

VOL. 2

NO. 5

SECOND 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.
THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1983

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before we begin the proceedings,

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the galleries today fifty students from Bishop White High School at Port Rexton, along with their teachers, Mr. Collins and Mr. Pearce.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) asked me why I have not got a copy of the statement. Firstly, most times I like to give a statement viva voce, as they say in Latin, but I did not have time to prepare a statement because I want to report to the House and to the people of Newfoundland a matter of great significance, and I am very, very happy and pleased to be able to do so.

It results from a telephone conversation that I had about fifteen or twenty minutes ago from Mr. William Mason of Mobil Oil Company wherein Mr. Mason advised me that due to -

MR. CALLAN: (Inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Does the hon. gentleman find something funny about this?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: He finds everything funny.

MR. W. MARSHALL: He finds everything funny. Well, this is not very funny.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mason indicated to me today, or twenty minutes ago, that due to ice conditions both the West Venture and the SEDCO 706 are being removed from their sites and are being taken to port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I think, Mr. Speaker, the position will be taken, as I understand it, that the oil companies will take the position that they are not doing it in response to the order. But to tell you the truth, Mr. Speaker, we do not really care whether - well, we care about the order being defied, but the main concern to us is the safety and integrity of the offshore operations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: I am very thankful and pleased today with the oil companies that there has been a response to what was an imperative which arose on February 15th, 16th and 17th and what has remained an imperative up to now. And just to give you a little rèsùmè, Mr. Speaker, of the various conditions which profoundly troubled us over the past twenty-four/forty-eight hours, I could perhaps give the House a little report.

MR. MARSHALL: On Monday - this is with respect to the ice conditions - so I hope that people when they hear this can realize the dire problem in the offshore. And it is not really a matter like getting in one's care and driving one's car and you may have an accident. Considerably much more is involved. People who make statements of that nature obviously do not know the nature of the offshore or what is involved in it. On Monday at 1:30 p.m. we received a storm warning and it looked, Mr. Speaker, as if that storm was to be serious. It was not really what you would call extremely grave but it was a serious condition. This was at 1:30 p.m. Twenty-four hours later, Tuesday, the storm warning was updated and it showed that the storm was deepening very quickly. There were predicted winds of seventy-eight knots, predicted possibility of combined seas of sixty-one feet that would occur by 8:00 p.m. Tuesday night.

The pack ice at that period of time was some seventy miles away from the rigs themselves. In that pack ice there were some - my information is - there were some five icebergs and this was within forty-eight hours of the rigs. I did not give this information, I want to say to the House, before, Mr. Speaker, because I did not want to cause undue, you know, concern but I can guarantee you it was a matter of profound concern to the government. Based on this information they proceeded to pull the anchors of the SEDCO 706. Now for the information of the House, the SEDCO 706 is anchored with eight anchors. It is a four-cornered structure with two anchors on its corner. They managed to pull, Mr. Speaker, three of those anchors, one of them they had trouble with. By the time that they had - I do not know even whether they had remedied the trouble but the fact of the matter is the seas then became too rough to continue with the disconnection of the SEDCO 706. And it was too rough then to disconnect the anchors on the West Venture.

MR. MARSHALL: It is to be understood that seas have to be of a certain level, and if they get so high, and the weather conditions get so bad as they can in the North Atlantic and very quickly, then it is impossible to pull the anchors-which was proven in that case.

The next forecast was this morning. There were forecasts in the meantime, but the next one I refer to is this morning. Here the pack ice now was within forty miles; before it had been seventeen miles. While it did not move as fast as predicted, that was the situation. Then presently the pack ice got within twenty-one miles, that is my information of the West Venture. Thankfully now there is a weather window. If there was not a weather window, Mr. Speaker, you would probably get the same situation which caused us such concern earlier this week, but there is now a weather window. I am advised there is a chance to pull the anchors. The anchors are being pulled and the rigs are being returned to port.

I want to assure the families concerned that from the information which we have there is no danger. Because there is a weather window, the rigs can get to port.

But I think that recitation of facts is valuable, Mr. Speaker, because it shows just how quickly weather conditions can change in the North Atlantic, when you combine that with the ice conditions there, you can see why we have extreme concern with respect to safety. And in this matter, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again, and once more, that our sole, complete, and entire concern was with respect to the safety of offshore operations, the lives involved, and of course with the environmental considerations.

MR. MARSHALL: As I say, if people want to say that it was not in response to the order, we will deal with the order afterwards. The main thing is, the thing that this government is concerned about and I am very happy to report to the people of Newfoundland that these rigs are coming in, which was our main purpose when we addressed this issue in the first place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on such a serious matter I hate to stand in this House and say that we here on this side of the House told you so. It is too bad that the government, the administration, did not react and respond to our suggestions and our recommendations that one year -

MR. WARREN: Before the Ocean Ranger, by the way.

MR. NEARY: Well, I am not going to get into that. That is a subject now of a royal commission hearing. According to the testimony that we heard today, there was all kinds of negligence in connection with training, etc., on that matter. But on this particular matter, we on this side of the House I believe were the first in Newfoundland, and probably

MR. NEARY: in Canada to suggest that there be a ban placed on Winter drilling off our coast. I am not sure yet from what the hon. said, because the hon. gentleman gave permission to the oil companies in November past, November last the hon. gentleman gave permission for Winter drilling and then he changed the ground rules in the middle of the Winter, and I am still not sure, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the hon. gentleman agrees with drilling offshore during the Winter months, say from the end of November up to the end of March. We are still not sure. We on this side of the House thought so much about this matter that we introduced a resolution to the National Liberal Policy Conference in November in Ottawa and had it passed, Mr. Speaker, had it passed to ban -

SOME HOM. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is entitled to comment on the statement quite obviously. The statement was given on a matter of safety. We are not interested really in the Federal Liberal party or the Provincial Liberal party or any political party, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: That is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I gather that the hon. President of the Council is referring to the hon. Leader of the Opposition as being a little more relevant to the Ministerial Statement.

MR. MARSHALL: And take it a bit more seriously, the Jackass.

MR. NEARY: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I just barely want to point out that it is a part of the philosophy, ideology and policy of the Liberal party of Newfoundland and of Canada -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: -and of Canada, Mr. Speaker, that there be a ban placed on Winter drilling until such time as new technology is introduced that can get people off these rigs.

The hon. gentleman agreed to send the rigs out this Winter knowing full well that in case of an emergency there was no way to get workers off these rigs. The hon. gentleman told me that right here in this House and yet the hon. gentleman sent these rigs out. Mr. Speaker, it is sad indeed that it has taken so long for the administration to realize the hazards and the dangers of drilling in the Winter months in the savage storms of the North Atlantic, and we are rather proud today, on this side of the House, that we stand for banning Winter drilling. We do not know yet where the administration stands.

MR. TOBIN: Where does Chretien stand?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could we have the lap dogs just keep quite, please, while I am talking about this very serious matter? Mr. Speaker, we do not know yet where the administration stands. Now I hope they have learned their lesson. I hope that the next time they will not make a unilateral decision to do anything drastic offshore without prior consultation with the owners of the offshore resources, the Government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about joint management. That was a big issue in the negotiations. Is joint management the hon. gentleman making a unilateral decision without prior consultation with the

March 10, 1983

Tape No. 192

ah-3

MR. NEARY: Government of Canada,
especially, Mr. Speaker, after the decision of the
Newfoundland Appeals Court where three Newfoundland
judges said the Government of Canada owned the resource?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman had no authority to do what he did. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman and the Premier have learned their lesson about confrontation politics. Because while they were squabbling and arguing and bickering, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!
The time for response to the Ministerial Statement for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has expired.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, as all hon. members are aware, the Iron Ore Company of Canada announced yesterday that an additional 110 people would be laid off at the Labrador City operation on May 8, 1983. This news came as a great shock to me and to my colleagues for a number of reasons. Firstly, government was not advised of IOC's decision until just a few hours before the information was publicly released. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet and I met just a few weeks ago with the President of IOC and his officials at which time we were given the understanding that while it would be necessary to improve production and efficiency, there were no plans for further lay-offs.

Mr. Speaker, government views this decision by IOC with great dismay. We not only regret that more people in Labrador West are being laid off, we are upset that government was not notified by the company well in advance of the decision so that we could have the opportunity to fully assess its implications and discuss with IOC alternative measures as well as their future plans.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, all members of this hon. House will agree that the people of Labrador West have suffered enough over the past several months as a result of the heavy lay-offs that have resulted from the world-wide economic recession we have been experiencing. Thus we feel it is incumbent upon the company to take every possible step to minimize further economic and social disruption in this area of our Province. That is why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier today telexed Mr. Brian Mulroney, President of the Iron Ore Company of Canada, requesting that he reconsider his decision and cancel the announced lay-offs. Additionally, the Premier spoke with Mr. Mulroney this morning by telephone and told -

MR. NEARY: He is your leadership candidate, is he not?

MR. SIMMS: More politics! Listen, boy. You are losing credibility every day.

MR. DAWE: Additionally, the Premier spoke with Mr. Mulroney this morning by telephone and told him in no uncertain terms that he wanted the decision cancelled. Mr. Mulroney advised the Premier that no action would be taken until he reviewed the situation and stated he would be in contact with the Premier regarding his decision. I will state one further point, Mr. Speaker. Over the years this government has worked hard to establish good relations with IOC and, indeed, with all the companies operating in this Province. We believe that only through co-operation and mutual respect for each other's objectives can the goals of the company and the people of this Province be achieved. This surprise announcement by IOC and their failure to give sufficient notice of it to government is not in keeping with good corporate/government relations and our disappointment in this regard has also been conveyed to the company.

MR. DAWE:

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Iron Ore Company of Canada seriously considers what we are saying. The suddenness of this decision, together with the absence of adequate notification to government of that decision, gives us great cause for concern.

MR. DAWE: I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this government views this most recent announcement of further layoffs at IOCC with dismay and we reiterate our call for the decision to be cancelled.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we are shocked also by this news, by this bombshell, shocked, Mr. Speaker, for more reasons than one. First of all, it represents the culmination of the disrespect being shown the Government of this Province by several companies in recent months. Mr. Speaker, I refer to Fishery Products which closed plants without prior consultation with the government. I refer to Mobil for thumbing their noses at the government in the past two weeks, and now, Mr. Speaker, this latest situation where IOCC decides to lay off 110 people without prior consultation with the government, showing a total disrespect for authority, showing a total disrespect for the government of this Province. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly aggravated by the fact that the president of IOCC is supposedly a great friend of the Premier of this Province, a great friend of all members opposite, a great friend of all people on the opposite side, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mulroney is supposed to be the great hope of Canada and here today he sees fit to lay off 110 workers in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I hope that it is certainly not associated with the leadership of the Tory Party. I certainly hope that Mr. Mulroney is not doing this to punish the workers of our Province because the Premier has not seen fit to come out and support Mr. Mulroney for the leadership of the party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that that is a perverted thought. I realize that, Mr. Speaker, I realize that, that it is a perverted thought, but worse thoughts have been expressed in this hon. House, I can assure you. Worse thoughts have been expressed in this hon. House. But, Mr. Speaker, I dismiss that, it is just a thought that was in my mind, and, as I say, a perverted one at that. I dismiss that and I certainly hope that through the intimate friendship between the Premier and Mr. Mulroney that the Premier can persuade Mr. Mulroney to change his mind. And I certainly hope that within the next day or so we will hear back from Mr. Mulroney that he has reconsidered this and that these 110 people, that these 110 workers will not be laid off, Mr. Speaker. Because it is a devastating blow to Labrador City, it is a devastating blow to Newfoundland. And we certainly hope that the Premier can convince Mr. Mulroney to change his mind.

That is our wish on this side of the House, that is our desire on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. And we hope that channels of communication can certainly be opened up with the various companies in this Province.

MR. LUSH: We hope the channels of communication can be opened up with companies in this Province so that we do not get other bombshells like this. We would like to know, Mr. Speaker, what the future of Labrador City is. What is the future of Wabush? We would like to know this because certainly the people of Newfoundland after this announcement today are certainly suffering great anxiety wondering whether next week we hear of other layoffs in Labrador City and in Wabush and whether other companies intend to lay off other people. So we certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that the provincial government can open up channels of communications with companies and that companies will show more respect for the government of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). I would like to ask the minister if he has had any correspondence or representations from individuals or groups in this Province to request that a Royal Commission of Inquiry be appointed to look into allegations and innuendoes and charges made by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the gentleman responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, allegations and innuendoes and insinuations and accusations that there was a leak in the Newfoundland Appeal Court that influenced Mr. Chretien to make -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: What is so funny, Mr. Speaker, what is so funny?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) a question - the hon. the Premier might think it is funny, he is on a high again today, I guess, he had his little pep pill today - has the hon. gentleman had any representation to appoint a Commission of Inquiry to investigate the possibility of the suggested leak that was made by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) in connection with the Newfoundland Appeals Court's decision on the offshore case?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I have had one request. I have no reference to the President of the Council, no reference to leaks or no reference to any contemplated improper actions on the part of anybody but it focused on the word 'rumour' not on the word 'leak', on the word 'rumour'. I have had one request in writing referring to rumours and asking me if I would set up a public Commission of Inquiry to enquire into this rumour and to enquire into the Court of Appeal of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland - one request to that effect.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman indicate what action he proposes to take on this request and on the public statements made by the President of the Council that indeed it may have been a leak of the outcome of the Newfoundland Appeals

MR. NEARY:

Court decision that influenced the breaking off of negotiations? That is a very grave and serious matter indeed. Would the hon. gentleman indicate what action he proposes to take on this matter?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any allegations that there was a leak or any impropriety on the part of anybody. I am aware that there are people who suspect there were rumours. I, of course, cannot substantiate whether there were rumours or not rumours. But it is obvious that there were certainly rumours of rumours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So I suppose that in itself would establish rumours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But the enquiry I had, my reply to it was that even if the government wished, the government would have no authority to have a commission of enquiry with reference to a federally appointed court. We would have no jurisdiction, even if we wanted to, to have an enquiry into anything pertaining to a federally appointed court, That would be outside of our jurisdiction.

