

VOL. 3

NO. 9

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.
FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1984

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. House of Assembly today that, notwithstanding the recent Supreme Court decision with respect to offshore jurisdiction, my department will continue in its efforts to maximize employment opportunities for Newfoundlanders. We will continue our employment monitoring programme, which has proven extremely effective, to ensure that Newfoundlanders are given preference for employment. I am pleased to say, in fact, that we will be broadening our service to both employers and prospective employees.

To assist employers in finding suitable Newfoundlanders for employment, my department will be providing companies on a monthly basis with a list of employees who have registered or updated their files during that particular month. This list will provide important details as to an individual's qualifications and work experience. Each monthly list will, of course, only include those people who have contacted the department either by telephone, in writing or in person at either our St. John's office or at one of our regional offices. This initiative will ensure that companies receive up-to-date information on a monthly basis on Newfoundlanders seeking work. Individuals, therefore, who are seeking employment in the petroleum industry should provide my department with copies of relevant certificates detailing their qualifications or updating information previously

MR. DINN: supplied. Additional information can be obtained by contacting our Employment Services Division at 737-2719.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, while it is desirable to give preference to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians offshore, I am afraid without an agreement that that will be almost as difficult to enforce as were the orders given by the hon. gentleman opposite to bring in the drill rigs.

I tell you what seems to be developing here, Mr. Speaker. The kind of situation that is developing in Newfoundland and Labrador

MR. NEARY:

today reminds me just prior to the Second World War when Neville Chamberlain came back from Germany and waved around a piece of paper and said there is going to be no war, Mr. Speaker. He went over and negotiated peace with the Germans; there will be no Second World War he told us. And was quoted all around the world, you know, he came back a hero and a few months later everybody knows what happened in the world.

Well, we have a similar situation here in this Province today, Mr. Speaker. My advice to the administration there opposite is to sit down and negotiate an agreement, carry out the mandate that they were given to do and stop, stop pretending.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Give it away.

MR. NEARY:

Because all they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is pretending.

Because all they are doing, Mr.

MR. MARSHALL:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. President of the Council

on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman is entitled to comment on the minister's statement but what he is doing he is entering into the area of debate and this is not the appropriate time.

Order, please!

Certainly the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has been recognized as replying to Ministerial Statement by the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn). And by my calculations the hon. Leader of the Opposition had approximately one minute to speak. I certainly do not see much relation between Mr. Chamberlain and the Ministerial Statement made by the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. NEARY: Well, perhaps if Your Honour was following what I said, I said the atmosphere in Newfoundland today, the attitude of the administration there opposite, is the same as when Neville Chamberlain came back from Germany before the Second World War and said there will be no war. Now, Mr. Speaker, all they are doing over there, this is all window dressing, it is all pretending, Mr. Speaker, the great pretenders. The fact of the matter is that the only way we are going to get anywhere with the offshore is to sit down to the bargaining table and negotiate an agreement. And, Mr. Speaker, the sooner that is done the better for all concerned.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Forest, Resources and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. House that we have awarded a contract for this year's spruce budworm spray programme to Kanata Aviation Limited of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

Kanata was the lowest of three bidders and this will be the company's third consecutive year working on our spray programme.

Under the contract, the company will provide six Ag-Cat single engine planes at a cost of \$23,750 for each aircraft. These planes are especially designed and built for agricultural and forest spraying.

Cost of the spray programme itself under the contract will be \$3.70 per hectare for two applications of the chemical insecticide Matacil.

MR. POWER: The total area to be sprayed is 35,700 hectares, most of it in Western and Central Newfoundland. This also includes 4,000 hectares being treated to provide information on the cumulative effects of spraying on selected segments of the environment. The entire programme, including aircraft, chemical and other costs is not expected to exceed \$900,000. The government will pay only one-third of this, the rest being paid by Bowater and Abitibi-Price under a cost-sharing agreement negotiated by the government with the industry.

The spray area is divided into twenty-three blocks ranging in size from 350 hectares to 6,400 hectares. Spraying will be carried out from three bases. The major base will be the Deer Lake Airport from which 24,730, or 67 per cent of the total, will be covered. The 4,000 hectares of environmental monitoring blocks will be sprayed from the Gander airport. The remaining 6,970 hectares will be sprayed from an Abitibi-Price woods road.

Mixing of the chemical will be carried out at Stephenville where we have proper facilities for doing this job. Spraying is expected to begin around June 10 but the exact date will depend on the development of the insect and weather conditions. Each block will get its two applications of Matacil five days apart, so the program will probably be complete during the first week of July.

My department, Mr. Speaker, will give the public and the media at least one day's advance notice of each block to be sprayed.

Thank you.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the last paragraph of the hon. minister's statement, he said that one day's notice would be given to the general public when spraying

MR. NEARY: will be carried out. In actual fact, what the minister has done today is to give notice, several weeks or several months notice, I would think, because spraying probably will not take place until sometime in June or July, weather permitting. So the general public in and around the spray areas now, Mr. Speaker, have ample opportunity to have input into safety measures, into whether or not the administration there opposite will be spraying near communities, if they will be spraying near water supplies in these communities, Mr. Speaker. So the people now have ample warning, and if they wish to protest or make suggestions I think they can do so. That is the only good I see in the minister making an early Ministerial Statement on the spray programme, Mr. Speaker. So I am hoping that the minister will listen to what people have to say in Central and Western Newfoundland in connection with the spray programme. I believe that he should pinpoint the area, that he should give the areas that are going to be sprayed wide publicity so that the people in and around these communities, in around these areas can make representation to the minister if they so desire.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) and I would like to start out by asking him who is right and who is wrong. The day before yesterday down at the Board of Trade, the Premier, in one of his off-the-cuff statements - carried away - made a statement that has been contradicted by the Minister responsible for Energy.

MR. MORGAN: He gave a fantastic speech.

MR. NEARY: That is not what the members of the Board of Trade said when they were interviewed after.

MR. MORGAN: They did not decline comment to CBC.

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

MR. NEARY: Nine out of ten, Mr. Speaker, declined comment. But in the meantime, the Premier made a statement that the development of the Lower Churchill was dead. He said it was a myth. There were no qualifications to his statement. There was nothing to say, well, as the Minister of Energy told me last night when I was down doing the estimates of Mines and Energy, it was because we could not wheel the power across Quebec ten years ago or we can export the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Develop it.

MR. NEARY: Develop it, yes, and export the surplus power now, we can still do that. No qualification, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman made an off-the-cuff statement that has been denied by the Minister of Energy.

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

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is proceeding to make a speech and I would ask him if he would be kind enough to direct a question to the minister.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I must give up watching the House of Commons because they are allowed quite a preamble when they are asking their questions up there.

I would like to ask the minister who is right and who is wrong. The minister has contradicted the Premier, no doubt about that, no ifs, ands or buts. The hon. gentleman did not qualify his statement, he just made it. 'It is a myth,' he said. You cannot be any more definite than that.

