get nothing like the benefit we should be getting from the fishery, the hydro power because they' - the federal government - 'are controlling these resources and now of course the offshore has gone in the same way as the other resources have gone. However,' he said, 'do not worry, this time the federal government will develop it for the benefit of Newfoundland and Labrador.' And I am sure we all realize that he is referring to the fact that when we have a new Conservative Government in Ottawa that then we will get our rightful place and that in this Province we will see the day when the sun will shine and have-not will be no more.

Mr. Speaker, again we realize that after numbers of meetings, as has been already indicated by speakers who have spoken prior to me, that prior to December, I guess the late Fall and Winter of 1982, that it became very clear that the federal government at the time wanted to have total power and wanted to share in the management and, of course, share in revenue. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that any person in the Province today could agree with such a proposal or with such a theory that a Province such as ours should be left with a small and insignificant share of that great natural resource that lies off our shores. Again,

MR. PEACH: Mr. Speaker, it is the fact that we are looking for shared management and, of course, the sharing of revenue, and I am sure again that I speak for the people in my district, in the Carbonear district, in saying how we feel with the handouts that we are supposed to accept from Ottawa. It was only on Saturday night past that I attended a function in my district where the hon. Mr. Rompkey was there with his usual goodies, he and the member for Bonavista - Trinity-Conception (Mr. Rooney), who I suppose will be member for another couple of months, until the election is called anyway, when the hon. Mr. Rompkey, after having made somewhat of a dull presentation to the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, had to get up of course and for the cameras and for the local papers make a presentation which he called at the time - he presented a cheque, as a matter of fact, to the Mayor of Carbonear for \$10,000 - which he indicated was just a small contribution to the federal propaganda machine which they have in place now and will be conducting twelve seminars in this Province to promote the federal programmes and really to get in gear

MR. PEACH:

and to promote themselves for the upcoming federal election. Mr. Speaker, one of the articles that has I am sure, brought out a lot of things on the offshore recently was that by Professor Lin Jackson of the University. I realized that it was only a few weeks ago, when it came out, that the members on the opposite side were very concerned and, of course, did not want to hear much of it when Professor Jackson referred to the fact that the judgement is a, and was a concerted effort on our historic status. That particular part is something that the members opposite do not want to hear. They have already indicated who they are supporting in the federal leadership. Mr. Chretien has already been singled out by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). And, of course, what it simply means, as Professor Jackson said, is that our revenues, and those are the revenues from the Grand Banks of Canada, of course, will flow automatically into the federal coffers and that this Province should, of course, rely on handouts and equalization payments. And that obviously is what the members opposite would like for future generations to rely on. They are not too concerned about the long-term, they are more concerned with what they can do in the short-term and to take the role and to take the line that a former leader of their party took and sold us down the drain for short-term benefits, and that is supposed to be the end of it. I realize, Mr. Speaker, that I have very few minutes left but I am sure that the members opposite are sort of again hurting somewhat today because they are short on speakers. Two of their members are missing, the one who was supposed to speak today at the beginning, because he closed off debate last day, could not be here, he is down in his



MR. PEACH: district or down in Mexico, one or the other, and the member who should be the last to speak today on this important resolution, the issue that he crossed the House over, the very important issue that he could not agree with our leader on. And then he wanted to become leader of a party all of a sudden, He could not find a party to become leader of, so he crossed the House and now he realizes that Mr. Cashin is more in line for that leadership. And I would not rule out the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) seeking that position if he does not end up in the Senate. I am sure if he has his eye on it, and he will look for it. And as my colleague, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) said earlier, I would like to see the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) retain that leadership. He is one of the greatest assets that we have right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sh! Sh!

MR. PEACH: I should not be telling these secrets, I guess, however it has been stated by the media quite often.

Mr. Speaker, one of the people over there who I am sure is an asset is the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). He is not here today, but I would like for him to be here to make some comments because he is usually a very reasonable and rash individual. And he also has indicated that he is interested in seeking the leadership of that party. But as Professor Jackson said, What then is there to sign? What is there to be negotiated and agreed to? Basically', he says, 'the answer is nothing.' And I quote from Professor Jackson. One final thing-- Mr. Speaker, that I would suggest to the member opposite, not the members opposite, the other members seem to have gone on vacation, or have abandoned their seats over there.

MR. SIMMS: They are all down South.

May 2, 1984

Tape No. 1218

ah-3

MR. PEACH:

What are not down South,

I guess, have gone to Europe and so on to better themselves.

And it looks like they have left

MR. PEACH: the reins of power in the hands of the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) who did not see fit to come out on Saturday night and support his federal member, out in Carbonear. However, I guess we will have to forgive him for that.

I realize, of course, that right now, as we said, the great discontentment that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has probably led him across the sea, very -

MR. CALLAN: A lot of rumours.