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

MR. NEARY: I understand from the hon. gentleman then that a commission of enquiry or any investigation into this matter would have to be addressed to the Federal Minister of Justice (Mr. MacGuigan) and not the provincial.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have that piece of information, but I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is familiar with the statements that were made by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), and, if he is familiar with these statements, does the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), who is also the Attorney General, who gives the Cabinet legal advice in this Province, does he not think that the statements made were pretty close to contempt of court, that they were unethical, and that they were anything but professional. They were less than professional statements? The hon. gentleman, I presume, is familiar with the statements that I am referring to, if not, I can quote the statements for the hon. gentleman.

But in a reply that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) gave to Mr. Chretien there a week or so ago, he said, "They were constantly in the background watching your every move, buttressed by rumours or reports that the Supreme Court of Newfoundland would decide in favour of Ottawa, the scales were tipped in their favour and they were successful in pulling the rug from under your feet." That is one quote, Mr. Speaker, but there is another one that is even far more serious than that which I consider to be very unprofessional and just goes to show how low down, how low the hon. gentleman can sink. Why was Mr. Smith, the federal lawyer who argued Newfoundland's ownership in the Court of Appeals and derided it as a mere colony in attendance with one of your official negotiators? What possible function could he be performing on information or advice conveying? Could it possibly be that Mr. Smith heard certain rumours that the Newfoundland Court of Appeal had reached a decision, something to

MR. S. NEARY: Newfoundland and was there to brief the federal employers of the content of any reports that he might have heard. What role did these rumours of outcome of the court case" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

order, please!

I think it is fair to say that the Chair has permitted the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) a pretty fair preamble to his question and I suggest that maybe he would like to get on to his question.

MR. NEARY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am asking

the Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) to tell us in his capacity as the Minister of Justice and Attorney General, as the gentleman who advises the Cabinet, if he would tell us what he thinks of this kind of a statement. Is this ethical, is this professional, is this the kind of a statement you would expect from a Minister of the Crown?

What role did these rumours of outcome of the court case -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has continued for some time now and again I would like to remind him that there is only twenty minutes allocated for the Question Period and the rules state that the questions and the answers should be very brief.

MR. NEARY:

I hate to correct Your Honour, but we have a half an hour for the Question Period.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Minister of Justice again: What does the hon. gentleman intend to do about these statements, almost verging on contempt of court, certainly low-down and unprofessional statements made by his colleague the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, any references made

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: by the President of the Council
(Mr. Marshall) had no references at all to leaks, no references at all to any action or omission or inaction or anything at all to the court. What he referred to was that, in this particular instance, that the federal government, the federal negotiators seemed to be influenced by rumours and that these rumours in his opinion were influencing their negotiating position. I mean, rumours can start anywhere they have nothing to do with the object which they are about. I mean, a rumour could start that the Minister of - I want to take one that no rumours can start about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I will give that tack.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: A rumor could start, for example, that the Bank of Nova Scotia is about to go broke and has loaned more money than it has, or has not kept in reserve the amount of money that it should keep in reserve. And perhaps because of that there rumor would be a run on the bank. Now, that would not necessarily imply that the bank had done anything improper. Anybody can start a rumor that this bank has done this and is about to go broke and people will then start taking their money out, but that bank may have done absolutely nothing of an improper nature. So what is being talked about is rumors, and rumors can start from any source. And as I understand what the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) was saying it is that it would appear that the federal negotiators are aware of some rumors and what those rumors are, and that their awareness of those rumors has influenced their negotiation. But that is not an allegation of anything improper. It has nothing to do with contempt of the court. It might be contempt for the negotiators but that would be in a different area.

Everything that he had to say had to do with rumors and, of course, other people have referred to rumors. I believe the Mayor of St. John's a couple of weeks ago on radio was referring to rumors and there has been a lot of talk about rumors. But, there has not been that I am aware of, certainly not by the President of the Council, a man of such great standing and high respect in the legal profession of the province, very proud of the fact that he is one of Her Majesty's Counsel learned in the law -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - he takes great pride in that. It would certainly be beyond comprehension that he would do anything

MR. OTTENHEIMER: which would even border on contempt.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the Minister responsible for taxes. The Minister no doubt is aware that the people of this province are already taxed to the hilt.

MR. SIMMS: Another rumor!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: No, that is no rumor. The people of Newfoundland are taxed to the hilt. That is no rumor. They find that right here, right in their pockets. That is what I want to ask the Minister about now, if I can get some silence and some order, some quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to raise what I consider to be some unjust and unfair taxes in a couple of areas and I want to refer first of all to the school taxes. I wonder if the Minister is aware that because of a weakness in the regulations affecting school taxes that there are people in this province who are paying double taxes. As a matter of fact,

MR. LUSH: I suppose they could be paying triple taxes because of a weakness in the regulations. So I am wondering if the minister is aware of this double taxation being assessed by various School Tax Authorities throughout the Province and, if he is, what does he plan to do about it?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the question of rumours is coming up. I wonder if it is a rumour that we have a new Finance critic on the other side? Another member of the Opposition was Finance critic at one time. Is that just a rumour that it has changed?

The other point that I would like to make at this time though is that the hon. member is alluding to some difficulty. I would like him to spell that out a little more clearly, if he would.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I will elucidate for the minister. I thought the minister was so aware that I just had to ask the question in the manner that I did. For example, I can refer to one School Tax Authority that is levelling taxes on people who have cottages in certain areas. The people might come from somewhere else, for example, from St. John's. A person might be a resident of St. John's, paying a school tax here, but because the person has a Summer cottage in some other area he is being assessed another tax by that particular School Tax Authority. And there is nothing, of course, which would prevent this.

By the same token, if a person had a cottage in some other area, under another School Tax Authority, it is obvious that he could be paying a triple tax. So that is three times. The person is already paying the school tax in St. John's. The regulations allow this. So I think this is an unjust and unfair tax. The person has already paid the tax in the place of his residence.

MR. LUSH: So I am wondering if the minister now understands the question, and if he does what he plans to change the regulations so that a person only has to pay the school tax once.

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member and I may know an individual who has been placed in that position. But despite that, I wonder if the hon. member would mind my passing this question over to the hon. the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), because school taxes come more clearly under her jurisdiction than they do under the Department of Finance. So I could ask my hon. colleague to answer it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

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

MR. NEARY: Is that proper procedure of the House for one minister to get up to answer a question and then pass it to another minister after he started talking, Mr. Speaker? Once he takes his seat then the answer to the question if finished, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it is in order to do that. The hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) took his seat and immediately the Minister of Education rose and the Chair recognized the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed the minister responsible for school taxation in the Province. The local School Tax Act says that School Tax Authorities, which comprise as a majority representatives of school boards and as a minority representatives of municipalities, may charge poll taxes or property taxes. Now, in fact,

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, most School Tax

Authorities are levying on the individual citizen merely
a poll tax. And if that

MS. VERGE: individual citizen resides in two or more parts of the Province -

MR. LUSH: Or three.

MS. VERGE: Or three.

- then the amount paid to each authority is prorated, so that if an hon. member lives part of the year in Terra Nova district and part of the year in St. John's, then that hon. member should be paying so much money to the tax authority based in Gander and so much money to the tax authority based in St. John's. Now, Mr. Speaker, under the legislation tax authorities are also empowered to levy residential property taxes as well as business property tax. Now in fact, Mr. Speaker, very few tax authorities are charging residential property tax, but property tax inherently is based on the value of property wherever it is situated in the Province and if an individual citizen of the Province should be fortunate enough, Mr. Speaker, to own property in the Terra Nova district and also property in St. John's, then, Mr. Speaker, it only stands to reason that that citizen should be paying tax based on both those properties to help finance school boards in the Province who are so strapped for money for the benefits of the students and the youth of the Province.

MR. S NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Marshall), who announced in the House this afternoon that the two oil rigs on the Grand Banks will be brought to port. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House what port these rigs will be brought to? Will it be a port in Newfoundland or will it be a port in Nova Scotia?

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the hon. gentleman would be asking questions like that? Could he be getting messages from his friends in Ottawa?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Rumours, rumours.

MR. MARSHALL: I talked with Mr. Mason today in connection with this matter, as I indicated. Mr. Mason was under the impression that there was so much ice around Newfoundland that it would be difficult to get them into a Newfoundland port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ah, ha!

MR. MARSHALL: 'Ah, ha!' They are so delighted, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, commit the young people of this Province to welfare payments for an eternity and they would be delighted, absolutely delighted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, so I informed and apprised Mr. Mason of the fact that on the South Coast of this Province that we have ice free ports, some of the best ports on the Eastern Seaboard of North America, and my understanding at the present time is that these rigs, of course, will be coming into Marystown. That is my understanding.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, may I say to the utter disappointment of the hon. the gentleman there opposite, that this government takes a stand for the people of Newfoundland. It took a stand with respect to this particular matter and I have every reason to believe that they will come

MR. W. MARSHALL: into Marystown where they belong,
at least I sincerely hope. But the main part of the whole
situation, Mr. Speaker, is this; that an item of safety
which we brought up before is now being addressed in the
way that we wanted it to be and we are very thankful that it has
been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not see in this House today, Mr. Speaker, that we have won the battle and we lost the war, that the oil rigs will henceforth be sent to Nova Scotia.

MR. MORGAN: If you can do it they will.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker. The reason I am raising it now is that I want an assurance from the administration, I would like to have an assurance from the minister in this House that we will take whatever steps are necessary to bring these rigs to Newfoundland, and not allow them to go to Nova Scotia. If the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is so concerned, let the hon. minister stand in his place in this House and tell the people of this Province that these two rigs will be brought to Newfoundland and not Nova Scotia.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there may be people in this firmament, including certain friends of the hon. gentleman in Ottawa, including certain Uncle Toms amongst ourselves, who would agree, Mr. Speaker, to panic over the fact a strong stand being taken by the government of this Province on behalf of the people of this Province is going to result in a detriment in not being able to fill up their money bags or whatever their interest is. But, Mr. Speaker, I hate to disappoint the hon. gentleman when I say to the hon. gentleman that, you know, here he is, he is repeating rumours that he has heard, he is a messenger once again, Mr. Speaker, from the people in Ottawa. There are people who would love, Mr. Speaker, in this to bring them into Halifax or to bring them into Nova Scotia so that they could try to downgrade once again the people of Newfoundland. But, Mr. Speaker, the people

MR. MARSHALL: of Newfoundland have not been downgraded. It has been demonstrated today as a result of the actions that were taken that the people who are here on the spot, nearest to the situation, who know the marine life, who know the life of this Province for centuries are much more capable of managing the affairs offshore than people 2,000 miles away -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - who compare drilling on the Grand Banks in 61 foot waves as the same as a chance of being injured on an airplane ride or when taking a car ride from wherever it may be in Ottawa from points East and West. That was said in the House of Commons. So, Mr. Speaker, it conclusively proves it. I am sorry to disappoint the hon. gentlemen. They exult in the fact that we "lost the court case." They exulted, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that the Federal Minister (Mr. Chretien) was countermanding a cease drilling order, which obviously endangered the offshore operations, and now they are trying to pull another little victory by attempting to exult in the fact that the rigs go into Nova Scotia. They might call themselves Liberals, Mr. Speaker, but they cannot call themselves Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not understand why the hon. gentleman is so testy about this question, because the question I am asking the hon. gentleman is would he give the House a commitment, an undertaking, would he give the people of Newfoundland and Labrador an undertaking that he will do everything in his power to persuade and convince Mobil to bring these rigs to Newfoundland and not allow them to go to Nova Scotia?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what is so unpatriotic about that? Why are we less than Newfoundlanders when we are insisting that the oil rigs be brought down to the hon. gentleman's own district of Marystown and not allowed to go to Nova Scotia?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Or is the hon. gentleman admitting defeat?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It appears that the Question Period, which it is not designed to do, is entering into the realm of debate. There are only a few minutes left in the Question Period. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition would like to raise another specific question.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman admitting defeat? Is the hon. gentleman admitting that the provincial government does not have the authority to get these rigs to Newfoundland instead of allowing them to go to Nova Scotia?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman should stand assured that everything has been done in this case, as is always by this government, to protect the interests of Newfoundland. The Mobil Corporation has been advised very clearly what the position of the people of Newfoundland is. And we will continue, Mr. Speaker, to protect the interests of the people of Newfoundland despite the hon. gentleman and the few but diminishing 'Uncle Toms' who are in our midst.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to pursue a question that I was asking yesterday of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). I want to ask it of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) today. I am referring, of course, to the questions of yesterday related to the Auditor General's Report and the government air services expenditures. Let me ask the Minister of Finance is it government policy to cover up spending of taxpayers' money such as we saw reported by the Auditor General? Is this government policy? Can the Minister of Finance tell us that?