Now, will the hon. gentleman get up and try to straighten out the mess and clarify the statements that were made by the Premier when he was down addressing the Board of Trade and got carried away?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as to who is right and who is wrong, I can tell the hon. gentleman we are right and you are wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, why we are in the position we are in today. The Premier, in his speech to the Board of Trade when he made reference to the Lower Churchill, said quite clearly what is the

MR. MARSHALL:

policy and has been the policy of this government for a long period of time, that we desire and we are moving to see what possibly can be done with respect to the development of the Lower Churchill. But it has to be understood at the present time, because of escalations in costs that have occurred whilst we had been prevented from wheeling the power through the Province of Quebec, that no longer is the Lower Churchill the source of cheap electricity for the people of this Province as it would have been ten or fifteen years ago had we been able to enjoy the same rights in Confederation as other provinces of Canada now enjoy, that is, had we been able to wheel the surplus power from Gull Island through the Province of Quebec for sale to markets in the United States. So, Mr. Speaker, the situation is that the Premier and I were, are and I know always will be, completely and absolutely consistent. The fact of the matter is what we are looking to at the present time is the possibility of recalling power, and recalling power cheaply, for use in Newfoundland from the Upper Churchill contract; This is what we are engaged in at the present time. We are attempting, as the hon. gentleman there opposite knows, to reclaim resources that were given away, be it in the hydro area or be it in the offshore or in the fisheries for that matter. What his government is doing is fighting to see if we can reclaim resources that were given away, inadvertently maybe in some cases although it was lack of perception in the Terms of Union in many cases, but negligently, and almost criminally negligently by the hon. gentleman and his colleagues when they were in government and they

MR. MARSHALL: signed that invidious Upper Churchill contract. So , Mr. Speaker, to come back to the first part of my answer, when the hon. gentleman asked who is right and who is wrong, I would say we are right and you are wrong and, because you people were wrong, the people of Newfoundland today will not enjoy the cheaper electricity that they would have otherwise been able to enjoy and to which they are entitled from their own resources.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Before I recognize the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary),

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): I would just like to take a few minutes to welcome to the galleries today sixty Grade VIII students from Holy Redeemer School in Spaniard's Bay and their teachers, Jennifer Pottier and John Drover, from the District of Harbour Grace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman starts talking about giveaways he should be reminded about the greatest giveaway in Newfoundland's history. The greatest giveaway in the history of this Province is the administration throwing away the offshore resources by referring the ownership question to the Newfoundland Appeals Court. There is the biggest giveaway in the whole history of this Province. Whatever bit of bargaining power they had they threw it away, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. gentleman has some face to get up and talk about giveaways. Now the hon. gentleman is smarting under that. They are just ignoring the Supreme Court and pretending that they can carry on in a normal way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman this: And, by the way, I would like to see the media take the television clips and the tapes and play what the Premier said to the Board of Trade side by side with what the minister just told us and see who made the statements. Mr. Speaker, you cannot place any interpretation on it, it was a direct statement.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: This is the Question Period. The hon. gentleman has an opportunity to make speeches, as he does from time to time, and all the time when you are considering interim supply, and the Address in Reply, and the Budget Speech and the pieces of legislation that come before the House. But this is the Question Period and the Opposition is there to ask questions and we are here to respond. I am anxious, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. gentleman's question, not to listen to his speech.

MR. NEARY: I would not even respond to that, Mr. Speaker. He is wasting the Question Period, that is all.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The Chair, of course, is compelled to make rulings on points of order when they are raised. A few moments ago I had to ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary) if he would pose a question? he was indeed into the realm of debate in making a speech, and he proceeded to do the same thing a moment ago. The purpose of the Question Period, as all hon. members are aware, is basically to give the Opposition an opportunity to ask as many questions as possible and to receive as many answers as possible. Therefore, both the questions and the answers should be very brief.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Premier says it is dead, it is a myth; the Lower Churchill is dead, it is only a myth, there is no possibility of developing it, the minister there opposite says that it is not dead, it is not a myth. Now I do not know who is right or wrong, but I want to ask the minister this; In view of his more positive approach than the Premier's, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if the matter of developing the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls - to develop the hydro potential, either for use in the Province or for export - if that matter is being actively pursued at the moment?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate once again, if the hon. gentleman would consider the speech made by the Premier at the Board of Trade, he made that statement with respect to the Lower Churchill being dead or being a myth in the context of the consumers of this Province. And I reiterate, once again, from the point of view of the legitimate expectations of the consumers of this Province, it is dead and it is disgraceful that it is dead. Because the people of this Province today would be enjoying much lower electrical rates if we had gotten and attained our rights within the Confederation as we were entitled to attain.

Now with respect to the other question by the hon. member, I can say that it is being pursued, it is being actively pursued through the Lower Churchill Development Corporation and we will continue to do it. But, obviously, what has to happen is there has to be a rationalization primarily of that long-standing, thorny issue of the rights of this Province to transport electrical power through the Province of Quebec and through all parts of Canada.

MR. NEARY: The Parliament of Canada gave you that right.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, they gave us that right! Oh, listen to that great apologist again. Listen to the gentleman seeking a seat in the Senate of Canada, Mr. Speaker, apologizing once again for the Government of Canada. The rights that were given to us by the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, that legislation constitutes a cynical act on the part of the Government of Canada. It would take us, in order to implement -

MR. NEARY: They gave you a corridor across Quebec.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - implement that, if we could implement it, to the year 2050 before we would get through the environmental enquiries in the Province of Quebec and all the other yardsticks that was there. It is absolutely useless and it constitutes a cynical gesture by the federal government of the time to try to weasel out of their obligations to protect this Province and give this Province the same rights as the rest of Canada in Confederation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get back to the question that the hon. gentleman asked, it is being pursued, and it will continue to be pursued but, first of all, of course, we have to have a rationalization of this long-standing problem of the right to transmit electrical power.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on those questions. I would like to ask the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) whether he has any information on the present needs in the Province of Quebec for electricity? Whether he has any information on the effect which the North American recession has had on demand either in Quebec or in other parts of North America? And how that might affect the requirement of Quebec for electricity at the present time? In other words, is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that the same demand is not there in Quebec at the present time for electricity and that this government may have missed a window where Quebec was highly interested in obtaining energy, and where there may not be the same urgency of demand in Quebec at the present time? In other words, has the delay of this government in reaching an agreement put the possibility of developing the Lower Churchill or other hydro sites in Labrador further away than would otherwise would have been the case?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman will understand, in the Province of Quebec at the present time they obviously have a surplus of power because they are selling it to the New England states, they are selling their power to the Power Authority in the State of New York. They made applications to the National Energy Board and the hon. gentleman is aware of the disposition of that despite the intervention of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it comes passing strange to this government, and it should come to the people of Newfoundland that, on the one hand, the Province of Quebec by the National Energy Board is given the right to

MR. MARSHALL: transmit, to sell power to New York State, and perhaps to the New England states, in order to enable the authority in New York to build a transmission line, and at the same time our intervention in and our request for power from the Province of Quebec through the Upper Churchill is denied because we have not got those same lines built. In other words, the National Energy Board gives the right to the Government of Quebec to sell power, approves its power, and to enable a state in the United States to build a transmission line, but refuses us, and that is passing strange and we will have more to say about that in the future as well.