MR. PEACH: - discontented with his seat over there. I heard a few days ago that he has his options left open. I do not know what options he has left because he seems to have used them all up. But, I guess, if need be the federal party will send someone off to the Senate therefore creating a seat for him to run in in the federal election.

But to go on to that, Mr. Speaker, to follow along the line of the discontentment that seems to be rampant throughout the Province right now -

MR. CALLAN: A lot of rumours!

MR. PEACH: - rumour has it that he is not sure whether he is going to run for the Liberals or the Conservatives in the upcoming federal election, the member for Mount Scio.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. PEACH: So I expect any day at all for him to put on his walking shoes and leave the House altogether.

But, Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that I would commit to the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) in particular, because the member and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is not too good at reading, as he has indicated many times here in this hon. House. The only time he seems to be able to read is when he has something in

MR. PEACH: bold print in Question Period. And the last few months he always had a tendency to read his questions to the ministers, which indicates to me that he is sort of getting spun out. He is only half correct most of the time, I am sure he would have no hesitation in conceding his position except for the salary that goes along with it. We all know that he is the highest paid Opposition Leader in Canada today and, I guess, that is one of the things that is sort of keeping him on. And if that was out of the way and if he did not have to face the realities of the financial world, I guess he would be willing to concede his position to Mr. Cashin.

But I should refer the hon. member to the brochure, really, the press release given by our Premier in his Moncton speech of several days ago on the offshore, called Sharing From Sea To Sea. I think that bottom line is very appropriate, the part about sharing, because we as a Province never did indicate that we were not willing to share. All we were asking for was our equal share. Both the federal government and our federal friends, Mr. Chretien and Mr. Lalonde, felt that we should not be in a position to share but that we should be in a position to give. And they are obviously in the position that they wanted to be in, that of taking and leaving very little for us. But we were quite willing to give our equal share and, of course, as time went on and we became a have Province and became reasonably self-sufficient from an economic standpoint, then we would be quite content and prepared for the federal government to reap the greater economic shares from our offshore.

This speech that was passed along and read by our Premier on April 16, while speaking in Moncton, has very, very important points in it that the members opposite should take and read and comprehend. I am sure that they will

May 2, 1984

Tape 1219

PK - 3

MR. PEACH: realize that when the Premier made those comments he was speaking for all of the people in this Province, all of the people in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. PEACH:

And, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing the comments from the leader now, I guess, the leader of the Party opposite, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan).

Thank you.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, anyone listening to the debate can compare the calibre of the speaker we just heard with the speaker who went before. The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) knew his subject. It is a vital subject, affecting the people of this Province, and all the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) could do was get up with inanities and get up with his usual generalities without dealing at all with the issues. Make no wonder, Mr. Speaker, there is such a turnabout in this Province. I wish that Mr. Gallup had galloped into the Province of Newfoundland, because if he had galloped into the Province of Newfoundland he would see quite a turning place. They cannot get a place big enough, the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) tells me, in Marystown to hold a nominating meeting for the federal Conservative Party. Throughout the district of Humber - St. George's - St. Barbe, all up and down, there are people whom we have never heard of before looking for cards for the purpose of the thing. And make no wonder, with the calibre of the hon. gentlemen there opposite and the way they address and ignore the issues that apply to this Province. So it was not sensible, Mr. Speaker, what they said. What they said is not sensible. I think it is very significant, too, that the member who proposed this resolution is away at the present time.

MR. NEARY:

He is travelling in Europe.

MR. MARSHALL:

Yes, he is travelling in Europe.

MR. MARSHALL:

And why is he travelling in Europe?

We are told by the Minister for Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms), and we have all heard the rumour, that the hon. gentleman has gone on an extended holiday because he is reconsidering, once again, his position. He has been heard to say, or he has been reported as having said that he made a colossal mistake when he went over with the gentlemen on the other side. And he has been heard to say, Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has been reported as saying that he is reconsidering his options. Now, I do not know what options he has. Maybe he is over in Europe looking for some sixteenth century parties or what have you, because he seems to now have a penchant for changing and joining parties. So he is reconsidering his options. And make no wonder the hon. gentleman would reconsider his options, having gone to bed with the hon. gentlemen there opposite. Because the wonder of it is that he could have sat in this House for the number of years he had and then gone over and joined the hon. gentlemen there opposite, particularly because of their stand with respect to this issue.

So, Mr. Speaker, the member for Mount Scio is having second thoughts about what he did and well he should, because all the people of Newfoundland had immediate second thoughts as soon as he crossed this House, right from the first time he opened his mouth in this House and made the accusation he made to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Fisheries made him look silly, indeed, as he has looked silly all the time through. What he did when the hon. gentleman went across the House, as is indicated in this resolution - this is a gentleman now who brings in this resolution, with respect to the offshore, to condemn the provincial government for its position on the offshore. This is the same gentleman who had the opportunity to conduct the negotiations with

May 2, 1984

Tape No. 1220

SD - 3

MR. MARSHALL: Ottawa himself, but the truth of the matter is, the heat was too much for him to take. First of all, he got out of the Cabinet because he could not take the heat and the responsibility,



MR. MARSHALL: and it just culminated within the last little while when he made the colossal blunder of going across the House with the Opposition, a blunder now that I think he regrets. He is reconsidering, he is taking a vacation, I do not know if it was a forced vacation, but the hon. gentleman quite obviously realizes now what he has done.