DR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, since obviously the minister does not know what I am asking about any more than he knew what the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) was asking about, let me enlighten him. Mr. Speaker, in May of 1982 in the Cabinet of the present administration, less than a year ago, a Minute of Council was issued which says, "No records be maintained as to the purpose of flights or the passengers" - no records of the purpose for the flights or no records showing what passengers - "travelling on Government owned or Government contracted aircraft." We are talking about aircraft, Mr. Speaker, that costs close to \$8 million to operate in the last fiscal year, 1981-82. Regarding that Minute in Council, let me ask the Minister of Finance - certainly the Minister of Finance must be aware that government cannot cover up these things - does not the

MR. CALLAN: minister agree that this is a blatant abuse of power and, of course, perhaps worst of all, it is a breach of the Financial Administration Act? Would the minister not agree to that?

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

DR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. I wonder if the minister could advise the hon. House as to what groups or individuals or companies are interested in taking over the government retail stores in Northern Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to the hon. gentleman up in the Combined Councils' meeting of Labrador about a month ago, and again at a meeting in my colleague's office, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) downstairs a couple of weeks ago, there has been one inquiry from a firm in the country about the possibility of operating stores and that firm is the Hudson Bay Company.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if a company or an individual group are interested in doing an analysis on those government stores, is it the policy of the minister's department of paying for the transportation of this company to go around the Coast of Labrador investigating the stores?

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

MR. GOUDIE: No, Mr. Speaker, there is no such policy. As a matter of fact, there is no policy adopted by this government that the stores will be turned over to anyone at this point in time, and certainly not to provide transportation of anyone.

MR. WARREN: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, why would the minister's department on Monday and Tuesday of this week have a helicopter chartered with Hudson Bay Company officials travelling the Coast of Labrador investigating the possibility of taking over the stores? Taxpayers' money I might add.

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that any such charter was made, but I am aware that in many cases over the last several years since 1975 free transportation has been provided to the hon. member to travel throughout his district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I might also add that I was elected by the people of this Province but the Hudson Bay Company was not. And, Mr. Speaker, the Hudson Bay Company was the same group that was removed from -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the Hudson Bay Company was the same group that was removed from Coastal Labrador because they were not giving the people satisfactory service. So why would the minister's department be interested today in getting the Hudson Bay Company back into the operation?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the Hudson Bay Company moved out of operations on the North Coast of Labrador in 1952, I think, or whenever it was. But I do know that the government of that day, and more especially the government of this day has been providing a tremendous service to the residents of Coastal Labrador in operating five retail outlets along the Coast of Labrador. The hon. gentleman is fully aware of that. He was a member of the staff of my department up until a few years ago.

MR. PATTERSON: You gave him his start.

MR. GOUDIE: Not only did we give him his start, Mr. Speaker, and pay his transportation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE: - along the Coast of Labrador, but through the successful negotiations of the Premier and the government on this side of the House, and to a certain extent myself involved with a \$50 million agreement in place for his district, we certainly go him re-elected in the last election. He should be grateful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for the Question Period has expired.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before I call Orders of the Day, I might take this opportunity to advise the hon. House that there are two items on the agenda for the Late Show today. Number one will be a question to be asked by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) to the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) dealing with the Auditor General's Report on government air services. And the second one to be asked by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to the Minister of Health with regard to the health services at the Melville Hospital in Happy Valley.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1, Address in Reply.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the Address in Reply.
I think the debate was adjourned last day by the hon. member for Port au Port.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. members there opposite. I do hope that they will be clapping when I finish.

MR. TOBIN: You were shot down some bad today.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in looking at the responses to the Throne Speech which came from the other side of the House, I could not find much of note to say except that the members did seem to direct their comments mostly at the federal government. However, one member opposite did feel that the CCDP projects, and the NEED projects, which are keeping the body and soul together of many of our Newfoundlanders in the rural areas these days, was a travesty. However, I might add, Mr. Speaker, that that particular member on every occasion he gets to sneak an announcement on a CCDP project, such as Little Port Harmon, he does so.

MR. STAGG: Never. N-e-v-e-r, never.

MR. HODDER: And I would say as well, Mr. Speaker, that the number of people working on CCDP projects in his constituency are very proud that they are working rather than drawing the meager social assistance which the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has been handing out of late.

MR. HICKEY: I get the impression that my colleague disagrees with the hon. member.

MR. WARREN: Do you get any impression?

MR. HODDER: And the hon. member disagrees with his colleague and with the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look at the offshore situation as it now exists. First of all there are six rigs off the Coast of Nova Scotia, While there were three off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, one now is, I believe, in Marystown, and two on their way to Halifax. So at the present time there is no drilling activity on the Grand Banks.

Drilling activity off the Scotia Shelf however, has been increasing steadily with no apparent sign of letup. The Nova Scotia agreement has precipitated new interest, while most of the drilling efforts are being directed towards the exploration of natural gas.

MR. HODDER: But it is expected that Shell Oil expects to encounter condensates at the Shubenacadie oil well and there have been other signs of oil in other wells that have been drilled off the Scotia Shelf.

MR. STAGG: Is the hon. member running in Halifax in the next election?

MR. HODDER: If the hon. member will listen, I will bring my sermon to an end very shortly.

While the drilling off the Scotia Shelf has increased in tempo, drilling on the Grand Banks has come to a virtual standstill. And with today's announcement, there is no drilling on the Grand Banks. And it is expected and contemplated that even were an agreement to be reached between this government and the federal government this year, there would still be very little increase in activity on the Grand Banks.

Now, I might add that in Nova Scotia Mobil has three rigs presently operating. Petro-Canada is operating two rigs, Shell Oil has one rig and another on the way for a total of seven rigs drilling.

On January 15, Husky Oil and Bow Valley Resources of Calgary announced another \$250 million deal which gives them the right to drill up to four wells on two exploration blocks in the Sable Island area. In addition to this news today, in The Halifax Chronicle Herald, it was announced that Dome Petroleum will announce a \$130 million offshore agreement in the Sable Island area, and another \$15 million for drilling in the Northumberland Strait area of Prince Edward Island.

I understand as well, Mr.

Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Does the hon. member know why they all want to drill?

MR. HODDER: Yes, I know why they want to drill.

MR. STAGG: Do you know where they all want to drill?

MR. HODDER: Yes, off Sable Island on the Scotia Shelf.

MR. STAGG: They want to drill off Newfoundland but the Federal government will not let them.

MR. NEARY: Who will not let them?

Let me say this to the hon. gentleman, when the negotiations were going on the administration wanted eight rigs out there. This year we will have ten, thanks to the Newfoundland Appeals Court. They did not want to overheat the economy. There will be ten out there this year.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I understand as well that the Venture and Olympia wells show significant levels of condensates, and the Venture well shows condensate formation of 3,400 barrels a day.

Now, it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that this government is playing a risky game. The longer we hold up the oil deal, the longer we see little or no exploration on the Grand Banks. And the more exploration that takes place off Nova Scotia and off Prince Edward Island - the longer we hold up the deal, the more exploration goes on in Nova Scotia, the less goes on here. What happens,

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if we find that Nova Scotia makes a major oil find more accessible to develop, more accessible to land and out of iceberg alley? That is one of the risks that the Premier is running when he delays an offshore agreement. We on this side of the House have never said that you should not drive a hard bargain. We have never told the government to ease back. The only thing that we have said to this government is, continue to talk, continue to negotiate.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: The risk, Mr. Speaker, is that we can lose everything. I think it would be irresponsible for this side if I did not point out these risks, that the longer we hold up the offshore oil agreement the longer we cease to negotiate, this year, this drilling season will go by with little or no drilling while activity increases in Nova Scotia. We must have fear in the back of our minds that a major find will be found, could be found, on the Nova Scotia Coast, on the Nova Scotia Shelf, in the Sable Island area or in the Northumberland block near Nova Scotia. And we cannot depend on the fact that there are no major oil formations in this area. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to consider that we have the oil because we made the first strike and they did not would be very irresponsible indeed. And every minute that we allow increased exploration in Nova Scotia means the chances become larger that the area adjacent to Nova Scotia will find a significant amount of oil. Now if that happens, Mr. Speaker, it will certainly be that the areas they are drilling in, both in Sable Island and on the Scotia Shelf, are not in the same type of area as we drill, 200 miles offshore. They do not have the problems with the icebergs, they are more accessible to land and they have a better method of getting the oil or gas, as it may be, to shore. None of the problems that we face - they face some

MR. HODDER: of them but a large amount of them they do not face. And it is bothersome to me, and to Newfoundlanders who are out of work, that the government has not negotiated in good faith, it is bothersome that it has the look of a public relations exercise. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the negotiations. The Throne Speech given in this House of Assembly on Thursday was one of the weakest documents which has been delivered since Confederation. If this Throne Speech is a document which shows the government's plans and directions for the coming year, then we can only expect another year of confrontation with the federal government.

This speech is not a chart of the government's plans for the year but an attempt to shift the blame and to deflect the problems that we are facing in this Province elsewhere.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, we have reached a low point in our history when we cannot negotiate as men, but must attempt to picture our counterparts in the nation, in our nation, as trying to steal from us, when we picture them as a group of people who want to discriminate against us as if we were second-class citizens, day and night, with a Premier who appeals to the isolationism in every Newfoundlander every time he speaks. And as long as we have that type of a situation, where we become more and more isolationists, then we will never have a chance to become equal with the rest of Canada. As long as that mentality is held by Newfoundlanders, that we cannot negotiate, that someone is out to get us, until we can go to the bargaining table strong in our beliefs that we have everything on our side, then I do not think anything can happen. But as long as we go feeling like second-class citizens, every time we speak we will lose.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have developed here in Newfoundland a ghetto mentality such as we see in, I suppose, some of the ghettos of New York or Watts. This mentality that has permeated the thinking of people has permeated the thinking of this government. Now the Premier has whipped up the emotions of the Province on occasion to such a fever pitch that no one cares whether we lose as long as we fight, fight for our rights. That gets to be a slogan. But what about the shrewd negotiator, the one who goes into a meeting with less in his hand and comes out with more? Where have those leaders gone? Where is the one who, through his ability to negotiate, through hard bargaining, through skilled negotiations, can come out with a good deal for this Province? We certainly have not seen that gentleman, or anyone like him, at our bargaining table yet.

MR. HODDER: All of us want to get as much from an offshore deal as we can. More and more each day, as the economy of this Province gets worse, as the economy of the Province flounders, it is important to have this stimulus in our economy.

Now, an offshore oil agreement will not change the economy overnight. But it will give hope to Newfoundlanders. It will give hope to Newfoundland business. It will give an impetus to try new things.

All of us want to see something like this happen, but all of us want as much as we can get from that deal, the best deal possible. However, those who disagree with the Premier these days, and I do not mean just the official Opposition of the Province, I mean every Newfoundlander who dares to speak out, is put in the category of a traitor.

MR. J. HODDER: An example of the Premier's tactics can be seen from the Constitutional debates, where he put his hands down in the muck and played with the churches in the boundary issue just to cement public opinion on his side. Those issues are not forgotten.

MR. DINN: Bring the level up a little.

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, because the government has not brought the level of negotiations up. Mr. Speaker, the Premier wants the people to come out on his side. He wants the whole Province unified behind him, to agree with his every move. Well, what is his track record? Let us look at the Newfoundland Court of Appeals decision on the offshore. The Premier knew that the government had an uncertain case, or at least he should have known we had an uncertain case. It was a case to be used only as a last resort. That is well known to Newfoundlanders. I think it was in 1977 or 1978 that the Premier himself sent a booklet around to all households, a very expensive and lavish booklet. Our Offshore Heritage, I think it was called. It went to every Newfoundlander.

MR. STAGG: Heritage of the Sea.

MR. HODDER: Heritage of the Sea, signed by the Premier himself. Although he may have written it, it appeared he wrote it, I suspect that somebody else wrote it and he signed his name there. The hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has a copy. That case was played with throughout the days of the Moore's government and it has been toyed with by the members opposite. But it has been said in the House on a number of times, once, which I remember, by the former Minister of Mines and Energy, when he said that this case would only be heard as a last resort. But what happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the Premier wanted to do something dramatic and without any thought at all, in the way he usually does things, he said, 'We will go to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.'

MR. J. HODDER: They will rule for us.' He forgot, Mr. Speaker, that the Supreme Court of Newfoundland rules on the law. And because they ruled differently from the Supreme Court of Canada on the Constitutional issue, did not at all mean that they would rule on the offshore for Newfoundland. And that is where the Premier made his mistake. He must have had very bad legal advice. Because of what happened in the Constitutional debates, he must have thought that the judges would do what he wanted them to do.