Now with respect to outside of Quebec, as to their needs, the hon. gentleman well knows the fact that there is a surplus in the Province of Quebec through the James Bay Development and mainly, as well, if you add to it the Upper Churchill amounts that they have which represent a considerable amount

MR. MARSHALL:

of their energy capacity that was given to them by the new found colleagues of the hon. gentleman some time ago.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the question with respect to the needs in the rest of North America, obviously hydro power, because it affords the possibility of a fixed price, is the most attractive means of generation of power and electricity, and it will remain so, Gull Island and Muskrat Falls, from the perspective, is one of the more attractive sites in North America and all we need at the present time to be able to tackle the problem and proceed is to get the same rights as other Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have responded to all of the questions that have been asked by the hon. gentleman. The rest of the questions, I think, are politically motivated.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I could become a little more precise in the question that the minister did not answer. Has the minister received any recent information, or to put it another way, when was the last time that a study was done to determine the present position of the Province of Quebec, the present situation with respect to the extent of the surplus, when that surplus would be exhausted, when the Province of Quebec would need additional power?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, these studies are going on all the time. Within the past six months we have had this in relation to initiatives that we have been taking. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that it is not to the Province of Quebec—and this is where, I think, he must have become brainwashed the past month with his new-found friends — it is not the intention, Mr. Speaker, of this

MR. MARSHALL: government and not the desire of this government necessarily to sell it to the Province of Quebec. The point is we do not look at the Province of Quebec as being the only source of sale when the whole point of this exercise, Mr. Speaker, is that all of North America, where it is technically feasible to transmit and sell this power, should be our market. And the question is, when it becomes politically feasible, when this geographical minority in Confederation, the Province of Newfoundland, is going to be treated equally with all other provinces, then we will have a broader market to be able to explore. But in the meantime we totally and absolutely reject the premise that we have to sell the power to the Province of Quebec within the context that the hon. gentleman seems to be suggesting. He seems to be suggesting because Quebec

MR. MARSHALL:

has not got adequate power, then we go to Quebec and ask them to take our power. Now that is not the question, Mr. Speaker, what is the question is the need of power in North America and the right of this Province to sell that power to customers, be they in Ontario or the United States, when it becomes technically feasible so to do.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for

Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Last week the minister

stated that the government was involved in, I believe the wording was, sensitive negotiations with the province of Quebec. Is the minister now telling us that no part of these negotiations refers to the possibility of developing other hydro sites in Labrador, whether it be the Lower Churchill or whether it be the rivers, which Newfoundland cannot develop itself, which flow into the province of Quebec? Is the minister saying that his negotiations with Quebec are not based upon the sale of any further power in the future to the province of Quebec, they are based upon the sale of power to the third parties.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the

Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

First of all, I want to

underscore that we are not making any comments, and I continue to refuse to make any comments with respect to these very sensitive negotiations. So I am not going to say what is being discussed at those negotiations and what is not being discussed in those negotiations because it is not beneficial at the present time. But all I can assure the hon. gentleman is that

MR. MARSHALL: these negotiations are being and will be conducted for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland. It is a matter of some pride to this government that we were able to initiate these discussions, and that is as far as I will go at the present time. I will just say that they are very sensitive negotiations. But I can guarantee the hon. gentleman that they are going to be conducted for the benefit of Newfoundland and whatever results from those negotiations or from policies of this government in the future, the hon. gentleman can be quite well assured that we reject his thesis, that he seems to be implying in his questions, to the effect that Quebec is the only purchaser of power generated in this Province. I reiterate once again that this Province has the vested right to sell power to any part of North America where it is technically feasible to transmit that power. And this Province, in order to do that, has to attain the same constitutional rights of equity and fairness in Confederation to enable that to be done. This government will not desist from that premise, whether it be in the offshore or whether it be in hydro power or whether it be in fisheries. And we are not, Mr. Speaker, going to embrace the policies apparently

MR. MARSHALL:

enunciated by the hon. gentleman, and now apparently embraced by him, that Quebec is the only purchaser of Newfoundland power.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister saying that the need of the Province of Quebec for power is not relevant to the current negotiations? Is the minister saying whether or not there may be other purchasers? Is the minister saying that he is shutting his eyes to the question of whether the Province of Quebec itself needs further power?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate: I am saying nothing with respect to the present negotiations. If the hon. gentleman wants a response within the realm of the policy of this government, I will tell him. Obviously the answer is that the need for the Province of Quebec, the need for the Province of Ontario, the need for the State of New York and the New England States, all of them are relevant to this Province, and the Maritime Provinces as well. What I am saying is it is not relevant to us, the premise that the sole purchaser of Newfoundland power has to be the Province of Quebec. If you accept that, Mr. Speaker, you are imprisoned once again and you are in danger of making the same mistake that the administration of the hon. gentlemen there opposite made so many years ago which the people of Newfoundland bear the burden and the yoke of at the present time.

So let it be clear that the needs of everybody are relevant. We hope to be able to sell power at the best price we can obtain from any

MR. MARSHALL: source; but the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that there is not only one source, there is more than one source and this can only be realized when we are treated as equal Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY: Is the minister saying that in negotiating, whether it be with the Province of Quebec on electricity, or whether it be with the federal government on the offshore, or whether it be with the employees of this government in collective bargaining, that it is not relevant to determine the other side's position to try and get a view of how badly the other side would like to have a deal? Is the minister saying that that is ignored by him

MR. BARRY: and he does not look at and try to put himself in the place of the person on the other side of the bargaining table so that he can get the best deal for Newfoundland by knowing just how badly the other side might want to have a deal?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. gentleman would get an impression like that. I mean, the hon. gentleman hears things he wants to hear, obviously. I did not say that.

Obviously, what the other side at the bargaining table wishes is very relevant and you have to enquire into it. But what is more important, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentlemen there opposite do not really understand, is you really have to understand as well where you are coming from.

You know what the other side is thinking, and when you know that the other side wants you to capitulate, and this is the only thing that the other side will accept, and this is consistent with the history within Confederation, you do not accept that, Mr. Speaker. What you do, obviously, in negotiations, in the first place, obviously, you know where the other person is coming from. But even more importantly than that, Mr. Speaker, you have to know where you are coming from, you have to know what your rights are, and you have to be prepared to enforce these rights and not be in the position of approaching somebody as if you were a beaten dog, not prepared to go to Ottawa as a beggar on horseback but to go to Ottawa as proud Canadians, asserting the rights of Canadians in Newfoundland. That is what we will continue to do, And when we do it, Mr. Speaker, certainly, we have to understand the other side, because it is very necessary to do

MR. MARSHALL: that, particularly in our relationships with Ottawa. Because, obviously, from Ottawa's point of view, they treat us as a colony and the main thrust and aim of this government is to try to get that thinking changed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: It has been made much more difficult, Mr. Speaker, over the years by the attitude of the hon. gentlemen there opposite when they were in government and presently in the stance that they are taking now in Opposition. In their mad lust for power, Mr. Speaker, to get power they would do anything to derogate the interests of the people of this Province. They show it in every statement that they make and they are showing it in Question Period this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's hatred for anything that is Liberal is unbelievable! It is unbelievable!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman will put every resident of Newfoundland and Labrador in debtor's prison just to satisfy his own ego and his stubbornness. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is paranoid, almost as paranoid as the Premier, and that is saying something!

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman talks about Newfoundlanders and Labradorians getting cheaper electricity if this happened and that happened. The hon. gentleman has it in his own hands, with the Public Utilities Board, to give Newfoundlanders

MR. NEARY: cheap electricity. Has he done it? No, Mr. Speaker, he has not done it. The Cabinet has the final say in whether or not electricity rates increase in this Province and the hon. gentleman lets the Public Utilities Board rubber stamp increases.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
I wonder if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) would like to pose a question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman lets the Public Utilities Board rubber stamp increases and then he has

MR. NEARY: the face, the nerve to stand up and tell us they would have cheaper electricity. Why do they not have it now? We have a government over there that has the final say in these matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman this; What kind of a time frame are we talking about with negotiations with the Province of Quebec on this package deal that is being talked about, the reopening of the Upper Churchill Falls contract, the development of the Lower Churchill, wheeling the power over the transmission lines in Quebec, and if necessary Quebec-Hydro putting up a large chunk of the financing of that project, and the development of the five rivers referred to by my colleague, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry); what kind of a time frame are we talking about to settle these matters and to get an agreement with the Province of Quebec?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman talks about the Public Utilities Board, he knows as well as I do, as everybody does, that the Public Utilities Board sets the power utility rates on the basis of cost recovery. And he also knows that it was this administration which have made the Public Utilities Board more relevant than it has ever been before by requiring Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro to present its applications for increases to the Public Utilities Board. He also understands that what is obtained has to be paid for, and it is either going to be paid for by the consumer or it is going to be paid for by taxes. You know, it is not like the hon. gentleman's funny financial ways in which the hon. gentleman would look to the heavens, as it were, and expect manna to come down from heaven. It just does not operate that way. Electricity has to be paid for; it either has to be paid for through taxes

MR. MARSHALL: or it has to be paid for by the consumers , This government has taken every conceivable step possible to protect the consumers by making Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro report to the Public Utilities Board, and by doing all it can to increase the effectiveness of that board, as it will continue to do in the future.