What he did when he went across this House, and this resolution is indicative, all the hon. gentleman has been doing is taking positions and taking positions not because they are positions of substance, he said himself he went across the House not on a point of substance, so how in the name of Heavens could the hon. gentleman have crossed the House on an issue as important as this to the Province? He did not go across on a matter of substance, Mr. Speaker, he went across on a fit of pique. And let us call a spade a spade, he never accepted the 1979 leadership convention, and that is why the hon. gentleman is over there. When he went over there on the other side of the House - you know, to debate the substance of a resolution put up by the hon. gentleman is very, very difficult when you see the positions that he took when he went over. So he went over across the House and he reflected first of all on the ministers here opposite, including the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), and the government, and said that we should not have referred that matter to the Supreme Court when, at the same time, a record of Hansard and the statements he made to the press when we had -

MR. CALLAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. May we have a quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please! There is not a quorum present.

MR. MARSHALL: There is a quorum. The hon. gentleman cannot count now. He cannot stand up for Newfoundland and he cannot count either.

But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) when he -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please! There is not a quorum present.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Three minutes have elapsed and a quorum is present.

The hon. the President of Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I mean, the hon. gentleman crossed the House. I am not going to deal with the absent member for Mount Scio for too much longer because I want to talk about the resolution itself. But, you know, it speaks for itself; when he crossed the House he was casting all sorts of broad sides at everybody. You know, he made that comment with respect to the referral to the court when he had agreed that it was the only course of action the government could pursue. Now surely a person who can be so inconsistent as that cannot be treated with any credibility. He said that the government had not gotten in contact with Geoffrey Marston since the court case was on, and Mr. Marston promptly denied it from Britain and indicated that he had not talked to Mr. Barry since then. So, I mean, the hon. gentleman is just on a trip, Mr. Speaker, he is on a trip now to Europe but he was on a trip anyway, he was on a trip suspended by his own ego. And I do not

MR. MARSHALL: think, Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with a matter of such import to the people of this Province that we can afford that type of thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on this question of the offshore, and it has to be said again and again, and I am not going to repeat all of the arguments, time does not permit, but I think it is very, very significant that the hon. gentlemen there opposite when they get up and talk on topics like this, they talk in generalities and legalities and banalities and they do not talk, Mr. Speaker, about the substance of the issue. Let it be known and let it be quite clear that this government is prepared to negotiate at any time with any party, but certainly anybody negotiating on behalf of the people of this Province most especially, but anybody negotiating personally about anything has one requirement that must be met and that is that they must be able to anticipate that the people with whom they are dealing are going to deal in good faith. I mean, that is the whole basis of negotiations, that you are going to strike a deal in good faith. And how, Mr. Speaker, can anyone, when you assess logically the turn of events that occurred last year and what has occurred since, how possibly can anyone conclude that there is any basis of good faith? We had just the other day another indication of the bad faith of the federal government, we have been treated to that, Mr. Speaker, during this Session of the House: We saw Mr. Chretien in here, we saw Mr. Chretien not mention the fact about the leases, he went off and announced them and did not do us the courtesy of telling us before, notwithstanding the fact we went in and welcomed him to the House. We saw it again subsequently with respect to the National Energy Board, where we had wired him and wired the federal Cabinet asking them to withhold approval of the

MR. MARSHALL: National Energy Board decision pending a review of our requirements and pending the outcome of appeals that we had launched. We never even got a response to that telegram. All they did, Mr. Speaker, was approve. And we saw even a third one that has occurred recently, and the hon. gentlemen there opposite have not addressed this because they are not aware of it, they are not aware of anything, but what happened recently was the fact that it was revealed that there was a secret letter that had transpired between the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa (Mr. Chretien) and the Government of Nova Scotia when they signed that deal. Now here you got it. Did you get that, Mr. Speaker? A secret letter that had occurred. Now bear in mind that this particular agreement was sent down to us and said, 'Now, this represents the agreement that we have with the Province of Nova Scotia and that is what they have stuck in all of the time, that document that they sent down and alleged that that was the agreement. But we find out recently, Mr. Speaker, that that was not their agreement at all, there were addendums to it. Apparently there was a secret letter, an under-the-table letter that passed between the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government of Canada that provided that equalization, instead of being phased out at a rate of 15 per cent per year, which is the formula by which it would be phased out under the present federal Fiscal Arrangements Act, that it would be phased out at 10 per cent per year and at the time for the commencement of the phase-out they were given an option of a three year period. Now that was the substance of the letter and I hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that that does not sweeten it in any way as far as the Province of Newfoundland is concerned. It does not change our concept that that agreement is not suitable for this Province, that

MR. MARSHALL: that is an agreement - we agree with their study - which gives a small to negligible benefit to the Province that we will never accept, and the 10 per cent rather than the 15 per cent phase-out each year of equalization does not change that conclusion.