MR. G. WARREN: The Premier has lost weight and lost hair since then.

MR. HODDER: But as soon as that case went to court it was out of our hands. And when we lost it, we lost the upper hand in negotiations. He placed it in the court first. He placed it before the Appeals Court of Newfoundland.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I never placed it there first. Do not be telling your lies.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon, you did. Therein lies the problem.

MR. HODDER: The Premier placed it in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland on the pretext that the Seafarer's International Case - a lawyer from the federal government gave some federal government thoughts on the offshore.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, no, no, no!

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes, yes, yes!

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

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the hon. the gentleman will let me elucidate on that point. The federal lawyers did not just give some thoughts on the offshore, they requested the

PREMIER PECKFORD: federal court to enlarge the issue to include the ownership and jurisdiction of the mineral resources and produced their factum and laid it on the table of the court so that the courts were forced then to deal with the request.

MR. S. NEARY: What happened to it? It was thrown out of court.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

To that point of order?

MR. HODDER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the

matter is that the Seafarer's International case did not rule on the ownership of the offshore. That is the fact of the matter.

MR. NEARY:

Right on!

MR. HODDER:

And if the Premier had had, again, sound legal advice, or had not been so impetuous, if he had just waited for another week to see what would have happened, he would have found out that the Seafarer's International case did not rule on who owned Hibernia or who owned the offshore.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We did not know that at the time though.

MR. HODDER:

Oh, but, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY:

Oh, I see! Well what about the Upper Churchill? Did you know about that at the time?

MR. HODDER:

Oh, but, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

But the court took it under advisement. They never said they were not going to rule on it.

MR. NEARY:

But you are an expert on the Upper Churchill, looking back at it. You are not an expert on this.

MR. HODDER:

Oh, but, Mr. Speaker, he says, that they did not know about it at the time. That compounds the -

MR. NEARY:

Oil was \$1.85 a barrel.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You are talking about escalation though in the reopeners.

MR. NEARY: Now you cannot reopen the offshore. You have lost the offshore.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I have never, never argued that the \$1.80 was wrong.

MR. NEARY: You have lost the offshore forever.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am talking about the reopeners.

MR. NEARY: It is lost forever.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, it is not.

MR. NEARY: Oh yes it is.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Oh no it is not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: No it is not, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if the Premier says that he did not know that they would not rule on the offshore, that the Seafarer's International case would not rule on the offshore, he should have waited. There was nothing saying that he had to put the case in the Supreme Court at that time. As a matter of fact, indications were, Mr. Speaker, that the Seafarer's International case would not rule on that particular item. And it was the Premier's impetuosity, he hit the ceiling and he said, we will put it in our court.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, you are wrong.

MR. NEARY: No, he is right.

MR. HODDER: Well, I am right.

MR. NEARY: My colleague is right.

MR. WARREN: He is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: He is right now sure! It is easy. We are all right when we all know all the information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: But at the time the court never said after the request went in we are only ruling on labour relations matters, they said, we will take this matter under advisement.

MR. DINN: That is right.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They gave every indication that they were going to seriously enlarge the issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh'

MR. HODDER: Oh! And how many days later after we put it into the Newfoundland Supreme Court did they -

PREMIER PECKFORD: That was the reason. And if we then did not put it into the Supreme Court and the federal court had ruled on the offshore, it would have went directly to the Supreme Court of Canada and we would not have had it in our own court.

MR. NEARY: You could have withdrawn it from the Newfoundland Appeals Court when it was thrown out in Ottawa.

MR. SIMMS: Oh sure, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is all based on a little word called 'if'.

MR. NEARY: Oh, 'if'.

PREMIER PECKFORD: If the moon was made of green cheese the moon would be full of mice, you know.

MR. HODDER: But the case is that they did not. And shortly after we had referred it to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland they came down with their decision. If the Premier had not been so impetuous, if he had not been so high off the ground at that particular time, we would have waited.

MR. HODDER: And indications were that the Seafarer's International case would not rule and they did not rule. They did not rule.

PREMIER PECKFORD: You cannot say that indications were that they were not going to rule seriously on the ownership. You have no evidence. That is just another rumor. You cannot show me any evidence.

MR. NEARY: Wat a bluff. What a big joke. You are an expert on the hindsight on the Upper Churchill but not on the SIU case.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ask anybody on the Upper Churchill.

MR. NEARY: What a colossal bluff.

MR. HODDER: Will the Premier admit that if he had left the case for another couple of weeks he would have known the difference?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: If we had not put it into court and if they had to rule on the ownership, then where would we have been?

MR. NEARY: You could have withdrawn it from the Newfoundland Appeals Court.

PREMIER PECKFORD: We had no choice then.

MR. WARREN: You did have a choice. You lost her.

MR. NEARY: You gave away our treasure. No reopening clause, no nothing. You gambled with the court and you lost.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I wish to remind hon. members on both sides of the House that the hon. member has a right to be heard in silence. And I would ask the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) if he would direct his remarks to the Chair, it might not cause so much back and forth.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I have been relating my remarks to the Chair and I will continue to do so.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter was that the Seafarer's International case did not rule on the offshore. And the fact of the matter was that if the Premier had waited for ten days he would have known that they were not going to rule on the offshore. But he put the case in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. HODDER: Now once he put that case in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland it was out of our hands. As long as he kept it out of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland we had a negotiating hand, we had room for negotiating.

MR. WARREN: He tried a bluff but it failed.

MR. HODDER: He placed it in the court first.

MR. TOBIN: It should not be in the courts.

The federal government should give it to us like they did the rest of Canada.

MR. HODDER: If the hon. member over there says he thinks the government should give it to us, that we should have had it, okay, I agree with him.

MR. HODDER: I will tell you what I think. I think that after all the anti-Ottawa sentiment that has been expressed by this government, and anti-Canadian sentiment that has been expressed through the constitutional conferences, through every DREE agreement, DREE agreements were not even contemplated. - this government would say, we want those agreements and then they would start complaining they were not signed. Every second word that comes from every second Minister on that side of the House - there has been nothing but a total confrontation. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that if this government had handled - and that was the part of the larger negotiations which, perhaps, are more important than the smaller negotiations. If this government had been sitting down as equals -

MR. TOBIN: What government?

MR. HODDER: - with people they consider as equals. We might have that agreement now. If the hon. member would like me to get ahead with my speech, would he please shut up!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HODDER: I told you, Mr. Speaker, when they applauded when I stood up, that they would not be applauding when I sat down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Oh!

MR. HODDER: The Premier was mistaken and once the case would go to the Supreme Court of Canada

MR. WARREN: There is less welfare than during election time.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, could I be heard in silence!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to remind members on both sides that the hon. member wishes to be heard in silence.

The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier was mistaken and once the case was in the court it was also on its way to the Supreme Court of Canada. The Federal government merely then countered the move by increasing the time. And, thank goodness, looking at the situations that have happened, it is a good thing that they did put it in the Supreme Court of Canada, because now it is there more quickly. Because now we have our own government who are appealing it in the Supreme Court of Canada. All that the Federal government did was to speed up the process. And by the

MR. HODDER: Premier's misguided move we lost the only negotiating tool that we had, the only negotiating tool that this Province had. They had two - they had the people of the Province and they had another one.

MR. TOBIN: And the goodwill of Ottawa.

MR. HODDER: No, they did not have that, they lost that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Never had it. Never had it.

MR. HODDER: But they also had a Supreme Court case which might or might not win, but there was some speculation that it could win. They had that in reserve as a last resort to help along in negotiating with their federal counterparts. But, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has not negotiated with a full deck of cards.

MR. TOBIN: That is right because there is not a full deck of cards in Ottawa.

MR. HODDER: His tactics are confrontationalist and they are transparent. His tactic is to fight against Ottawa on every front, even if it means he has to send one of his ministers down to Shoe Cove to organize a demonstration. You know, Shoe Cove is a symbol. The Premier saw an issue that he could rally people around much as he did on the Labrador boundary. He saw that issue. He told the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that the terrible federal government had closed the facility that provided information on icebergs and sea conditions. And then he sent the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) down - the one minister of all ministers to send down there - the most unpopular man in rural Newfoundland, he sent him down there to organize a little demonstration. Let us get this going, this will get our people together with me again. Because I am losing my people now, this will get my people together with me again.

MR. TOBIN: What is your position on Shoe Cove?

MR. HODDER: But it was a red herring.
My personal position on Shoe Cove is that since it is not a facility which is giving us accurate information, since it cannot see -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HODDER: - through cloud cover, because it cannot give us the information that other more sophisticated systems can and because the information that we will be receiving on iceberg and ice conditions will be superior, then -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, it was a red herring and a transparent one.

MR. BARRETT: Do you agree with your federal colleagues, the Liberals in Ottawa, to close her down, send it to Central Canada?

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Do you agree with Brian Mulroney - close her down?

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker. I would like to see it here but I also realize, just as this government realizes when they cut social assistance to recipients and they cut education budgets, that there is so much money around. And if I can be told that the information that we were to see on the icebergs will be better, then I would not do what the Premier did and hash up a report which is full of holes and then stand up here and try to blindfold the devil in the dark and try to mislead the people.

MR. DAWE: Are you saying that the Premier misled the House?

MR. NEARY: He misled the people.

MR. DÄWE: Are you saying the Premier misled the House?

MR. NEARY: Go back to your seat. Do you not know the rules of the House? Go back to your seat.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, let us look at offshore drilling. Last year the Premier and the Minister without Portfolio said, no, there would be no offshore drilling.

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

MR. HODDER: Oh, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I must have enough here for three.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Leave is not granted.
The hon. member for Trinity North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, after listening to that I can come to only one conclusion, I am very, very disappointed in that particular member who just spoke, very disappointed.

MR. SIMMS: We all are.

MR. BRETT: But I can only conclude one thing, that it does not matter what Ottawa does, it does not matter what they do, it does not matter what they close down, they are going to support the Liberals in Ottawa and that is it. That is the only conclusion that we can come to over here.

MR. STAGG: That is where we stand.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, in opening my few remarks I want first of all to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), and the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). Both gentlemen did an exceptionally fine job and I think it is fair to say that these two gentlemen are good examples of the calibre of men the Premier has in his backbenches.

I noted the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) on the day that the House opened, when he was speaking after the Throne Speech. He indicated that years ago there was a great clamour, everybody wanted to be the person to move the Address in Reply but he said that that is not so today. Now I beg to differ from that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the interest is just as keen today to be the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply as it ever was.

My mind went back to 1972 when I was chosen to be the mover of the Address in Reply. I do not think I will ever forget it, Mr. Speaker, it probably was one of the outstanding events in my life because -

MR. STAGG: An outstanding speech, too. I was there.

MR. BRETT: - I sort of came off the street. I did not plan for years to become a politician. I guess like a lot of us in those days, we came in rather quickly and to be chosen to make that speech was something else. I remember sitting down about eleven o'clock in the night, with some help from a relative, and it was daylight when we finished the speech. Yes, I thought it was a pretty good speech.

MR. NEARY: Is that your maiden speech you are making now?

MR. BRETT:

But there was no television in the House the other day when the Throne Speech was read, that is two years in a row, and I remember one of the things that thrilled me the most was that for the first time in my life I was going to be on television.

MR. BRETT: I was not standing on the floor, I think I was that far off the floor. But I was making a speech and it was, indeed, a thrill to be on television.

Now, it is unfortunate that we could not have television in the House the other day, and, of course, it is because of a whim of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). He says if we cannot have it in the House everyday, then we are not going to have it at all. Well, I suppose, he has every right to say that. But I was one member who voted against television in the House. And I did not do that to toe the party line, I did it because I have very strong feelings about television in the House, very strong personal feelings. And the reason is that, if I understand correctly, the televisions will be here but they will not be broadcasting directly from the House, the tapes will be taken back and edited.

And I am going to say something now that is not going to make me very popular with the media. But I do not trust that crowd at CBC enough to let them edit anything that is said in here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I recognize that freedom of the press is something which every one of us cherish. We know that all of us would fight, I suppose give our last drop of blood to see that we always have freedom of the press. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that freedom of the press carries an awesome responsibility, and I suggest to this House that probably there are people in the media in this Province who do not acknowledge that responsibility and do not carry out that responsibility.

I am not suggesting that this is a political thing, Tory versus Liberal or NDP or anything like that. It seems to me that it is anti-establishment,

MR. BRETT: and I would suggest that if these people over there were over here it would be the same thing.

MR. BAIRD: God forbid!

MR. BRETT: I think it was a person who at one time, not all that long ago, was news director at CBC who made a statement in one of the courts here in St. John's quite recently, that his job was to report the news as he saw it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not the responsibility of the press

MR. BRETT: to report the news as they see it. It is the responsibility of the press to report it as it is, and I am afraid that is not exactly what they do. And that is why I do not trust the CBC to edit anything that is said in this House, and I never will until they change their tactics.

I do not want to give the impression that I am smearing everybody who works with CBC. I am not doing that, I am just stating some things, some facts that I feel very strongly about.

And there are a couple of other things that I want to get off my chest. They have been there for a year and I have to say it, I want to say it, I want to say it in this House.