Now with respect to the hon. gentleman's main question, with respect to the time frame, once again I will say that these are sensitive negotiations and I am not going to be put in a position of responding

MR. MARSHALL: in a way that we feel, and legitimately feel, could affect those negotiations. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that there will be as much time as the government perceives is necessary hopefully to strike a good deal or otherwise to determine that a deal is unattainable. But I can tell the hon. gentleman, as much time will be taken as necessary to explore as to whether or not it is, in fact, possible to unravel that horrendous mistake that was made by the hon. gentleman there opposite which now sees approximately \$700 million a year go into the Province of Quebec while we get a paltry \$8 million a year, which now sees, Mr. Speaker, a budget in this Province financed on the basis of a manageable deficit but a deficit just the same.

MR. NEARY: When you nationalized Churchill Falls (inaudible) over \$10 million a year.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, he talks about electrical rates! Imagine having the gall to talk about electrical rates in this House when the hon. gentleman was a party to giving away \$700 million a year of our electrical rates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. gentleman this: We will take as much time as is necessary in order to forge the best deal for the people of this Province, and we will not forge a deal on this or any other matter unless it is for the long and enduring benefit of the young people of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now I know that will disappoint the hon. gentleman but that is the position that we take.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to change

MR. NEARY: the subject for a moment to talk about the offshore. We had quite a struggle last night down in the old Colonial Building, the hon. gentleman and myself, probably the wildest debate seen in that building since we gave up Responsible Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman was wrestled to the floor, Mr. Speaker, several times.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And his colleagues found out something that they did not know before.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to pose a question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's colleagues found out something that they did not know before and here is what they found out. They found out that these wild, irresponsible statements being made by the hon. gentleman about the package that was on the table when negotiations were going on with Mr. Chretien in 1982 and 1983 - the hon. gentleman keeps saying that proposal

MR. NEARY: was the same as the Nova Scotia agreement - members of his caucus found out last night that that is not true. Let me ask the hon. gentleman one question just to confirm what I am saying and that has to do with the management committee. Is it not a fact, Mr. Speaker - and I want the hon. gentleman to level and be honest about this and not play political games because I have the Telex here in front of me to the hon. gentleman which I am prepared to table, so he need not try to mislead the House or mislead the people or deceive the people - is it not a fact that in that proposal, in that package there was a proposal for a management committee comprised of three appointees by the Newfoundland Government, three appointees by the Government of Canada, and the six would get together and select a Chairman? Now, can the hon. gentleman tell the House if that kind of a proposal is in the Nova Scotia agreement?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
That answer may have to wait another day, the time for the Question Period has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House want to grant leave to the minister to answer?

MR. NEARY: No, let him suffer. Let him mull it over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Let him mull it over, let him sleep on it, Mr. Speaker, because we want an honest answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
Leave has not been granted.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in tabling the 1982-83 annual report of the Newfoundland Oceans Research and Development Corporation. As hon. members are aware, NORDCO is a provincially controlled company involved in research and development projects and acts as a service/consulting organization in the area of marine industrial development.

Some of the major corporate highlights of NORDCO during the fiscal year 1982-83 are as follows:

As a direct result of managerial and personal efforts, corporate activity resulted in significant market penetration raising corporate revenues to \$5.5 million, an increase of 50 per cent over 1981-82.

Direct impact of such activity has placed NORDCO in a profitable picture as it shows a profit on operations of \$293,250 for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1983.

The activity of NORDCO couple with those of its subsidiaries, Geonautics and CAN AM Offshore, contributed approximately \$6.8 million, or 75 per cent of their combined earnings, to the provincial economy via their expenditures.

MR. WINDSOR: All four divisions of NORDCO have performed well during the period. Either through expansion of activity or continuation of existing work, the technical personnel and managerial efforts are paying rewards. Such efforts of the staff speak well of the future of NORDCO, as maintaining a technological edge is extremely important in this area of development.

During the fiscal year 1982/83 NORDCO did not require provincial funds for its operations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GOUDIE: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Livestock Act".

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DINN: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Elevators Act".

MR. NEARY: It is your act to ride it down.

MR. DINN: Yes, it is only down for the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

And I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a special bill, a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Boiler Pressure Vessel And Compressed Gas Act", especially for the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. NEARY: I have to point out to the House that the Minister of Energy(Mr. Marshall) had an opportunity to answer my question, Mr. Speaker. Obviously he wants to take my advice and mull it over on the weekend so he can give me a straight, honest answer for a change. He just missed an opportunity to give me the answer to the question, Mr. Speaker, he missed that opportunity and I would say the hon. gentleman should learn the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary) did not raise a valid point of order.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think there is an error in the Order Paper. However, I would just like to note that the hon. gentleman has missed the opportunity, he waited until the other Orders were called before he got up and said it.

But interim supply does not appear to be on the Order Paper today, the motion. Did the printer miss it, interim supply? Anyway, it is supposed to be on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. I call the House into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering interim supply.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Just as a matter of

MR. NEARY: curiosity, I would like to ask Your Honour if it is possible to call an order in this House that is not on the Order Paper. Now, I believe that should be researched. And before we go into Committee of Supply, I would like to have the answer, because I believe the hon. gentleman is out of order. I think that if a matter is not on the Order Paper there is no way we can debate it in this House. Whether it was an error of omission, a typographical error or whatever it was, Mr. Speaker, we follow the House of Assembly Order Paper, Orders of the Day, and we have to take the Orders of the Day in the order in which they are shown on the Order Paper.

The hon. gentleman has gotten up and said that the administration, through negligence or through an error of omission, have neglected to put the Committee of Supply on the Order Paper, and I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no way under the circumstances that we can go into Committee of the Whole until the item is placed on the Order Paper tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: This is really an example of the smallness of mind and stature of the hon. gentleman, that he would get up and actually make that point. It is not a case of embarrassing the government, it is a case of probably embarrassing one of the staff, and I do not think the staff should be embarrassed because those things do occur.

MR. MARSHALL: On yesterday's Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, there was on "Motion 2, - The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) - To Move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain Resolutions for the Granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty (No. 10)" - being Bill No. 10. So the answer to it is it is already on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not.

MR. MARSHALL: It was considered yesterday.

MR. NEARY: No, today's Order Paper.

MR. MARSHALL: It is a typographical error in the Order Paper. The printers do not set the Orders of this House, it is the House that sets the Orders of the House. Now, Mr. Speaker, it shows, as I say, how completely small the hon. gentleman is to raise it as a point of order and, really, how intellectually bankrupt the Opposition is that it would consume the time of the House with such a spurious point of order, geared not to embarrass the government but to attempt to embarrass the people outside the House and permanent officers of the House. I think it is incumbent upon the hon. gentleman to get up and apologize to the people concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is a pretty serious matter, as far as I am concerned. The hon. gentleman is trying to weasel his way out of the way he is mismanaging this House, because the hon. gentleman should check the Order Paper. The Order Paper should be thoroughly checked by the Government House Leader

MR. NEARY: The government calls the order of business in this House, Mr. Speaker, and they can only call what is on the Order Paper, otherwise we would have chaos and turmoil in the House, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman talks about apologies. The hon. gentleman should apologize to the House for his own stupidity and neglect, Mr. Speaker, in this particular matter. He cannot hide behind the fact that the item was on yesterday's Order Paper. Yesterday's Order Paper is dead, Mr. Speaker, it is as dead as a dodo, is as dead as the Premier said the Lower Churchill Falls is. It is a myth. It is dead, Mr. Speaker. It is today's Order Paper that we are following. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should be prepared to admit man-fashion that it is virtually impossible for us to follow an Order Paper if the hon. gentleman is going to get up and amend the Order Paper when we come into the House, to put things on that were not on the original Order Paper.