But I think the significant part of the fact, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that there was this letter under the table and that these people whom we were dealing with were passing out this agreement to us as if it were the agreement on which they were going to base negotiations and indicated to us that it represented the sum total of what they had agreed with Nova Scotia. Now we find that that is not so.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how can you deal with people like that? Negotiations require the demonstration of good faith on both sides. I ask you, how can you accept so-called good faith when people make secret deals under the table and make it appear that they do not? How can you rely on 'good faith' when you have a gentleman who comes into this House as a guest of the House and you go out to greet him as you would be expected to do on behalf of the Government of the Province, and he goes out - having announced \$750 million alleged agreements; they are not going to come to reality, but they were substantial agreements - and does not even mention them? How can you, Mr. Speaker, deal with people who contemptuously do not even respond to a Telex sent to them asking them to postpone a decision in the interests of the people of this Province?

Now, I do not deny their right to make their own decision if they wanted to - I do not agree with it - if they wanted to, to approve the National Energy Board decision but, my God, Mr. Speaker, one would

MR. MARSHALL: think that at least they would do us the courtesy of giving a reply to that Telex, but they did not!

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on. I could say that these are the same people with whom we negotiated a deal - I mean, we negotiated a deal with Mr. Chretien which was acceptable at the time to this government and acceptable, presumably, to the Government of Canada, because he was the representative of the Government of Canada as I had been delegated for Newfoundland. And we merely asked him to put down in writing his understandings but the man refuses to put them in writing. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with that? I ask anybody, would they not question the good faith of a person who refuses to put in writing what he has promised you orally in serious conversation?

So surely, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing comes down to a matter of good faith. And I am afraid with the present administration in Ottawa that on this issue, yes, they have dealt with this Province less than honestly. They have been dishonest with this Province, Mr. Speaker, in their dealings. And one of the more recent indications of it has been this secret letter that has passed between the Government of Nova Scotia and the Government of Canada. And the only reason, Mr. Speaker, why it is coming to the fore - I have got it on very reliable information - is that the Premier of the Province of Nova Scotia is a little bit perturbed because he is getting a lot of backlash in Nova Scotia as to the adequacy of the agreement that he signed, because reports have come out that say it is inadequate. Now, I do not care whether it is or it is not for Nova Scotia, that is for them to determine, but the present Premier of Nova Scotia feels the heat of

MR. MARSHALL: this and he has insisted, Mr. Speaker, that in the piece of legislation that is going to be passed or introduced in the House by this dying administration in Ottawa at the present time -

MR. NEARY: According to Gallup they are dying alright!

MR. MARSHALL: According to Gallup - when the hon. gentleman was out of the House I said I wished Mr. Gallup had galloped into the Province of Newfoundland and done a reading on the numbers of P.C.s up and down the Northeast Coast, in Humber - St. George's - St. Barbe and down the South Coast. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not being driven off by the hon. gentleman who is an apologist for Ottawa. I am saying seriously that the reason why this has come out is because it is now going to find itself in the form of legislation in the House of Parliament of Canada sanctioning that particular agreement; it has not passed the House of Commons yet. When it does, I understand the Premier of the Province of Nova Scotia now wants this in because he is afraid of a double-cross

MR. MARSHALL:

By the present dying administration, and he has insisted that it go in. And that is the only reason why it has come to the fore. So we are asked to deal with people in good faith, people who give us an agreement and say, Look, this is what we signed with Nova Scotia, when it is obvious now, it has come out, that that is not all they signed with Nova Scotia.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the enormity of that? We were sitting in the Cabinet room, and that agreement was negotiated a long time ago, not by Mr. Chretien, it was negotiated by Mr. Lalonde when he was Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, and he sent it in to this Province, to us, very triumphantly saying, Look, this is what we have agreed to with the Province of Nova Scotia, and this is what we will agree on with you. But, Mr. Speaker, he did not send down that extra letter. You know, he was less than honest when he was saying that. And they owe an explanation to the people of this Province. They owe an explanation, but we will never get an explanation, Mr. Speaker, because of the contemptuous manner in which the present administration in Ottawa deals with the Government of this Province.

Now, let there be no doubt, once again, so that the hon. gentleman cannot misrepresent it, that as far as we are concerned, we are prepared to deal with people who will deal with us in good faith, and we will only deal, though, on the basis of good faith ourselves, and that good faith requires that we have a deal on the offshore which is going to allow the resources that we brought into Confederation with us to be employed to the degree that this is possible, to see that we attain equality in the Canadian Confederation. It is not our intention to try to use this resource for the purpose of getting more than the average in the Canadian Confederation, but certainly, Mr.