There was an event in my district a year or so ago, a couple of years ago, a very important event. I believe Clarenville was the only town - every year there is a town chosen. It has something to do with this 'energy save'. There are a number of towns chosen across Canada, from the Eastern Seaboard right on down, and Clarenville was chosen in Newfoundland, it was the only community. I stand to be corrected on that.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible) and Grand Falls the year before.

MR. BRETT: Grand Falls was the year before.

The people who organized that energy save thing contacted the CBC in St. John's and requested that they come out. It was an important event not only for the residents of Clarenville, but it was important enough they thought, and I think so too, that it should be shown on the news, and everybody in Newfoundland was interested in it.

MR. BRETT: Well, I do not have to tell you that nobody came out, it was not important enough. But just previous to that there was an event in which I was involved, one which cost me my job, and I can guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, there was no shortage of cameras and crew then. Because that camera was over the boat, under the boat, on top of the boat, inside the boat, you name it.

MR. BAIRD: Even in the hay.

MR. BRETT: No. It would make you sick. That was important, because that was a scandal. And the hon. the member, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), you can smile if you like, but they will get you too. They have gotten you on many occasions.

And, of course, the seal hunt, as far as I am concerned, the greatest friend that Mr. Watson and a few of them have is the CBC, because they have done more to smear the blood and the guts than anybody else in the world. The greatest buddies they have. And, of course, the latest one, as the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) pointed out yesterday, was the fact that two or three people from the CBC here in St. John's are on the boat that is supposed to arrive here tonight.

And another one I want to get off my chest is about the salaries, and that one really bugged me. Everybody in Newfoundland knows what my salary is, what the salary of the Leader of

MR. C. BRETT:

the Opposition (Mr. S. Neary) is, the Speaker of the House, the Deputy Ministers, Anybody in Newfoundland who is getting their pay from the public purse, it is common knowledge what they are getting paid.

MR. NEARY: They have a right to know.

MR. BRETT: And they have a right to know. You are right on.

But the CBC? No, we do not have a right to know. And pray tell me, who pays the salaries of the crowd at the CBC?

MR. J. MORGAN: We will know, though, within the next few days.

MR. BRETT: Who pays their salaries? Is it public or is it not? But we do not have the right to know. It is not their policy. Let us take a crack at some of them. before I get to the crowd up here. It was just this morning I was reading in The Daily News about Peter Mansbridge, who is the anchorman for CBC on the weekends. He only gets paid \$100,000, that is all. Not bad! Some of my crowd down on Random Island would really love to get much, would they not? I would suggest to you that probably the man in charge over here is getting anywhere from \$50,000 to \$75,000. That is not too bad. I do not know, it is not public policy. They will not tell me so I have to guess at it. I would guess that some of the crowd that sits up there are making roughly around \$30,000 or \$34,000. Anywhere from \$24,000 to \$30,000 plus. And, of course, every time that they go outside of St. John's with their vans and all of the rest of it, that is all paid for as well. What do we get over here on the backbenches and you people over there? We get \$22,5000 a-year plus you get a district allowance which we spend every nickle of because we have

MR. C. BRETT: to be seen in our districts in order to do our work. We have to be in our district, not only seen there, we have to be there at least once a month. So, we get \$22,500 a year, I would suggest to you that most of the people involved in giving the news at CBC are making an awful lot more than \$22,5000 a year.

So now I got that off my chest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: Maybe, Mr. Speaker, the next article they do will be on the Godfather, Trudeau. I understand that the taxpayers are even paying for the babysitters for Justin - and what is the other one's name?

MR. DINN: Sasha.

MR. BRETT: Sasha and Justin. I understand we are even paying for the babysitters. Of course, not to mention that we are paying for his groceries. So that is a good one for the CBC, maybe they will pick that one up soon.

MR. BRETT: So much for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible). For that, Charlie.

MR. BRETT: That is for sure.

But I think everybody in this House and everybody in Newfoundland knows that if I have a reason for saying this, it is not because I am complaining about getting publicity. Everybody who knows the member for Trinity North is well aware of the fact that I have never been a publicity seeker. Whatever else you can say about me, you cannot say that.

Now, I will get down to some of the problems at hand. Mr. Speaker, I sat here last week listening to the Throne Speech and my mind wandered back to the mid '70s. I was sitting in Cabinet one day and the Minister of Fisheries then was Walter Carter, he was my seat mate. On that particular day I think we realized

MR. C. BRETT: that we were never going to get
joint ventures in this Province. It was a lost cause.
And I remember Walt looking at the Premier of that day
saying, 'Frank, why do we not pack it in and go home
old man because we were destined to be poor.'

MR. BRETT: And I said to myself then and many times since, I do not think we were destined to be poor. I think that a lot of our problems, a lot of the things that have gone wrong we have to blame on ourselves. But after listening to the Throne Speech the other day I got second thoughts, I am not sure anymore. I am not absolutely positive anymore that we were not destined to be poor. I am beginning to believe that we were. You know, the last speaker said that everyone of us that got up over here since the Throne Speech was read have done nothing but lambaste the federal government. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult not to when we are conscious of the fact that our destiny is controlled by the federal government. So it is difficult not to talk about it. But it is no longer a question of what we do not control, the question now is what do we control? Is there anything left? Is there anything at all left that we do control? Can we do anything anymore without going to Ottawa? Let us look at some of the programmes that we do not have any say in at all. First of all there is CCDP. What is that? That is the Canada Community Development Programme. I suppose that is the one that replaces LIP and Canada Works, no say at all.

MR. BAIRD: A slush fund for the M.Ps.

MR. BRETT: I will talk about that later on. NEED: That is one of the newest ones now, very little say - what? 10 per cent or 14 per cent of the say, whatever it might be. Employment for Youth, no say, no say at all. And then there is that CHIRP and CHIP and RRAP and COSP. I do not know what that one stands for. And now we are being told we may not get a Rural Development Agreement, and if we do not it means

MR. BRETT: that all the Rural Development Associations are gone down the drain. My understanding is that the federal government wants to bypass the provincial government and deal directly with the development associations. Obviously it is for purely political reasons. Offshore resources, no control, no control at all. Even though the Premier is very much aware of the fact, or it is pointed out to him that there are more than 100 men offshore whose lives are in danger, even though this is pointed out to him and he knows he has a moral obligation to try to get them in out of it, in spite of all that, no, he has no say, it is none of his business. The fisheries: Well, a little bit but not very much, not enough to really do anything about it. And these are our major resources, of course, these two.

Page 4 in the Throne

Speech: I did not want to write it out so let me read it. "My Government views our present circumstances with grave concern. The ability of the Province to chart a course that, on the one hand helps our Nation, Canada,

MR. BRETT: and on the other hand allows Newfoundland and Labrador to grow and prosper, is in jeopardy." Now how true that is, Mr. Speaker. Because the question is how can we chart a course, or how can we control our destiny, or be masters of our fate, if someone else has control over our resources, particularly the major resources of our Province.

Somebody is going to say the once that I am paranoid or whatever.

MR. STAGG: Even people who are paranoid have enemies.

MR. BRETT: I remember once being told that, and it was told to me by a CFA - you know what a CFA is.

MR. BAIRD: Come from away.

MR. BRETT: It was once told by a CFA that all Newfoundlanders have inferiority complexes. I said, Well, perhaps we have old man, it is quite possible. Because we had a Premier who for twenty-odd years told us we were not as good as anybody else. We certainly were not as good as the Germans and the Japs or anybody who chose to come in here. Certainly not as good as other Canadians, that went without saying. Of course, I suppose the prime example of that are the two who sat down there on the first floor, I think it was, Mr. Sametz, and Mr. Van Es. And I guarantee you they were not born in Bonavista Bay. I do not know where, but I think one was Dutch and I do not know what the other one was. Those are the two who sat down and planned the resettlement programme.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very, very difficult - is it not? - to chart a programme. Again I say you can call me paranoid if you like, but I get this strange gut feeling, Mr. Speaker, that we are being looked upon by

MR. BRETT: the crowd in Ottawa as being very inferior.
I think they believe that most of the people down here are
Liberal anyway. I suppose it is reasonable that they would
think that, seeing that people traditionally seem to vote
Liberal in the federal elections. I suppose they look on
us as people who

MR. BRETT: kill seals, eat fish. It is cold down here, and wet, most of the time, a lot of the times the planes cannot get in. And I suspect that they must say how dare we down here speak up, how dare we try to be equal. After all, they gave us the baby bonus, did they not?

MR. HICKEY: Yes.

MR. BRETT: Yes. And they gave us the old age pension, and they gave us unemployment insurance, they gave us all of that so what do we want anyway? And, of course, this Canada Works, this CCDP, is it not? - Canada Community Development Program - that, of course, is the biggest slush fund that ever existed in Canada. It is nothing more than a slush fund for the MPs up there. The previous speaker said that at no time did we have the goodwill of the federal government - or we did have the goodwill of the federal government, that is what he said, prior to this administration. But I would suggest to that hon. member that we never did have the goodwill of the federal government, we had the goodwill of Don Jamieson. And it is unfortunate that today we do not have the goodwill of Mr. Rompkey.

But getting on to these Canada Works, and that is something else I have to get off my chest because that has been bugging me to no end - I wonder how many cemetery fences have been built, you know, over the last number of years? The millions of dollars that have been poured into this Province is unreal, but how much of it has been wisely spent? Look, I can practically walk with a pair of slippers on from Clarenville to Catalina on wharves. And I can guarantee you that they are some of the most beautiful wharves that you ever say in various communities down the Trinity Bay coastline and there is not one black punt to be seen anywhere, nothing to tie on, not a thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: And there is one place in my district, a place called Harcourt, there are three wharves that are not finished yet. Last Winter, not this Winter we are in now, the Winter before, on one of them they built a fish holding unit and there is not one single fisherman in the community, not one. But I do not know if it is true or not but I have heard of bridges being built and after the bridges were built they realized that the brook or the river did not run under the bridge or there was no river or brook there so they had to divert a brook to run under the bridge. They have poured in an awful lot of money, there is no doubt about that but very little to develop our resources.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that what is going on right now, what has been going on the last year or so, I think that probably Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Lalonde might be afraid that probably the fish-eating natives are getting a little bit restless. I think probably that is the way they feel right now. And I suggest to you that they could be saying that whatever else happens they cannot have the East as independent as the West. The West has given them so much trouble -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. BRETT: That is right. - that there is no way that they can have that same trouble in the East.

MR. BAIRD: (Inaudible) down on the fish flake.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, you do not have to be very smart, I suppose, to see that as long as we are dependent on Ottawa and beholden to them, I guess, they can control us. Now, for twenty years, Mr. Speaker, we kissed their hand and other parts of their anatomy, for twenty-odd years, twenty years plus. Then in 1979 we decided to stop, we said we are not going to kiss their cheeks any more.

AN HON. MEMBER: We said that in '72.

MR. BRETT: Well, we said it more strongly in 1979 and 1980 than we did in 1972. Now what price are we paying for making that decision? What price are we paying? To read off some of them: They set out to develop the gas potential off Nova Scotia even though there is a surplus of gas in Canada. But not a move to develop the oil off Newfoundland even though we need it if we are to be self-sufficient.

In other words, pat the fawning dog Nova Scotia and kick the barking dog Newfoundland is the attitude. Another way that we are paid, they refused to treat us the same as other provinces. And I know this has been said, you know, I know there are people probably in the galleries over there saying we heard all of this before. But I will tell you something, I can sit down here and depending on the topic I can write the speech that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is going to make the next time he gets up. We have all heard it before. But this is worth repeating. We are not being treated the same as other provinces.

The Western provinces were given control of their resources in 1930. And why do we have to fight today to get ours? Why can we not have ours given to us the same as the Western provinces got their's in 1930?

MR. BRETT: Another one, the federal contribution in the field of regional development reduced in three years from \$70 million to approximately \$35 million. The lack of a rural development agreement, and I mentioned that before. It appears to us that they want to bypass the government and deal directly with the Rural Development Associations. You know, it is just as well for us to be a municipality for what say we have any more.

Inadequate search and rescue -

MR. ANDREWS: That is what Trudeau wants (inaudible) all the provinces -

MR. BRETT: Oh, yes, I realize that. The latest one, of course, is taking away the tracking station at Shoe Cove. But the one that I wish I could talk about is what happened out in Conception Bay the other day. And the truth of that matter is, I do not know if it has ever come out or not, that these men would have froze to death, and the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) if he has not already talked about it he will, these two men would have frozen to death on the ice in Conception Bay that night if they had had to depend on the search and rescue.

MR. ANDREWS: That is right.

MR. BRETT: That is a fact and nobody can dispute it.

AN HON. MEMBER: A local helicopter had to help them.

MR. BRETT: Right.

MR. DOYLE: You have raised a good point.

MR. BRETT: We have been fighting and scratching.