MR. CARTER: Sit down. Sit down.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says, 'Sit down' Mr. Speaker, you cannot have this House run by hon. gentlemen making up their own Order Paper and making up their own rules and regulations as the House goes on. You cannot do that. You may as well be down in a beer pit, you may as well be down in some tavern on Gower Street debating. We can only go on what is on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, and we came into this House fully prepared to debate this Order Paper and the hon. gentleman cannot call an order of business that is not shown on the Order Paper. Now I would submit that Your Honour adjourn the House for a few minutes to research this matter very carefully, because it is a very important point

March 23,1984

Tape No. 321

ah-3

MR. NEARY: of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell) I shall hear the hon.
President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is
being ridiculous. If Your
Honour wishes to adjourn on a small point like this,
of course, it is Your Honour's prerogative to do, but
there is authority in Beauchesne. The hon. gentleman
gets up and he makes all these statements without
any authority. I mean if you want to refer to
Beauchesne, the Fifth Edition, page 89, Paragraph 275,
it says that if there are any error they may
be corrected by the House. And certainly the House
can correct them.

MR. NEARY: This is not an error.
This is an omission.

MR. MARSHALL: This is merely a typographical
omission. I think we should get on with the business
of the House rather than be occupied with this
spurious point of order.

MR. NEARY: One quick remark, Mr.
Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

This is an omission, not a -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair has heard enough argument on the point. It is an interesting point and it is the first time since my term here that matter has been raised. I think it is an error on the part of printing the Order Paper. But I would like to adjourn the House for maybe five minutes to take a look at it.

RECESS

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Call in the members.

Order, please! Having some consultation on the point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), it has been determined that today's Order Paper is identical to past years' Order Papers' when the motion did not appear on the second day either.

Yesterday there was a motion on the Order Paper, moved and carried, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain Resolutions for the Granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty. That was passed yesterday and the House went into Committee of the Whole. Therefore, in the Chair's opinion there is not a need to have that appear again today on the Order Paper. But, indeed, the Committee does appear on the Order Paper as Committee of Supply, which perhaps is the order that should have been called.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

We are discussing the resolution pertaining to Bill No. 10.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal for a few moments today with the extravagance and waste that is involved in the propaganda, the political brochures and the political ads that are being taken out in newspapers and so forth by the hon. gentlemen there opposite, because they are sore, Mr. Chairman, they are hopping mad because they lost the court case. They put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court and before the Supreme Court of Canada-the offshore ownership question-and they lost, and they are not prepared to accept the decisions of the two courts.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman last night indicated, when we were having this great debate down at the old Colonial Building, that the administration there opposite have no intention of negotiating an offshore agreement until after the next federal election. The hon. gentleman is so anti-Canadian, so anti-confederate! The hon. gentleman cannot get over the fact that Confederation won the day back in 1949 and now they are putting statements in the Budget Speech like 'Confederation is merely an experiment.' That is what the hon. gentleman told us.

The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is responsible for the budget, but the administration have to stand behind that document. They have to take the responsibility for it. And here is what they are saying: 'Confederation is merely an experiment.'

MR. NEARY: That is all it is.' And the hon. gentleman keeps working out the anti-confederate statements, the anti-Canadian statements, as he did again last night, draping himself in the flag, Mr. Chairman, making statements like, 'Oh, we are not going to give in to anybody. What we want,' he said, 'is an honest, fair and equitable agreement for Newfoundland.' Well, can anybody deny that? Is that not what this side of the House wants? And the hon. gentleman can drape himself all he wants in that kind of a flag, and appeal to people's emotions, but the fact of the matter is that the policy is getting us nowhere. They are on a disaster course. And now, Mr. Chairman, they have embarked for the third time upon a campaign of propaganda. And, Mr. Chairman, here is one of the brochures that they are putting out to householders, The Offshore. Tory blue! Mr. Chairman, they cannot even get away from partisan politics when they are trying to score a point - Tory blue. Just imagine! Whoever dreamt it up must have had a distorted mind, Mr. Chairman, Tory blue, and what does it say? 'We have been fair,' it says, 'We have been fair, first proposal, second proposal, third proposal.' Mr. Chairman, if I had to hang my hat on this little, weak, jelly-livered brochure that has been sent out to householders to get a good deal for Newfoundlanders on the offshore resources, Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that it would be doomed to failure. Is that what we are relying on, the likes of that, to try to get a good deal on the offshore? And what will that accomplish, Mr. Chairman, It is a little bit of low, sneaky politics, that is what it is, cheap politics that will accomplish nothing.

I tried to nail the hon. gentleman down last night. And this is the third time, by the way, they have tried this. They lost the battle

MR. NEARY: of the seal hunt, they threw that away, and they are going to lose this. This is not going to get anybody anywhere, buying ads in newspapers. The Premier said, 'I am going to take off on a cross-Canada speaking tour.' I say to that, So what?

MR. NEARY: He wants to get out of the Province while the heat is on. He wants to distract people from the real problems in this Province, which is unemployment among young people, high electricity rates, the highest taxes in Canada, student allowances, no future for young people graduating from our university and the College of Trades and the Fisheries College. A bleak outlook, a bleak future. Parents are brokenhearted because their sons and daughters, twenty-three, twenty-four and twenty-five years of age cannot find jobs even though they have degrees from the university, Mr. Chairman. They have their degrees and they have their skills and they have their training but they cannot find jobs, so what does the Premier do? Does he elect to go to the negotiating table to find out what kind of a package can be put on the table that we can negotiate, that will be fair and honest for Newfoundland and for the rest of Canada? Does he do that?

MR. WALSH: They do not want to negotiate.

MR. NEARY: Who said they do not want to negotiate? I heard Mr. Chretien, I saw him on TV, say, 'Yes, let us sit down and negotiate. We are anxious to get back to the negotiating table.'

MR. WALSH: As long as you give it all to us.

MR. NEARY: How can the hon. gentleman justify a statement like that, Mr. Chairman, 'As long as you give it all to us.' That is their paranoia coming out. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that back in 1983, when negotiations broke off with hon. gentlemen there opposite, there was a package on the table that we will never see the likes of again. It was a very generous package, it had nothing to do with the Nova Scotia agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, I sent copies to

MR. NEARY: the member for Exploits
(Dr. Twomey) the other day. I said, 'I got something I would like for you to read. You are a thinking Newfoundlander and you should read this because this is being kept away from the caucus members.' The caucus members are being duped and deceived by their leader. One of the items in that agreement had to do with a management committee. Now listen to what Mr. Chretien said in his Telex of January 26, 1983 to the hon. gentleman - something I doubt very much if the caucus over there heard before. They are hearing it now for the first time because this information is being kept away from them to try to keep their morale up a bit, to wrap them all in the flag. He said, 'Dear Bill: Following up on our telephone conversation and your Telex of today's date, I was happy to receive your personal confirmation that the points set out in your Telex of yesterday were simply 'perimeters' and not preconditions to our resuming our talks face to face. From the beginning you and I have agreed that we would explore new avenues in an effort to come to a draft agreement and a memorandum that we could take to our respective governments. I am eager to carry on this process immediately to try to make up for the time we have lost since your return to St. John's last Friday. I understand your position on the seventeen points raised in your Telex of yesterday and give you a firm undertaking that I shall be ready to address each and every one with you face to face when we meet. As I see it,' Mr. Chretien says in his Telex to the Minister, 'the key elements of the basic perimeters to which you and I have generally agreed on our discussions to date are: (1) a joint management board responsible to both ministers.' Is that in the Nova Scotia agreement? I ask hon. gentleman to be honest and fair and stand up man-fashion and admit whether it is or not.