MR. MARSHALL: Speaker, it is our fixed and absolute determination that we will settle for nothing else.

I look forward to a change in the present administration. I believe it is going to be, and I believe it is going to be the Progressive Conservative Party. But if it is not the Progressive Conservative Party, I still look forward to a change in the present administration in Ottawa so that, surely to heavens, this Province can look forward to dealing with people who will not act with it dishonestly, falsely, make representations to it that are completely and absolutely untrue, as has been proven from time to time, will not deal with it contemptuously, with the type of actions that Mr. Chretien showed when he came in here as a guest of this House, but people who will be prepared to deal with the Government and people of this Province on an equal basis, on the basis of good faith. Because then and only then, Mr. Speaker, can you ingraft an agreement which is going to endure to the lasting benefit of the people of this Province. We will settle for nothing else, Mr. Speaker.

The only contempt that is due in this Province is to the hon. gentlemen there opposite for the way in which they have supported this type of attack on the people of the Province of Newfoundland, and the actions of the federal government. The only contempt, Mr. Speaker, that is due is due to those people, also outside, and we know who they are, what they are, we have heard from time to time, who trumpet the fact and try to push us into signing an unequal agreement on the basis of the fact that we are losing out to Nova Scotia.

And what happened there the other day? We got a report, I am sure COGLA must have

MR. MARSHALL: choked on it, because they had to put it out, and what more credible concern than the federal government agency COGLA, the Canada Oil and Gas Authority, Mr. Speaker, put it out, and they said in unequivocal terms, despite the fact that we do not have an agreement in this Province and Nova Scotia has, that there will be more money spent on offshore here in this Province in exploration than in Nova Scotia, there has been more jobs here than anywhere else, and there has only been that, Mr. Speaker, because this Province has insisted that

MR. MARSHALL: the people of Newfoundland get the first and paramount return and we will continue to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, the only contempt, as I say, that is due in this Province is due to the hon. gentlemen there opposite for the way in which they have represented, so-called represented the interests of the people of Newfoundland. They are a complete and absolute disgrace for the way in which they have purported to represent the people of Newfoundland and the way in which they have supported those people who very patently and obviously have dealt with this Province dishonestly and in bad faith.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! Shall I put the question?

MR. SIMMS: No, we are not ready yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this important topic. Just following on from what the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) was just saying when he said that we have to be persistent, or he implied we have to be persistent in our task in getting the just rights for this Province, that we must not lose heart just because one particular battle has been lost, and there is no doubt about it the Supreme Court decision is a lost battle as far as this Province is concerned, and I would like to just deal with that in a few moments, but that was only a battle, it is the war that matters and we will certainly not flag just because we have had one reverse. I would just like to point out to hon. members, Mr. Speaker, an example by

DR. COLLINS: way of encouragement. I am sure hon. members recently saw on their television sets the First Ministers' Conference in regard to Native land rights. It was striking to me, and I am sure it was striking to others of this House, when they saw the credibility with which the Native people of this Province were being listened to. And when they think back perhaps ten or fifteen years, if the question of Native rights came up and land rights and so on and so forth, people scoffed at it, people paid no attention to it, they made derogatory remarks, as a matter of fact, as often as not about Native people saying, you know, A few uneducated people living in shacks in the North and so on and so forth, they must be out of their minds to think that they have some claim on parts of this country, some land rights in this country. Now, that was ten or fifteen years ago, but what has happened since then? Since then we had a First Ministers' Conference dealing solely with that subject and we had very knowledgeable people from the Native groups speaking on the subject being listened to and their views being considered. And that can happen in the space of ten or fifteen years. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Native Rights people can make this sort of headway because their cause was just, surely we must, ourselves, also look forward to making the same sort of headway. Because our cause is just and if we do not make headway it is only because we are not putting our backs to the wheel. Now I think there is one other striking thing that came out of the Native People's quest for justice and that was that they were united. There was very, very little dissension in their primary objectives.

DR. COLLINS: There have been some differences about tactics or whatever, but nevertheless you did not have groups arguing with other groups on substantive matters, undermining the groups who were looking for the same objectives.

Now we in this Province, if we are to succeed in our just cause, we must not have our position undermined by some of our own people. And I trust we will not. But at times one wonders when one hears certain remarks made, when you see federal ministers, who by their actions, by their blatantly apparent actions are totally adverse to the best interest of this Province, being welcomed into this Province with open arms and being cheered and being given, you know, a reception well beyond the demands of courtesy. When you see that sort of thing you begin to wonder, you know, are the Newfoundland people going to stand up for their rights the way the Native Peoples have stood up for theirs? I think that the Newfoundland people will not flag, but it certainly makes you wonder on occasion.