I was at it for two years and my colleague is still at it and, I suppose, the people who were there before me, the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and several people who were in that portfolio, have been fighting for

MR. BRETT: the last four or five years for a decent transportation agreement. We have not got one for years. The federal government have continued to refuse to intervene in the situation which allows another province, Quebec, to be a broker for the sale of Labrador power. And again we have heard it many, many times but it is worth repeating. Everybody knows that that latest legislation that was brought in to assist the Province of Newfoundland in building transmission lines across Quebec is nothing more than a farce. It will never happen. So, Mr. Speaker - I was going to say with a foreign power but that is terrible, I suppose, I cannot say that in the House of Assembly. But with a government like that in Ottawa in control of our resources, I say it is impossible for us to ever chart a course in this Province.

Now I have five minutes and very quickly I want to mention the two issues that are most prominent, the ones that have been talked about the most since the reading of the Throne Speech. One is the removal of the drill rigs from offshore and the second one is the agreement, and the development, or the lack of the agreement and the development of the offshore resources.

I realize that the rigs are on the way in, or they will be shortly, but I want to say this; I do not care what the Premier's reason was, but I believe it was out of genuine concern for the lives of the people out there, I do not care what the reason was, I am very happy that the Cabinet made the decision to ask Mobil to bring these rigs in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: I will never forget, Mr. Speaker, as long as I live, the morning that the radio woke me and the first thing I heard was that the Ocean Ranger had gone down and it was suspected that all lives were lost. I was lying in my warm bed but I will never, ever forget the cold chill that went down my back, down my spine. I will never forget it as long as I live. And I do not ever want to hear that on the radio again. So I do not care, Mr. Speaker, I do not care what the reasons were, I thank God that the decision was made. And if there ever was an accident out there, if there ever was an accident out there, then at least no one in this House, on either side, will have to accept the responsibility for what might happen. As for the agreement let me say this, that if there is anyone in this House who is stupid enough to think that we should sign an agreement that is worse from a revenue sharing point of view, worse than the Nova Scotia deal, then it is ludicrous. I do not think the people of Newfoundland want us to do that. And to me the matter is not all that complicated. We want joint management, joint management, down the middle, six on the committee, three provincial, three federal and an independent chairman - that is not difficult to understand is it? and a decent sharing agreement. Now you can beat around the bush and make all kinds of fancy statements, you can say what you like, but that is the bottom line, decent revenue sharing - they have offered us worse than Nova Scotia - and joint management. That is it

MR. BRETT: and they will not give it to us. You do not need to go on and talk about that for hours because that is the bottom line. And until we get that we are not going to sign. And if there is anybody over there who thinks there are chinks in the armour over here, then they have another thing coming to them, because there are no chinks in the armour over here. We are solidly behind the Premier and the Cabinet, and we know that he has more sense than to even sign an agreement like that.

MR. NEARY: Seventy-five and twenty-five works for Nova Scotia.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to have a few words to say about my district but there will be another opportunity in the debate on the budget and I will take the opportunity to speak on my district then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start off my few remarks as well by congratulating the mover and the seconder, as the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) did when he stood to speak.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intended to make a few points which I do not think I will make now. What I will do, after listening to the gentleman who just sat down, is respond to some of the points that he raised and rather than taking them in the order in which he brought them up, I think I will work back from the last points that he was making to where he, I think, talked about the TV and the House of Assembly, that was one of the first things that he talked about.

Let me work back from where he just ended off. You know, it is more than passing strange, of course it is a fact of life, obviously, that the way you see

MR. CALLAN: something depends, obviously, from where you sit. You know, when it is convenient to tell half of something or to tell your side of it, that is all you are going to tell. The gentleman who is presently in the Chair last Fall was making a few remarks and he was talking about an opinion poll or something, an article, and how it rated politicians as compared to how it rated doctors and so on. And, of course, for a long time I have known, and I guess the newer members of the Legislature know now, that to be a member of the House of Assembly does not hold anybody in very high esteem. I resigned myself to the fact many years ago, or four or five years ago, to the fact that this is a job. It is not nearly as good a job as you would like it to be when you are in Opposition, because all you can do when you are in Opposition is do the little things, and apologize for not being able to accomplish a lot of those.

MR. CALLAN: The big things like pavement and water and sewer and that sort of thing, you resign yourself to the fact that you cannot get any of that for your district. For the same reason, by the way, it depends on where you sit, you see it from where you sit. This same government here that is talking about the inequality and discrimination that Ottawa is showing to this province as compared to what it does for other provinces, You know, I can take ten hours and outline what this government is doing to show inequality and discrimination in favour of their own crowd, their own members, their backbenchers as compared to the way we are treated in the Opposition, And I have seen it, of course, from the first time I was elected, in 1975, and it has not changed. The leaders have changed, the premiers have changed, but that fact has not changed.

Now, of course, getting back to the gentleman who is presently in the Chair and who talked about the poll as comparing politicians and doctors. You know, what the gentleman did not go on to do was to tell us about the popularity of a man who was mixing both, both a doctor and a politician. I have a feeling that a lot would be said there.

Just mentioning for a brief moment last Spring's election, the Premier stood on a stage in an auditorium with 400 or 500 people, and it was not the infamous one that you have heard me talking about in my own backyard, in Norman's Cove, it was in another district and I will not mention it. The member is not here so I will not mention it. He has not been here since the House opened, but, anyway, he is probably ill, I do not know. But, the Premier stood on this stage and he said to the 400 or 500 people, as an example of telling only half, the half that

MR. CALLAN: you want the people to hear and not finishing the other half, the Premier said, 'Ladies and Gentleman, I want you to vote for this man here', pointing to the PC candidate who sat on the stage with him, 'I want you to vote for this gentleman here', he said. This is the gentleman that we had to call on all winter and, of course, everybody remembers how tough things were last winter with all the snow we had.

'Here is a man I want you to vote for, because here is the man that we had to call on to keep your roads open'. Of course, the Premier, that is where he ended, the Premier did not bother to mention the fact that this man was a contractor and this man was paid out of the public treasury \$117,000 of taxpayers' money to keep the roads open. The Premier was trying to convey the impression to the people there that, you know, if we did not have this man to call on, their roads would not have gotten cleared at all.

MR. W. CALLAN: So you just tell it the way it is and the Premier is a master at it. If he can be given credit for one thing, the Premier must be given credit for being a master at manipulating words and making a fiery speech. Many people have compared him to Joey Smallwood and I think it is a good comparison. I mean, former Premier Smallwood was also a master at it. The thing that disappointed me, Mr. Speaker, last Spring, was as I traveled to the district of Bellevue and met people, I said - and people said it to me - 'You know, the Premier is just like Joey Smallwood.' 'Yes,' I said, 'he is'. But I said - and I was disappointed to learn after the election was over - I said, 'But there is one big difference, do you not believe? Joey Smallwood or somebody else could have pulled this trick ten, fifteen, twenty years ago when a lot of Newfoundlanders were a lot less educated, did not have the television and newspapers and the radios and so on and were not exposed to world affairs and provincial affairs and did not have cars to drive down to another district or drive to another part of the Province.' I said, 'That is the big mistake that the Premier is making, Newfoundlanders will not fall for it.' But as I was saying yesterday, I was shocked and amazed to discover that Newfoundlanders did fall for it, 25 per cent of them. The 35 per cent staunch Tories, dyed-in-the-wool Tories, that 35 per cent would have voted Tory if the member for St. John's West, (Mr. H. Barrett) were the Premier, heaven forbid.

MR. G. WARREN: Or the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg).

MR. CALLAN: Those 35 per cent, by the way, just to be fair, just as the 35 per cent of the people who voted Liberal last Spring would also have voted Liberal no

MR. W. CALLAN: matter who the leader was or what the issues, you see. So it was only 25 per cent - 35 per cent and 25 per cent gives you the 60 per cent that the Premier got. So it was only 25 per cent of the people that he conned. But these are the people who elect governments, and why these people were so taken in is beyond me. Perhaps the arguments were good and, I suppose, looking back they were good. Right now, of course, obviously they are not very good. I mean, the Premier was saying, as he is saying now, regarding bringing the oil rigs in, he is saying - and I heard him say it on the radio or television - 'We have the documentation.' These were the kinds of expressions that he was using when he -

You want to say something, Mr.

Speaker, about the Late Show, I believe. I will stop.

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): Yes.

MR. SPEAKER (MCNICHOLAS): Yes, it is now five o'clock and there is a notice by the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) that he is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in relation to the Auditor General's reporting of continued weakness in control over government air services during the fiscal year, 1981-1982.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. NEARY: Is there only one issue?

MR. SPEAKER: There is a second one by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). He is dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Health (Mr. House) in response to a question re surgical services in Melville Hospital in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: So you see, Mr. Speaker, what I was saying was that the Premier (Mr. Peckford) was using these same sorts of expressions and the people were conned. "We have the documentation to win this offshore oil dispute in the courts of Newfoundland, we have the documentation", you know. "We do not want anymore Upper Churchills or Lower Churchills" and all of this nonsense.

MR. DAWE: Nonsense? Nonsense?

MR. CALLAN: Of course it is nonsense.

Who wants it? The Premier does not want it. Who in Newfoundland wants it? Do I want it? Did the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Neary) want it? Who wanted it? Nobody wanted it. Nobody wanted it and everybody in this Province, everybody on this side of the House, all thirty-five per cent of the Liberals across this Province who voted Liberal last Spring, they all want the

MR. CALLAN: best possible deal for this Province as well. It is not just the Premier (Mr. Peckford) and the few people who support the Premier. Every Newfoundlander wants it, you see. But the Premier in his tactics, and as I said the persuasive way that he has of telling half of something, you know, the Premier more or less gave the impression to people who did not really think about it that, you know, if it was not for me, if I had not been Minister of Mines and Energy and if I were not Premier today that there would not be any oil out there anyway. He was almost persuasive enough to convince some people that it was 'I' who put the oil out there anyway. You know, he did not bother to mention the fact that when Joey Smallwood was Premier there was drilling for offshore oil and it just happened that the technology was around and the rigs were around to discover the oil when this government happened to be in power.

MR. DINN: How many people were Newfoundlanders who were working on the rigs then?

MR. CALLAN: I could not care less.
You know, it is

MR. CALLAN: totally unimportant. It was totally unimportant. But I will say this much -

MR. DAWE: That says volumes.

MR. CALLAN: No. No. But I will say this much, that the same government that made sure that the majority of people working on those rigs, who press for the point that they should be Newfoundlanders, should also have been the same government that had the strictest possible regulations in place so that the Ocean Ranger would not have gone down in the first place. Put that in your pipe and smoke it. It should have been the same government that did not wait until after the Ocean Ranger went down to hire four extra inspectors. They should have been there then. They should have been there to see that that porthole was closed before the waves smashed the glass. They should have been there to see that the iron porthole was closed, the glass would not have smashed, the electronic equipment would not have gone haywire and the rig would not have gone bottom up in the first place.

MR. WARREN: They close the barn door after the horse is gone.

MR. CALLAN: You see, it is so very easy to point to the mistakes that somebody else made ten or fifteen years ago. 'But why beholdest thou the mote that it is in thy brother's eye' - in Ottawa's or your predecessor's - 'and not the log that is in thine own?'

MR. WARREN: Hear, hear! Good scenario.

MR. CALLAN: Newfoundlanders know now. Did you hear the people, the oil rig workers on one of the open-line programmes the other morning, phoning in from Clarenville?

MR. DINN: I am too busy.

MR. CALLAN: You were too busy. But it is all monitored. You are given copies of what was said and who said it. You get a chance to read it. It might not be until

MR. CALLAN: eleven o'clock that night but you do know what was said. The CBC are listening to VOXM, I heard that this morning as I was driving along.

MR. NEARY: The open line brigade will tell him.

MR. CALLAN: The gentleman phoned in about the Sea Shepherd. But anyway, getting back to the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) and some of the points that he was making, you see the biggest problem that this government has, Mr. Speaker, is that it is - and the Premier, of course, is the aider and abetter, he is the person to blame most of all, the biggest problem that this government has is its too good to be told. It is too good to be told. The Premier is too good to accept advice from anybody. The government are too good to accept advice from anybody. As an example, the few things that they do do they wait a year until they do them, and the latest example we have of that is excellent advice was being given last year in January and the first two weeks in February by the same gentleman who is on the stand now before the enquiry, and it was being given by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) -

MR. NEARY: Correct.

MR. CALLAN: - the same man - no, no, the President of the Council, he pooh-poohed it. They were too good to be told that, you know, there is impending danger, that unless something is done this rig is going to go down. They were warned but they were too good to be given advice.

MR. WARREN: So they must take the blame.
They have to take the blame.

MR. CALLAN: Just take another small example, Mr. Speaker, of the things that this government - now, a year later of course, they are implementing the very things that were called for before the Ocean Ranger went down.

MR. WARREN: So the blame must be theirs.