MR. NEARY:

Three members appointed by this Province, three appointed by Ottawa and they get together and select a chairman. Is that in the Nova Scotia agreement? If it is not, why is the hon. gentleman allowed, as spokesman for that crowd there opposite, to keep repeating the big lie day in and day out that the proposal was the same as the Nova Scotia agreement when hon. gentlemen there opposite knows that that is untrue. It is the big lie. Why would the hon. gentleman make that kind of a statement, Mr. Chairman? Why? To further his own political ends and his own political game playing.

MR. NEARY: And listen to this, Mr. Chairman, (2) 'When the Board cannot reach a decision on a consensus basis, "Paramountcy" for the federal and provincial ministers in specified areas. (3) A deadlock breaking mechanism for the federal minister until energy security in oil self-sufficiency is achieved, with safeguards to ensure that it is used reasonably. Afterwards the provincial minister would have to concur.' Is that in the Nova Scotia agreement? Is it? Are hon. gentleman hearing it for the first time? And if they are, are they ashamed that they did not try to find out if this was all political propaganda and poppycock and balderdash. That is not in the Nova Scotia agreement. And I am amazed that the media and the press would allow the hon. gentleman to get away with these wild, irresponsible statements that he keeps making that are completely untrue.

'Number 4'-listen to this, and I ask hon. gentlemen if this is in the Nova Scotia agreement— 'A revenue sharing scheme which would initially provide the Province 75 per cent of offshore resources revenues, declining as the Province achieves a high level of income to a permanent share comparable to the initial federal share recognizing the incentives which have been paid to industry by the Canadian taxpayer.' Mr. Chairman, is that in the Nova Scotia agreement?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak but I have to speak in response to the hon. gentleman, not really that there is any need to, but just in case there might be one or two people in the Province who, you know, might listen to the hon. gentleman and not have heard before what consummate nonsense the hon. gentleman is speaking. Once again he speaks from the point of view of a Telex that has been given to him by his colleagues in Ottawa -

MR. NEARY:

It was sent to you.

MR. MARSHALL:

- which he is prepared to accept verbatim without any enquiry as to whether or not it is true in fact and in substance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just before I get on to that, the hon. gentleman talks about the waste of money in that brochure. There is no waste of money, Mr. Chairman, in sending out to the people of this Province information of critical importance to the people of this Province so that they can see exactly what the situation is, and that is what was done. If you want to talk about waste of money, Mr. Chairman, and I can tell this - I do not want to get the hon. gentleman paranoid now, but he has a certain mailing list, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does - it was just a couple of days ago that a person called me absolutely incensed that the Leader of the Opposition was using, he said - and I repeat it and I will bring this up in the House because it was a legitimate complaint - that he was using the mailing system in the Opposition Office to send out certain information. And what was he sending out? He was sending out, I am told, the March 9 and March 15 publications of the Toronto Globe and Mail to the people concerned. Now, Mr. Chairman, if he wants to talk about wasting money, I will put that brochure up against some of the diatribe that occurs from time to time in the uninformed comment from the Central Canadian press that the hon. gentleman is sending out to people.

MR. MARSHALL: It is the misuse of, as far as I am concerned, of public money. I am sure the Toronto Globe and Mail can afford its own circulation and the hon. gentleman does not need to be sending out clippings of the Toronto Globe and Mail to certain people at public expense.

I would also draw to the hon. gentlemen's attention there opposite that this is his own personal mailing list of supporters and if some of their supporters ring us up and tell us what they are receiving from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and smote disgrace over what they are receiving and the use of public funds, it just goes to show how little support the hon. gentleman there opposite has.

Now I will just deal very briefly with the way in which the hon. gentleman tries to twist things. He tries to say there was joint management and this was different than the Nova Scotia agreement. Mr. Chairman, if this were different than the Nova Scotia agreement it was only because it was marginally worse than the Nova Scotia agreement. He repeats by rote, you know, what the minister said on joint management. And he does not inquire in any depth into the last phrase that he read out to the effect that deadlock breaking mechanism which the federal minister would exercise till energy self-sufficiency and security of supply. Now, you know, the federal minister, in other words, was to exercise a deadlock breaking mechanism; if the federal minister felt it was unreasonable, he could break the whole thing. So obviously it was not joint management, it could not be joint management when the final decision rests with the federal minister. It would be just, as well, if you are prepared to be a suppliant in that fashion, to forget the board altogether or forget any board, and give it to the federal minister.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman,

MR. MARSHALL: far as the board goes, the way in which the board was set up, the hon. gentleman does not mention that the three and three on the board, it was envisaged that all of the employees would they be employees of the Province? No, they should not be of the Province. Would they be employees of the federal government? No, I think any rational person would say that they are going to have joint management, they would not be of the federal government either, obviously, they would have to be employees of the board and reporting to the board. That did not suffice the federal authorities. What they wanted, and what Mr. Chretien was proposing, was that the employees be responsible to whom and employees of whom? The federal government, not of the board. We said they had to be of the board. Now how can you have joint management when you have that?

And then, Mr. Chairman, he gets into other situations that he does not know where he is treading. The fact of the matter is all legislation was to be federal legislation, so it was totally and completely federal control and a federal board just like the Nova Scotia agreement. Now, you know, if there is any reason why the people of Newfoundland should be leary of acceptance of that Nova Scotian agreement, I mean, there is nobody in this Province today who should be deluded into thinking that the Nova Scotian agreement was a good agreement for this Province because, in fact, the Nova Scotian agreement had been assessed as being of

substantially no use to the Province of Nova Scotia. I have here a report called 'The Socio-Economic Review of the Venture Development Project', the Venture Development Project, of course, being the Nova Scotian project. It was conducted by a socio-economic review panel and its membership consisted of the nominees of the Government of Nova Scotia and COGLA, which is the federal agency. I quote,

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, directly from the last paragraph on page 18 of that report, where it says, "The Province", that is the Province of Nova Scotia, "could gain incremental revenues from the spinoff activity of the project and participation in the Crown corporations in the project". This is the construction industry. 'Incremental' they call it, 'incremental revenues', small revenues. "However, as a first approximation, and in the absence of definitive statement from consultants, it is necessary to assume", now get this, "that the net impact of the project on provincial revenues is small to negligible". I will repeat that again, "The net impact of the project", that is the project in Nova Scotia, "as a result of that agreement on provincial revenues is small to negligible". Now does anybody really in this Province wish us to be put into a position where we have to be

MR. MARSHALL:

pushed into an agreement? Well, we will not have to be because this administration just will not be. But is there anyone in his wildest imagination who thinks that the Province of Newfoundland should be pressured into any kind of an agreement where, in the assessment of the people who signed it before, the net benefit to this Province should be small to negligible? Is the Province of Newfoundland only entitled to a small to negligible benefit from the resources offshore, from the resources that we brought into Confederation?

MR. DINN:

Shocking!