One of the members opposite mentioned the question of separatism a little while ago, suggesting that because this government has tried to lead the battle for Newfoundland getting its just rights that we were giving rise to aspirations for separatism in this Province. I do not know if that is so or not. You know, even if it is so, I think that we just cannot say we will not go for what is just and correct just because some people may get, perhaps, carried a little bit too far in the matter. And I would like to point out that there were separatist feelings in other provinces in this country, and it was very largely because those people felt that under Confederation as it existed

DR. COLLINS: at that time that they were not getting their just concerns adequately dealt with and the fault was as much, therefore, with the other people as with the people in that Province. And if we have feelings of separatism in this Province, and I do not think they are very strong really, if we have feelings of separatism in this Province it is largely and very much more to the fault of people not giving the proper concerns and the proper attention to the rights and natural aspirations of the people in the Province that other Canadians expect without having to struggle for them.

MR. NEARY: Repeat after me,  
I am a proud Canadian.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have been a proud Canadian since 1949, but that does not mean that I will throw all my principles out the window and just take anything that is handed out from a particular party which happens, for a short period of time, to be in power in Ottawa. I think that you can be a proud Canadian and still stand up four square for the rights of Newfoundlanders, and that is what all people on this side of the House do.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the court decision, and I would just like to deal with that very briefly, just to recall to hon. members' minds what the Supreme Court decision said. It is very instructive. If anyone has not read the full decision all the way through I would recommend it as most interesting reading.

DR. COLLINS: The first point the Supreme Court made, and they looked at the situation in various sections, the first point they made was that if the claim had been made that Newfoundland owned the offshore up to 1934 they would have to say no, because international law had not settled that point up to that time, that anyone had particular rights to the offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court went on on that at some length. It seemed to me it was strange that they did, because no one, certainly from our side, was talking about that issue. We were not saying that 'Up to 1934 we are laying our claim on that basis'.

DR. COLLINS: But, nevertheless, the Supreme Court said that even if we had made the claim then they would have to turn it down because the international law had not crystallized on the point up to that time. Well, I suppose one can accept that, but it seemed to be labouring an issue that no one was questioning.

The next point they made was that if from the period 1934 up to 1949, the claim for the offshore was laid on that period of time, the Supreme Court would also have to turn the case down, turn against the provincial case and go for the federal case. And what was the reason for that? The reason the court gave for that was at that time Newfoundland did not have international status even though previously Newfoundland had been a Dominion, and even though there had been a temporary suspension or replacement of the particular type of government at that time by a Commission of Government, that this necessarily meant that Newfoundland's status in the world, in international eyes had changed radically.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that no Newfoundlander accepts that. All Newfoundlanders do accept, and this is not something new, not something this government is dreaming up, all Newfoundlanders right from the time that they reach the age of reason and go through their schooling and so on and so forth, they understand that we were a Dominion, there was a suspension, that the Commission of Government was a temporary phase but that this did not negate our Dominion status. But the Supreme Court says, we do not care what Newfoundlanders for generations have felt, what they feel now, this is our opinion and that is the end of it. So if anyone had right to the offshore, and listen to this, Mr. Speaker, if anyone had right to the offshore in that period it was the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom had the right to the offshore off the Province of Newfoundland -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on. You are absolutely right on.



DR. COLLINS: When they even said that the Caribbean Islands had the right to their offshore down there, in the same period. The United Kingdom did not claim the right to the offshore from the Caribbean Islands in that period, but the Supreme Court of Canada says, Oh, well, that does not matter, apparently, if anyone had the right to the Newfoundland offshore in the period between 1934 and 1949 it was the United Kingdom.

Now, then, the court went on to say that, Well, even if we put that aside and just look at the 1949 period itself, just the immediate period prior to Confederation, Newfoundland still could not reclaim the offshore in its own right. Now, again, that is not, in my view, and I think in the view of most people in this House, on both sides of the House, this is not the view of the average Newfoundlander. The average Newfoundlander felt that shortly before we entered into Confederation the full rights of Dominion status which had been suspended, no one doubts that, by the Commission of Government - that did not mean that we lost international status, because that particular form of government was suspended, but even taking into account the suspension, just before we joined Confederation the full rights of Dominion status was returned to this Province as it is now, but it was otherwise then, so that the status in international law and in imperial law and in constitutional law and in any law you want to think about, reverted to this Province just as though it had been, say, in 1933. We had just as much standing as a separate nation, shall we say, certainly as an international person, as the lawyers like to say, as we had prior to the Commission of Government. And, Mr. Speaker, that is borne out by two points in particular. The first point is that in our Terms of Union it says that our constitution returns to Newfoundland before Confederation. The Terms of Union even say that. Now, the Supreme Court, of

DR. COLLINS: course, rationalize that by saying, Well, that only meant in a limited way, to a limited extent.