MR. W. CALLAN: The gentleman who died a month or two ago, the gentleman who used to write the column in The Evening Telegram, Ray Simmons, had some excellent advice - and I mentioned this last Fall in the Legislature - that I happened to put out a press release the same weekend and a couple of days later I read what Ray Simmons had to say - and the minister is not there now - but what he had to say about poaching in this Province and moose licences. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly what Ray Simmons had to say and what I was suggesting about a public education programme and hiring extra wildlife officers and so on, now, a year later, the government is going to implement some of this things. But last year they pooh-poohed it just as they pooh-poohed -

MR.S. NEARY: They would not listen to us on the offshore. Look at them there now. They have lost their shirts.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to say, and I can understand the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) feeling the way he does, 'We are solidly behind the Premier.' You know, you have a different perspective, and I might add the couple of years that I was out of politics, in 1977 and 1980, I had a different perspective altogether. When you are out you are really out, but when you are up close you cannot see the forest for the trees. Let me ask the member for Trinity North - even though I know he does not want to answer, but perhaps he will; I will yield if he wants to - but let me ask him - you know, it depends on where you sit - if he were the Liberal member - he is going to say, 'Heaven forbid', or somebody will say it for him - but let us assume for a moment that he was the Liberal member for Trinity North back in 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981 when the hospital that the PC Premier promised, that time just drifted on

MR. W. CALLAN: I wonder if he would not have been on the radio and in The Clarenville Packet damning the government for making this empty promise to the people in Clarenville, going to build a hospital. Spent almost a half a million dollars over five or six years, nothing to show, it is starting to happen now but I am wondering and I am wondering if - and let me use another example - I wondering if the member for Trinity North (Mr. C. Brett) - he is a fine fellow, a Joey hater, that is his biggest problem and he knows that I do not have to tell him that -

MR. C. BRETT: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: Well, there are some over there like that. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is another example.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN: They are Joey haters, that is their biggest fault. Fine gentlemen, I will sit down and have a drink with them anytime at all, but they are Joey haters.

Now then, let me ask the member for Trinity North: Let us assume that I was the PC member in Bellevue and he was the Liberal member again in Trinity North and the decision was made to pave to the very last house in Adeytown but not to pave Deep Bight, would he not have been seeing things just the way that I saw them? It depends on where you sit. I can condemn Ottawa on many, many scores but the problem that this government has and the problem that the Premier has is three years ago when I watched the Premier when I was not a member of the House and I watched the Premier in the media and so on - he used to do a lot of it then not nearly as much now -

MR. CALLAN:

But anyway -

MR. STAGG:

for Don.

But he did not step aside

MR. SIMMS:

then.

He was Liberal Reform

MR. TOBIN:

aside for Don. Bas almost did the job on him
then.

No, no, he stepped

MR. CALLAN:

friend, only counts in horseshoes and making love. So
that is what Bas did, he came close but it does not count.

Almost? Close, my

MR. STAGG:

MR. CALLAN:

the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

What about hand grenades?

I wish I had one for

Mr. Speaker, you see,

the Premier (Mr. Peckford) three years ago was seen
as this fighter and every Newfoundlander said, 'Yes,
well here is the man who is going to do the job'. But
unfortunately what has transpired and what we see today,
and more and more Newfoundlanders are beginning to see
it more clearly - I could see it last Spring and I told
the people in my district and, of course, now they
can see it - and now they say, 'You know, those people who
voted for the Premier last Spring must be feeling pretty
bad now, they could not see what we saw last Spring'.

MR. TOBIN:

MR. CALLAN:

is beginning now to look like a fighter, but the
kind of a fighter that he has been all along, it is the
bar-room fighter, the fellow who fights because he loves
fighting. You see, the Premier, when he had a cause, looked
like he was fighting for something, but, as these causes
slipped by, the man is beginning now to appear to everybody
to be not the fighter for others. I am wondering, Mr. Speaker,

They do not say that.

Yes. But the Premier

MR. CALLAN: how many of those forty-four - well actually there are forty-three because you are in the Chair - how many of the forty-three on that side of the House in all sincerity and honesty would have said, 'I would have gladly lost my seat last year if it meant that a Liberal government would have gotten elected in this Province and would have given this Province the kind of deal that our Premier has been fighting for'? When it comes down to it, I rather doubt, Mr. Speaker, that their hearts are always in the right places. And I rather doubt that the Premier's heart is always in the right place. I believe, even though I oppose Ottawa on many things, I believe John Chretien when he says that all that the Premier and the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) are doing with this issue is playing petty politics. They have not got the gumption to say, 'The three Supreme Court judges have made a decision, unfortunately we lost but now let us get back to the negotiating table. This is what the mandate was all about last Spring. I owe it to the people of this Province to get back to the negotiating table and if I cannot get a deal like we want, but if I can get something in between' - and there is a happy medium in everything, Mr. Speaker - 'but if I can get something in between' and it does not have to be from the Chruchill experience we know that we should not sign ninety-nine year contracts or fifty year contracts. Why does the Premier not say, to pick up that phone that they are so used to using to talk to John Chretien when it suits them or send one of these telexes that they send every day of the week.

MR. SIMMS:

We sent one.

MR. CALLAN: The gentleman had his chance and he will have another chance now when I sit down.

MR. TOBIN: I cannot wait to get up.

MR. CALLAN: I cannot wait for you to get up either so as I can be gone out of listening distance. If the Premier really cared about the people of this Province he would say, because he knows, anybody knows, that whatever chance we had, we had it with the Supreme Court judges in this Province, you see. The best case that could possibly have been put was put by our lawyers here in our court in this Province, and unanimously, not two to one, unanimously, all three Supreme Court judges voted against this. I think it is just a matter of time when the same thing will happen in Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Say 'hope'.

MR. CALLAN: No, I do not hope for that. No, I do not hope for that. You think that I think like this because you think like it. You think that I think like that because you think like it.

And the point that I was making, Mr. Speaker, and unfortunately I lost my cool because I should not be getting on the way I was on Opening Day, the day that the Throne Speech was read. But, you see, for the people who have short memories or for convenience want to forget, they forget that this same Premier, who appears to be wanting to fight so hard for the offshore and Newfoundlanders here and there, this was the same Premier who today on radio is fighting with his good friend, Brian Mulroney because it suits him to say, you should have given us sometime or you should have let us know, you see. And it is the same Premier who said when there was a P.C. Government in Ottawa for nine months - yes, people say it was not long. The average pregnancy is nine months, and most governments give birth to something a lot better than the Joe Clark Government gave birth to after nine months.

MR. CALLAN: What did the Premier accomplish in the nine months? What was he doing? He was saying that Romeo LeBlanc was a better Fisheries Minister than his own friend and fellow Newfoundlander, Jim McGrath. That is the kind of thing that the Premier has been fighting about.

MR. CALLAN: That is why, Mr. Speaker, that across this Province, slowly but surely across this Province, the people-not even that 25 per cent ; never the 35 per cent in St. John's and Grand Falls and Corner Brook and Clarendville, never that 35 per cent -but that is why, Mr. Speaker, that the 25 per cent of the people who change their votes and elect governments, these people are beginning to see the real Premier, the man who fights not because he believe in a cause but because he is like the bar-room fighter; he loves fighting no matter what the issue, no matter who the opponent, You know, if a psychologist, or somebody at the university who knows so much about the politics of this Province -

MR. NEARY: You know what happens to a boxer; he gets punchy after a while.

MR. CALLAN: Yes. Any psychologist who analyses the Premier's actions , and I am talking about his public performance in office - I am not at all concerned - I am concerned - and here is another example. I mean, why was it that the Premier had to wait seven months to move out of Mount Scio House? Why did he not do it last September when he knew that we were \$60 million in debt on current account? Why did he wait until February, why did he have to wait that seven months? Why was he down there? He told us his family was in South Brook. Why was the Premier living alone in a twenty-seven room house for seven months? Why did he not do it in September and save the taxpayers that extra money? But no, it was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who was calling on him to move out of Mount Scio House , so he had to do it five or six months later when it looked like he was doing it on his own rather than taking advice. And that is the problem with the Premier, that is the problem with this government, they are too good to be told and, of course, they cannot accept advice. That is it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me refer to the remarks made by the member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) about the LIP programmes. I am working back from some of the points that he made. I mean, the member for Trinity North surely must know that he is not hitting at Trudeau or someone in Ottawa when he says that he can walk in his slippers on wharves or that bridges were built where there was no river. What is he doing? He is insulting the intelligence of the people who live in his own district because as the programme indicates these applications came at the initiative of the local people. They were local initiative programmes. The applications were not made up in Ottawa, the applications came from someone or a bunch of fishermen in the little town who said we need a wharf here or we need a fish holding unit or, as the Premier so often talks about and some of his other colleagues, they need a new fence around a graveyard. It was the people in the local town, that is who made out the application. And if there was a mistake made in building the wharves or putting up the fence, it was the people in the local area who made the mistake. That is why, Mr. Speaker, what the member for Trinity North, when he says he has no say in it, John Crosbie does the same thing in St. John's West. John Crosbie, last Fall, knowing full well that Arnold's Cove and Come By Chance would not be in his federal riding next time around, did not approve a project in Arnold's Cove or Come By Chance because they are not

MR. CALLAN:

going to be in St. John's West after redistribution so he did not approve either one. So what is happening in Arnold's Cove and Come By Chance now? The money was not there to approve it or John Crosbie decided not to approve it under LIP or Canada Community Development, so now these projects are approved under other federal money, the NEED programme. But the problem with Arnold's Cove and the problem with the programme is this, that Arnold's Cove, which has the National Sea fish plant there, there are two people in Arnold's Cove on welfare, two people, There are some on unemployment but the NEEDS programme says you must be a UIC exhaustee or be on welfare. There are a number of young people there who are willing to go to work, but, you see, the problem would not have existed at all - and this is getting back to the point made by this gentleman down here - the problem would not have existed at all if the programme were approved under what it was applied for under. It was applied for under the Canada Community Development and then all of these young people now who cannot get on because John Crosbie said, 'I am not going to put a project in Come By Chance and Arnold's Cove'. I used Arnold's Cove but the identical same thing is happening in Come By Chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

And as the member for

Trinity North (Mr. Brett) and as the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), who is hardly ever in his own seat but is talking continually when somebody else is trying to make a few points, as that gentleman knows full well -

MR. NEARY:

He talks more in the

House than he does in Burin.

MR. CALLAN: My time has elapsed, I will get back at it tomorrow Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, the first thing I would like to do this evening is acknowledge the presence of four people from that great, historic district of Bonavista North that I have the honour of representing, who are members of the Brookfield Hospital committee; Rev. Munden Way, Chairman, Mr. Wallace Windsor, Administrator of Brookfield Cottage Hospital, Dr. Butler, the doctor who works at the hospital, and Mr. Wayne Brown, Administrator of Bon News Senior Citizens Home at Badgers Quay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, like most members who have already spoken on the Throne Speech debate, I would like to offer my congratulations to the two hon. members who Moved and Seconded the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). They both did tremendous jobs in most people's estimation. Mr. Speaker, no doubt, most of what I will say here today has been said before but I believe what I will say bears repeating. As I represent a great historic rural district which depends heavily on the fishery for its economic existence, my first remarks will be directed to the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, this has been said before and it will be said many, many times more, that we all realize that the fishery always has been and always will be the most important single industry.

MR. CROSS: Fish has been and always will be our greatest resource, the very reason for the existence of the vast majority of our rural communities. As has been pointed out many times in this hon. House, the federal government has jurisdiction over our fishery. It is the federal government that has jurisdiction over the licencing of fishermen, the licencing of boats, the allocation of quotas to fishermen where quotas apply and the allocation of quotas to foreign countries. It is the federal government who decided what the total allowable catch will be. And it is the federal government who decided whether there is a surplus to our needs.

Mr. Speaker, we are told that there are too many fishermen in Newfoundland chasing too few fish, yet every year, Mr. Speaker, despite that fact, we give away to foreigners millions and millions of pounds of fish of different species. In 1982 alone, Mr. Speaker, we gave away approximately 200 million pounds. Mr. Speaker, fish is our prime resource. Do we give away our iron ore? Do we give away our wood and other resources? The answer is no. We have heard the reason expounded that we have to trade off our fish so that the European countries will reduce their tariffs on our fish and allow us to export fish products to these countries. We have heard the federal Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bane) say that the EEC countries have not lived up to their bargain and is reducing their quotas for 1983. I say the quotas should be totally cut out, Mr. Speaker, not one pound of fish should we give away.

Mr. Speaker, if we have too many fishermen chasing too few fish, I would like to ask the question where is the surplus to our needs? Mr. Speaker, we charge taxes and royalties on other resources, fish is the only resource that is being given away. If the

MR. CROSS: Europeans can place too high a tarrif on fish products entering those countries from Newfoundland should we not be able to charge them a price for the fish that they catch in our waters? The fish, Mr. Speaker, is our resource.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CROSS: I note, Mr. Speaker, that it is 5:30 p.m. and that we have the Late Show on so possibly I would adjourn the debate and finish my remarks tomorrow.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): It has been noted that the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) adjourned the debate. It being Thursday we do have two questions for the Late Show. In the order that they were listed, the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) was to go first. I note that the hon. member for Bellevue is not in his place. If it is agreed, we can have the second item first, a question by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Is that agreeable?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Question Period I thought at the time I asked the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House) a very simple question with regard to what the administrator of the Lake Melville Hospital told me minutes before that the obstetrician, Dr. Tait, who is stationed in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, is on vacation for three weeks or maybe longer, at least three weeks, and at the present time there is no other surgeon to perform the duties that this doctor usually performs in Happy Valley-Goose Bay area. Due to the fact that there are at the present time six patients to be transferred from Happy Valley-Goose Bay to St. John's or St. Anthony, and the reason they will have been transferred - and the minister's department has been notified - is that an emergency will occur if they are moved because the doctor will not be back in time. This is the reason they are to be transferred. The doctor in Happy Valley-Goose Bay has taken the initiative for the safety of those six patients, who are to give birth. He has taken every precaution, he

MR. WARREN: knows complications will set in within three weeks. Therefore, he cannot declare them as emergency cases now because the emergency has not occurred, but he wants to head off the emergency. My simple question to the minister was, "Why should those six patients have to pay the first \$500 expenses from their own money and the government only pick up 50 per cent of the remaining costs. This government has an emergency air ambulance programme in place that will alleviate the medical suffering of anybody within this Province, from Nain to Cape Race if there is an emergency. Now surely the minister cannot be dumb enough to say as he said yesterday - I know he must have made a mistake yesterday - that there is no emergency. But the doctor has said, the administrator of the hospital has said that there will be an emergency if the patients are not moved now. So therefore he wants to avoid that emergency because there will be no doctor in place to handle it.