MR. MARSHALL:

Can there be any doubt, despite what the hon. gentleman mentioned, that this is what we actually received, both from the revenue aspects and from the joint management? I can tell the hon. gentleman that from my own assessment, that offer that was made, that he touts for Mr. Chretien, was marginally worse than the Nova Scotian agreement. But knowing the hon. gentleman's penchant for not accepting what is said on this side of the House of Assembly, I can also tell him that it was the unanimous, individually and collectively expressed opinion of the officials who were there who were negotiating at the time, that what was being offered was marginally worse than the Nova Scotian agreement.

MR. TULK:

Not true!

MR. MARSHALL:

Not true! It was true, Mr. Chairman! The hon. gentleman does not want to do a disservice to his Province, but he is doing it by making an uninformed statement such as that. It was true and it is true, and if the hon. gentleman wants to analyze it he will see it is as plain as the nose on your face

MR. MARSHALL: that this is all that we were offered and this is all that is on the table at the present time.

MR. NEARY: Not true!

MR. MARSHALL: And this Province, under the leadership of the Premier of this Province, is not going to be put in a position where we are going to have to submit to an agreement of that nature. It is not right for the people of this Province.

I suggest what the hon. gentlemen there opposite can do is try to get their federal counterparts to address an agreement that was wrought between myself and Mr. Chretien, before it was taken away from him and was rendered down, which had been an agreement that was based purely and simply on equality, justice and equity for the people of this Province and for the people of all of Canada. It envisaged us getting 75 per cent, for instance, of the total government revenues until such time as our per capita earned incomes in this Province were equal to the per capita average incomes elsewhere.

People should be well aware that one of the major problems in this Province is that when we went into Confederation, the per capita earned income was approximately 49 per cent of the national average. Now, after thirty-five years of Confederation, it has only ascended to the magnificent sum of 54 per cent. So we say that these resources we brought into Confederation with us, 75 per cent of the revenues - not all of them, you take 25 per cent - but we get 75 per cent until such time as the per capita earned incomes are equal to that of the average Canadian. Now, what is wrong with that? What is wrong with us receiving 75 per cent until we can

MR. MARSHALL: bring our taxes down to the level, ^e not to wipe them out, but to bring them down to the level of the average in Canada? And what is wrong with us having an equal say in management?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) quoted from the socio-economic review of the Venture Development Project. He quoted one paragraph but did not quote the paragraph immediately preceding it. And in this report,

MR. BARRY:

immediately before the paragraph to which the minister alluded, there is a prior statement which says, "Under existing equalization legislation, which is reviewable on a five year basis, it appears that for every dollar provided by the project the Province give up a dollar, approximately, in equalization payments. This is justifiable since the sole purpose of current equalization payments is to offset the lack of a revenue base for provincial economies. If, as in Nova Scotia's case, a new revenue base is added, equalization transfers from the rest of Canada would be reduced accordingly".

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is the nub of the question. It is not that the development of the Venture gas field will not produce revenues for both levels of government, including considerable revenues to the Province of Nova Scotia, it is that there would be a dollar for dollar reduction in equalization. And I understand that, subsequently the Premier of Nova Scotia was reported as saying that the analysts were not aware of an agreement which he had with the Government of Canada with respect to something less than a dollar of equalization being lost for every dollar of revenue coming in.

Now, I find it strange to see how there could be such an agreement between the Government of Nova Scotia and the federal government that would not have been made public, but I do not think that is any of our business. If there is such an agreement, well and good. I just hope that there is. Nor should we be standing up in this House and criticizing the Government of Nova Scotia for entering into their deal. They have different objectives as a province than we have. We have our objectives in this Province, they have their objectives.

MR. BARRY: They may not be as concerned, for example, with being involved in management so as to be able to influence the location of business and so forth. Nova Scotia may be prepared to leave those decisions to the federal government finally, because they know they have a geographic advantage which will see much of this stuff locate in Halifax in any event.

Similarly, they may not have the same need for direct government revenue, although looking at their budget deficits on current account in recent year it would seem that they are strapped for cash the same way this Province is. So the difference between the two Provinces on that may not be all that great. But the point here, Mr. Chairman, is that it is on the question of the rate at which equalization will reduce from oil revenues that the real, crucial bargaining point develops. And I would hope and expect that Nova Scotia - they were aware of it, I know - would have some arrangement with respect to getting some advantage from oil other than just an exchange of equalization.

Naturally, everybody in the Province supports the notion of Newfoundland, rather than just getting in the same position once oil comes on stream, once Hibernia is developed, or other fields, rather than our being in the same position as far as government revenues are concerned but having that now come from the sale of oil rather than from transfer payments from the federal government, at that point in time we would be earning our own way.

MR. BARRY: In the current budget-
what is it? The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)
would know - close to 50 per cent -

MR. BAIRD: You would put the Province
in the position of poverty.

MR. BARRY: The hon. member for Humber
West (Mr. Baird), hopefully soon to be a minister - he
can do a much better job than many of them who are
there now.

MR. BAIRD: Thank you very much.

MR. BARRY: The member for Humber West
should be aware that this red herring, this bugaboo,
that somehow there are traitors on this side of the
House if they dare analyse the government's position,
that they are traitors if somehow they ask, for example,
why is it that we have these full page ads running
in the Daily News and the Evening Telegram preaching
to the converted? the member knows that 99 per cent
of Newfoundlanders support the development of these
resources for Newfoundland, to have the revenues for
the benefit of Newfoundland, to have Newfoundland
involved in management, Mr. Chairman, and that is not
the issue anymore. The issue is whether the colleagues
of the hon. member are going about achieving those
objectives or whether, in fact, the Province is now
further away from those objectives than when we started.
That is the question which the people of Newfoundland
are concerned about. Is the member opposite and his
colleagues going about it in the right way in achieving
those objectives, Mr. Chairman? So if the member is
asking, 'Do I support the objectives,' the answer is,
yes, but if the member is asking, 'Do I support the
way he is going about it and the way his colleagues

MR. BARRY: are going about it?' the answer is emphatically, no, no, no. You are blowing it, you are making a mess of it, you are taking the Province farther away from achieving what we want to achieve on offshore negotiations. For all of your apparent sincerity, you are taking us further away from getting what our own people deserve and should have than if you were going about it in another way, and, Mr. Chairman, that is the opinion of the vast majority of Newfoundlanders, as the member is going to see in the next election. Mr. Chairman, members opposite had their chance and they are blowing it. Now, Mr. Chairman, just to get back to these newspaper ads. They may have been, I missed a couple of days of the Globe and Mail - I have been travelling a little bit and I have not been following the national newspapers as closely as I normally do over the last week - but I have yet to see one of those full page ads run in our national newspapers. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, and the people of this Province would like to know, and we will find out hopefully in the estimates, where is the money coming from for these full page ads to run them in our local newspapers and what do members opposite see is the point of preaching to the converted? We should be campaigning Mr. Chairman, across Canada; we should be running that type of ad, we should be running our media campaign in other provinces of Canada.

MR. DINN: That is coming.

MR. BARRY: The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) says it is coming. Well, I say

MR.BARRY: it is about time.

MR.DINN: Why did you not do it in your five years as Minister of Mines and Energy?

MR.BARRY: It is about time. I recommended that it be done years ago and it was ignored, Mr.Chairman. We had a brochure prepared and the minister opposite used it in his election campaign. Rather than getting it our across Canada so that we could convince the people in other provinces, the members opposite used it for their short-term political games in the Province, Mr. Chairman.

MR.BAIRD: You used it in your election campaign.

MR.BARRY: I did not use that, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR.BARRY: We have a situation where the government is engaging, Mr. Chairman, paying the taxpayer's dollars on nothing more than political propaganda within the Province and they are failing to do the job they should be doing, namely that of informing the people across Canada of the justice and equity of our case on the offshore. And the time has come, Mr. Chairman, the time has come for them to recognize that they are not going to get away with it.