MR. NEARY: No wonder all of his members are looking bored over there, they are carrying on private conversations.

DR. COLLINS: The second thing that supports that position is the Prime Minister of Canada himself in the House of Common; the Prime Minister at that time stated

DR. COLLINS:                   that the Newfoundland Constitution was fully restored to us before Confederation. But despite all that argument, the Supreme Court says no, that is not so, Newfoundland did not regain the offshore at that time. The reason why they say we did not regain it at that time was that international law still had not decided that the offshore was the proper concern of the coastal state, and, this again, was despite the fact that there were thirteen countries in the world at that time which had made the claim and those claims have since been validated.

Mr. Speaker, in reading the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, one is amazed by the series of arguments put up that no matter what situation Newfoundland was in, the Supreme Court would still judge against us. It would not matter even if we had made actual claim, which is not required in international law, if we had actually passed a statute in this House at some point in time or in a previous House at some point in time. No matter what we had done - even this foolish act that former Premier Smallwood is supposed to have performed in putting a plaque down on the bottom of the ocean out there, even things like that - it would not matter what we would have done, the Supreme Court of Canada would have ruled against us. They used every possible situation and they came down saying no. So it is quite clear that the chances of Newfoundland getting a decision other than the one which was received from the Supreme Court of Canada, that in support of the federal case, was absolutely and utterly nil. There was no sense in the judgement as it was written that there was any recognition of the validity of the Newfoundland arguments. Each one was arbitrarily and almost contemptuously thrown aside and only the federal case was written.

DR. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Speaker, what is our attitude as a result of that decision? The attitude of this government, Mr. Speaker, is that we accept the decision. We fully accept the Supreme Court decision, because we are a law-abiding government, and the set-up in Canada is that the Supreme Court is the final arbiter and when the final arbiter makes a decision, we accept it. Now, that does not mean we feel that the decision is right, as a matter of fact, we feel the Supreme Court decision is wrong, it is totally, utterly, absolutely and indubitably wrong, and we will never say it is right. We will accept it. We will not go against the law, we will not flout the law as it is presently set up in Canada, we will accept the decision, but we will still maintain with every fibre in our bodies that that decision was absolutely wrong, it was incorrect, it was not consistent with the facts. And more than that, Mr. Speaker, we say that ultimately we will try to right that decision. If the Supreme Court judges on certain legal points, our task will be that ultimately we will change the basis. We will ask the people of Canada and the Parliament of Canada to change whatever is needed to be changed, the law, the constitution or whatever, to ultimately have this wrong decision righted.

In the meantime, having accepted that decision, we will negotiate to reach an agreement so that the offshore development can go ahead.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, when we say we will negotiate let us be very clear on what we mean by that. It does not mean that we have capitulated. It does not mean that just because we lost, as I mentioned, a battle we will throw everything aside and say, 'Just come and take what you want and we will just take the few crumbs.' And, of course, that is the attitude that the Opposition on the other side has put forward, that is the approach that certain rather superficially thinking people, a small number fortunately, in this Province are taking. Now the decision is down just go with cap in hand and say, 'Give us any crumb at all, we will totally capitulate to your point of view.' That is not what we mean by negotiating. We will negotiate but we will still negotiate on the basis that we must get a good and just agreement for the development of the offshore, good and just for the people of this Province. And if anyone thinks that just because the Supreme Court decision came down and that we now state that we are willing to negotiate that they are going to get away with anything less than a fully satisfactory, fair agreement for the people of this Province, well, they have another thought coming to them. If we cannot get such an agreement from one set of individuals who happen to have authority in the federal government, then we will get it from another set of people who will have similar authority. But we will not give up the task, that is the point. This government is not going to give up the task. And no matter how much the Opposition says or how much certain businessmen say or whatever, just go to the people who in the past have contemptuously thrown your arguments aside and say, 'Please, give us something now,' You know, that is so unrealistic and it is so foolish that I wish they would come off that point. If they would then come and join in the task of getting a just agreement for this Province and not align themselves with those who have

DR. COLLINS: shown by their actions in the past that they had no intention of giving a just settlement and reaching a satisfactory agreement from this Province's point of view, if they would give up their support, their allegiance to these people and join the task of getting a just agreement, an agreement which will see this Province prosper, I think we would be much further ahead.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

MR. NEARY: It is a point of information more than anything else, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that my colleague is travelling in Europe, Mr. Speaker, and there is not an ounce of truth in what the hon. gentleman said in the House this afternoon, the rumourmonger, the Dr. Goebbels of this Province, the rumourmonger, the smear artist, in view of the fact that my colleague is in Europe, Mr. Speaker, travelling, I wonder if it is permissible under the rules of the House for me to pinch-hit and wind up the debate on this resolution?