I am sure, in fact I know that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) will get up in a few minutes and try to defend himself, but surely goodness he should have the heart and the common sense and the knowledge to say to those six patients - there may be more within the next two or three weeks - but surely goodness he should have the intestinal fortitude of advising the Melville Grenfell Hospital that those six patients will only have to pay the \$50 that

MR. WARREN: is required under the emergency air ambulance programme of the Province. I am sure the minister agrees that there are monies being wasted in other areas of government spending on less trivial things than the health and well being of an individual person.

So I beg the minister again today, as I did yesterday, for goodness sake and for the sake of common decency, give those six patients the benefit of the doubt, and give the doctor and the administrator in the hospital the benefit of the doubt. Who else would know, if not the doctor who has been seeing those patients for the last eight and a half months, who else should know if complications are going to set in? Who else should know? There is a doctor up in the gallery today and probably that doctor can sympathize with Dr. Tait and the administrator of the hospital, and also with those patients. They are in the profession and they know that all they are doing in Lake Melville is trying to head off an emergency. The cost is just too exorbitant for the patients to bear. So surely goodness the minister should not have on his conscience that, he is going to deprive six patients of the benefit of taking advantage of the air ambulance programme. Those patients, Mr. Speaker, do not want to leave Goose Bay, but they will have no alternative because the doctor has declared that there will be an emergency. They do not want to leave Goose Bay, they want to stay there and deliver their children in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, but they cannot do it, Mr. Speaker, because the doctor has ordered them to go to a larger hospital and to be under the care of an obstetrician.

So therefore I call upon the minister to respond in a positive manner on behalf of those six patients.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, in responding to that particular question that was asked yesterday, I gave good information, something that the Liberal Government before could not give. I gave the information that we do have an emergency ambulance programme, one instituted by this government, one put in last year by this government, one that, of course, brings all people who are in emergency situations to hospitals, one that will take stretcher cases to hospitals whether the situation is an emergency or not, because of the cost of more than one seat, and, of course, for indigents we bring them free of cost.

Besides that, Mr. Speaker, from the Labrador Coast, that is the Northern part, the Board has a plane that brings people into Goose Bay and St. Anthony free of cost. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is being done by this government of great compassion and great concern.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE:

Now the particular situation is Dr. Tait has not gone on holidays, Dr. Tait is away because of an emergency in the family.

MR. HOUSE: There is, Mr. Speaker, another person there with surgical capability, a person who was trained and specifically sent up there to work with Dr. Tait as a backup in surgery. He is there now, he is not an obstetrician but he does have surgical capability. He is there now.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is I am dealing with the administrator of the board, Dr. Peter Roberts, brother of the health critic and finance critic, who advises me that everything is being done to ensure the safety of all people in the communities of Goose Bay-Happy Valley.

Now, it is sort of ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the doctor in charge of the hospital there, Dr. Dyson, did not phone his member or did not phone me, the minister.

MR. WARREN: He did not phone me either, I phoned him.

MR. HOUSE: It was quite ironic that this happened. And I think the hon. member across the way knows a little bit about what is going on. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, let me put it this way while I have a couple of more minutes here, that if any emergency occurs and there are a few people who understand or think they are at risk, the hospital is going to look after them via emergency service. That is going to be looked after. And we are looking after the non-emergency people; if they come in here, of course we will pay half of the legitimate costs above \$500. So notwithstanding all of this, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at each one of these cases and if the doctors deem that emergency evacuation is necessary that will be viewed.

MR. WARREN: They are out here.

MR. HOUSE: Well, if they are out here, Mr. Speaker, it just shows that they have been looked after.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the information that I have is that they are not all out here. But, anyway, I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, to wind up that any emergency situation will be looked after. We are in constant contact with the director of the board. My staff is in constant contact, and we are well assured that the people are well served with our air ambulance services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I apologize I was not available, I was on the phone. That is what it is when you represent one of the largest districts in the Province.

MR. CALLAN:

We just saw

an exchange there, Mr. Speaker, between baldheaded men, but this exchange is going to be difference from that, I think. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) tried to answer the question but he side-stepped as is his usual fashion. Here is the Auditor General, on page 25, the Auditor General in his latest report for the last fiscal year, he says: 'In previous Reports, the Auditor General has commented on the serious lack of control by the Department of Transportation over the payment of public funds for air services'. He concluded, 'In previous reports that action should be taken without delay to develop, document and implement systems and procedures to establish strict and satisfactory control over the use of government air services'. Now then, quoting the Auditor General, "My 1981-82 audit of certain government air services' expenditures disclosed that many control deficiencies have yet to be fully corrected", and he lists some. He says, 'Expenditure for special charter helicopters exceeded the original approved budget of \$370,000 by \$201,443. Treasury Board approval was not requested for the additional expenditure. Flight reports were not signed for services received by persons using the helicopters. Times of departure and arrival did not appear on some flight reports. Numerous photocopies of original flight reports were submitted. In several cases flight reports in support of flights invoiced were not available.' And the Auditor General says to add insult to injury after time after time bringing this to the attention of government, the Auditor General says to add insult to injury subsequently in May of last year, 1982, in council if the subject was discussed in Cabinet and the Cabinet came up with the following remedy Ordered that, in view of there being no regulatory requirement for recording such specific information, no records be maintained as to the

MR. CALLAN: purpose of flight or the passengers travelling on government owned or government contracted aircraft. It costs the taxpayers of this Province \$8 million last year and we do not know how that money was spent - some of it, we know was legitimately spent to transport Cabinet Ministers to important meetings and so on. Some of it transported patients, you know, in Labrador and so on but with a lot of it the Auditor General is left wondering. So because of that, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition today has written this letter to Mr. Bernard Carew. He is the Comptroller General in the Department of Finance. 'Dear Sir: I refer you to page 27 of the Report of the Auditor General. The Auditor General states' - and I just read it. And here is what we are saying to the Comptroller General, it is the direct command contained in that Minute of Council by our provincial Cabinet that it be ordered that no records be maintained as to the purpose or as to passengers travelling on publicly owned aircraft. They are commanding it, that is what causes us alarm and it should cause alarm for every taxpayer in this Province.

MR. BAIRD: You are an alarmist anyway, boy.

MR. CALLAN: You are a smoke detector. This is taxpayer's money, Mr. Speaker. Government owned and operated aircraft are expenditures from the public purse. And that Minute of Council that I just referred to in essence tells the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that this government orders no records be kept of the reasons why these flights be made or who uses these flights. That is what the Cabinet is saying. This Minute of Council removes the approval of government spending from the floor of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, it removes it from the floor of this Legislature. It therefore removes populace sanction of government action and creates government secrets over public expenditure. That is what we have. We have government secrets here, Mr. Speaker, over public expenditures. We are going to ask for the opinion of the Comptroller General. It will be interesting to see what his opinion will be. We know the opinion of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). His answers are, 'No, no'. Those are his answers.

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) will not be saying, "No, no". The Minister of Transportation will be talking about all the roads that he paved last Summer completely side-stepping this issue. Let us listen to what the Minister of Transportation has to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I kept quiet while the hon. member was trying to ask his question. I say trying because there is always a doubt when the hon. member gets up whether there is a question that comes out of it or not. I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I am very proud indeed to be a part of an

MR. DAWE: administration that continued on a fine Tory tradition of introducing the Public Accounts to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: A previous reincarnation of a government did not do that and there was no public accounting of publicly generated and expended funds.

MR. BAIRD: There was no Question Period either.

MR. DAWE: No Question Period, Mr. Speaker, all very righteous, very forward thinking policies of the Progressive Conservative Party of this Province.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to have some considerable time to delve into the specifics and I hope the five minutes that I have available will enable me to address some of the concerns expressed by the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). Maybe we will go down through the use of the government aircraft, King Air initially and some of the comments that were made as they relate to perhaps accounting procedures that were not adequate in keeping controls on the expenditure of public funds.

MR. DAWE: First of all, Mr. Speaker, the authorizing signatures were not on some flight reports. Now a flight report, Mr. Speaker, is a documentation that the pilots will have on the particular aircraft on which they list the time of departure, where they are going, all the relevant information. And there is a requirement on that particular flight report for the signature of a passenger on the aircraft.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what kind of a percentage do you think was applied to the reports that were not signed?

MR. HODDER: Sixty or seventy per cent.

MR. DAWE: Was it 50 per cent of the flights where that signature was not available?

MR. SIMMS: No, no!

MR. SIMMS: It must have been.

MR. DAWE: Twenty per cent, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: Five per cent? How about 3 per cent?
1 per cent?

MR. SIMMS: How many?

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, .05 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DAWE: On four occasions, Mr. Speaker, out of 750 the pilot who was in-charge happened to forget, he is a human being like anyone else, he happened to forget to pass along the log book to a passenger aboard the aircraft. Four out of 750, Mr. Speaker, very significant incomplete documentation.

MR. SIMMS: Massive.

MR. HODDER: It is scandalous.

MR. DAWE: .05 per cent.

Perhaps we will go on to -
no authorization for flights taken, okay. There was no authorization forms signed for the flights taken. So, Mr. Speaker, they involved situations where there was authorization

MR. DAWE: for the flight. The authorization was either done through the Department of Health or done through some other department when the aircraft was going from St. John's or a particular destination to somewhere else to pick up a patient or another authorized passenger. And in so doing an individual, a government official took advantage of the aircraft going from A to B and was a passenger on that flight.

Now how many times do you think that happened, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SIMMS: Five hundred.

MR. DAWE: Fifty per cent?

MR. SIMMS: Forty?

MR. DAWE: Twenty per cent?

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, again, four times out of 750 flights that occurred. The flight was duly authorized, the flight was taken and some particular civil servant or senior government official took advantage of taking that flight, .05 per cent again.

MR. SIMMS: The same per cent as the Liberals in the House, .05.

MR. DAWE: And I could go on, Mr. Speaker.

Let us deal with the helicopters. The indication in the Auditor General's report is that the expenditures exceeded by \$201,443 -

MR. SIMMS: Right.

MR. DAWE: - as it relates to an over expenditure on helicopter contract time. When in essence, when you go back through the records, Mr. Speaker, it shows that in actual fact the budgeted amount was \$370,000 under that particular subhead, the actual expenditure for those types of contracts was \$369,900. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the department saved \$100.00 on that particular subhead.

MR. SIMMS:

Now!

MR. DAWE:

What had happened internally was the individual, the clerk who was putting the invoices through inadvertently charged some of the expenditures to a different subhead, and it was

MR. DAWE: ultimately changed back again. So instead of overexpending without Treasury Board authorization of some \$200,000 in actual fact the department spent less than was actually budgeted for that amount. Authorization forms signed after flights, now, Mr. Speaker, you can put in controls and make them as tight as we have, the kind of controls that see an accounting procedure that is only point zero five per cent in flaw and yet, Mr. Speaker, there are times when it is very difficult to have authorization forms signed prior to an emergency. I am sure Emergency Measures and Mr. Greer when he takes on an assignment of some community or some area of the Province where there is a difficult and tremendous situation like we had in Bishop's Falls, like we had in Badger, like we had in Rushoon-

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

I wish to inform the hon. minister that his time has elapsed. Does the hon. minister have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. DAWE: Okay. Mr. Speaker, on those occasions, with police, with health emergencies, on some of these occasions it is impossible to get the authorization prior to the flight being taken. But in all cases, Mr. Speaker, the authorization is given just about the next day, as soon as possible after the flight was taken.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier I would really like to go on. I would just like to highlight again the fact that I, as a member of this side of the House of Assembly, am very proud of the fact that the Public Accounts Committee is in place and very pleased with the fact that the various

MR. DAWE: departments are under scrutiny of the public in this form. And I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to be part of a department, to be the minister of a department when the only discrepancies that can be found, the only comments that the Auditor General would make about the department and its accounting procedures are so insignificant as the ones mentioned in his report this year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): That is the last of the items for the Late Show.

It has been moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Friday at ten of the clock. Those in favour 'Aye', those against 'Nay'. Carried.

I do not leave the Chair until ten of the clock tomorrow, Friday.