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The rules are quite clear on this, Mr. Speaker. On Private Member's Day the motion is put and the member proposing it - I am trying to get it here now in the rules. Page 19, Order 53.1 (3) " The member

MR. MARSHALL:

introducing the private member's motion has the right to close the debate and if at 5:40 p.m. on the second day of debate on the motion the debate has not been concluded the Speaker shall recognize that member who shall then close the debate." So, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious

MR. MARSHALL: that this right cannot be transferred or delegated to another member.

MR. DINN: Hear, hear. That is right.

MR. NEARY: You should change the rules.

MR. MARSHALL: This is Private Member's Day and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) should understand it, he has been in the House for twenty-five years. This is Private Member's Day and motions are brought up by private members as private members. It is not a matter of a party motion, although, you know, they are usually couched in party terms. But he cannot delegate that. It says clearly the member proposing the motion has a right to close it. Now if the hon. gentleman is on a trip to Europe, Mr. Speaker, reconsidering his position in the Liberal caucus -

MR. NEARY: Listen to the rumour! Listen to the innuendoes!

MR. MARSHALL: - wondering if he has made a mistake, and is not here in the House to consider this very important resolution that he moved, then -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Alyward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - Mr. Speaker, that is his problem. But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the hon. gentleman there opposite to speak. He does not stand in the shoes of the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). I would say neither one of them could stand in the shoes of the other. Mr. Speaker, I would say the shoes of neither one of them could stand either hon. member. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is the member introducing the private member's motion has a right to close the debate. Mr. Barry is in Europe for one reason or another. We hear he is over in Europe reconsidering his position in the Liberal Party, wondering about the gigantic, colossal blunder and mistake he made, smarting over all the negative comments that people have made, the anonymous telephone calls, and being regarded as a pariah as he walks around the



MR. MARSHALL: city of St. John's, does not entitle the hon. gentleman to stand in his shoes. The hon. gentleman is a pariah but it is not the member for Mount Scio.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): To the point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is quite correct in what he says. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does not have the right to speak for the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). However, if he were to ask for leave there is a very remote possibility that it might be considered.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of information, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Let me first of all say it was a point of information, by the way, so I do not know what the hon. gentleman addressed himself to. His remarks, Mr. Speaker, just showed how dirty minded he is, what a rumourmonger he is. He knows there is not an ounce of truth in the statements that he is making. He is just repeating rumours. Now the hon. gentleman gets up in this House every day to give us a lecture during the Question Period about rumours, and here he is repeating rumours that he knows are designed merely to undermine the credibility of my colleague. They are just designed to smear my colleague, to start rumours, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman should get off of that hobbyhorse he is on. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I am not asking for leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: If I speak in this House it is as a matter of right, my right to do so, and I will not ask the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) for leave to do anything, Mr. Speaker. But I do believe that it is a fair question to ask the Chair. I do not believe the rule has ever been tested.

MR. SIMMS: Yes it has.

MR. NEARY: No, it has not. I would like to test it now to find out if it is possible for me or another member to respond to the silly statements that have been made by gentlemen there opposite who did not know what they were talking about. Your Honour, if we are not allowed to do it then we can only assume that they do not want to hear their silly statements exposed. They do not want to hear rebuttal to the silly nonsense both the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) got off with a few minutes ago.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

To that point of information, I do not think I need any more debate on this point of information.

It has not been the practice, and it certainly has not been a precedent of this House to allow anyone to fill in for the final speaker. Nowhere in the Standing Orders does it say the speaker who moves the motion can delegate that power to another member. So it would not be permissible to substitute another speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Shall the amendment carry?

The amendment was moved by the hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and seconded by the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews):

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, the resolution as amended, carried.

May 2, 1984

Tape No. 1230

SD - 4

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Is it agreed to call it 6:00 p.m.?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It being 6:00 p.m., I do now

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

Index

Answers to questions

tabled

May 2, 1984

Told by Hon. Minister  
of Justice, 2 days ago

REPLY TO QUESTIONS RAISED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY BY THE  
HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR THE STRAIT OF BELL ISLE, MR. ROBERTS

QUESTION #39 on the Order Paper

(a) The number of consumer complaints received by the  
Department of Justice in the years

1981	-	11,405
1982	-	10,060
1983	-	13,412

(b) The number of cases brought to Court in Newfoundland  
during

1981	-	6
1982	-	0
1983	-	3

(c) The number of convictions in those years

1981	-	2
1982	-	1
1983	-	5

QUESTION #41

(a) The number of Personal Bankruptcies for the years

1981	-	251
1982	-	339
1983	-	371

(b) The number of Bankruptcies involving Business Firms for  
the years

1981	-	46
1982	-	63
1983	-	81

QUESTION #41

- (c) Information respecting Companies that went into Receivership is not available from the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

With respect to Question 41, it is to be noted that Bankruptcies are a jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the above information has been obtained from the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Bankruptcy Division, Halifax.