MR.HODDER: They want one more election off the offshore.

MR.BARRY: They are not going to get another election off the offshore, Mr. Chairman. Their time has come. The people of this Province realized that they should be

MR. BARRY: out talking to the people in other parts of Canada, rather than deluging, Mr. Chairman, the people of this Province and paying the hard earned taxpayers dollars on ads in The Evening Telegram and The Daily News , They should be running these ads across Canada in national newspapers where they will be acting to persuade those people who can influence Mr. Trudeau, and influence Mr. Turner, Mr. Chretien, Mr. Roberts or whoever else is going to be Prime Minister, Mr. Chairman, even Mr. Mulroney might be influenced, Mr. Chairman, if he wins the election.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is what members opposite should be doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will get time again.

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member who just took his seat, of course, is giving a very distorted view of things. He is giving a single little viewpoint of things, sort of tunnel vision, but, however, perhaps I will come back to that. Before doing that, though, I would like to make a comment on what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said (Mr. Neary). The hon. Leader of the Opposition waxed eloquent and said ~~sc-and-so~~ was in the Budget Speech. Unfortunately what he said was in the Budget Speech was not in the Budget Speech. And, of course, this is nothing new to have the things said across the way that they are so, when, if you just look, if you just examine, as the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said in regard the report that the hon. member

DR. COLLINS: for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) was discussing, if you will just look at it you find that what people are saying are not what are factual. And the same way, what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said about the Budget Speech is not factual.

Now he said that in the Budget Speech I said that Canada is merely an experiment. And he said, 'Terrible, Merely an experiment. Imagine the minister saying, 'Canada is merely an experiment.'

Mr. Chairman, just let us go back to the Speech and just see exactly what was said, a very brief little paragraph, and it said, "The Canadian Confederation is a unique experiment", not merely an experiment now, 'It is a unique experiment in governing a huge landmass, a small and widely dispersed population, and diverse heritages and cultures! It is an enriching experiment in which Newfoundland and Labrador is proud to participate'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Chairman, is that the meaning that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was putting across when he said the minister said, 'It is merely an experiment'? Was he implying that the minister said it was an enriching experiment, unique, combed in, patterned for our particular circumstances in this great country, this huge landmass, half a continent, a small population, 25 million people if it is that, where a similar landmass, the United States, is 200 million', a similar landmass, in Russia, has 250 million plus, a similar landmass, China, has one billion plus'. Did he say I was implying that it is an experiment in people's living together from different languages, different backgrounds, different countries? Did he say that that was in the Budget Speech? No, Mr. Chairman. He tries to deceive, he tries to say

DR. COLLINS: things that were not in there, not meant, not implied, not intended. And that, of course, is not unusual. This is what we get all of the time.

Mr. Chairman, the Canadian experiment is a noble experiment, but it is an experiment, all forms of government are an experiment. How do people live together? The point is you must have principles that you do not change, but then you change the terms under which you bring those principles into effect depending on time, circumstances, and people involved. And that is what we are asking about the Canadian experiment.

One of the most fundamental principles in the Canadian Confederation is that the provinces control natural resources. It is written in there. It was written in from the beginning. It was written in for a very good reason: The only way the regions of Canada can develop, with so few people in this great land, this huge land, it is spread out all over the place, the only way they can develop is if they have control and management ability over their natural resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: If you have control and management ability over our resources from 1,500 miles away, you cannot develop the economy down here for the benefit of the people who live here. You may want to. You might, with the best will in the world say I would like to, in practical terms it is impossible to I would like to, but in practical terms it is impossible to do it. It is all very well to give resources to the central government in resources to the small country, a little

DR. COLLINS:

like the United Kingdom where you can travel from one end to the other in a morning's train trip or whatever. You can do it there probably, you can run everything from London, and they do not even do that in the UK but you could do it, and they do it to a very large extent. In Canada you cannot do it, it is totally impossible. As I pointed out in the Budget Speech, we have got to learn from our history in this Province. We just cannot go from day to day repeating the same old mistakes, which is what the members opposite want us to do. We have got to learn from our history. We have got to go back and see what happened? did it work? if it did not work let us try something else. As I pointed out in the Budget Speech, we gave the fishery up at Confederation. We totally gave it up at Confederation. It was the most blatant mistake made in the history of this Province when the people who brought us into Confederation gave the control of our fishery, which we had for 400 to 500 years before that, they gave it away. We were left without any control over the fishery once you got a few inches offshore, and that is where it all matters. You cannot control an industry if your supply is in someone else's hands, and especially if your relationship to the world is in someone else's hands and, of course, trade relationships are really in the hands of the federal government. Quite apart from that, we gave the fishery away when we gave the resource away. That was a error of the most enormous magnitude. Now we have learned that, we know that. We know what has happened since that time. We know the trouble the fishery has been in. Now people might say, 'Well, it would be just as big a trouble if Newfoundlanders regained control.' We do not know that. That may or may not be true. Even if it

DR. COLLINS: is true we do not know it. We do know though - and this is quite clear, blatant, factual - we do know it was a terrible disaster and a mess when we gave it away. Now, let us not repeat that disaster; let us at least give Newfoundland the chance to control its new resource, the offshore resource. At least give us the chance. We know from past experience if we give it away it will be a disaster, so at least give Newfoundland a shot at the ball now. And, of course, we are on good grounds because the experience in other provinces have shown that when they do control their natural resources, the people do prosper. So that is what we are saying. Let us be like the Albertans with their resources, like the Saskatchewan people with their resources, like the Ontario people with their resources, like the Quebec people with their resources. Let us use our resources that by all manner of assessment are rightly ours. By all manner of assessment - and I will just mention the legal thing in just a moment - by all analyses they are rightly ours: Let us manage them for our benefit as other provinces have shown, when they managed theirs, they can get benefits out of them. We know from experience if you give it to someone else they will not manage it to our benefit. Now what is more logical than that?

Now just a small point on the legal case. This government is not saying that in legal terms Canada owns the offshore. The Supreme Court said that. We have no quarrel with that decision. We did not think that the case and we felt that on good, moral, historic, logical, reasonable grounds that we in fact did own them. However, the Supreme Court has now spoken and said, 'No. In legal terms Canada owns them.' That does not give Canada the moral, historic, sensible, reason for owning it.

DR. COLLINS:

So what we are saying now is laws are made by men. If the law is the one out of step, if the law says Canada owns it but every other logical thought in man's mind say that Newfoundland should own it, and the precedents in the Constitution says that the Province should own it, well, let us change the thing that is out of step. Let us change the

DR. COLLINS:

law. And that is where the Canadian Constitution is an experiment. It is when things are out of step, you do not throw your principles out the window and say, 'Alright, we will tear up the principle that provinces should own and control their resources'. You do not tear up that, that is a fundamental principle. You keep that. If the other thing is out of step, you change the law; you change the Constitution, in other words, because the Constitution is the great law. It is the law which bears up all the other laws. And if that one is out of step, if that one gives rise to an injustice, gives rise to an inequity, that is the one that must be changed. And that is the thrust of this government. Now, in the meantime, we know it will take a little while to bring that about, but we know that it will be brought about. We have full confidence in the way the Canadian nation thinks, we know that they will change that law. We are absolutely convinced, we are working hard to assist it and to bring about the earliest possible change. We know that it will be changed; however, it is going to take a bit of time. In the meantime, our position as government is we are willing, anxious and able to sit down and reach an agreement so that things will go ahead.

The only proviso we put in there, we are not going to get into a rotten agreement. We are not going to get into another fishery type of agreement where we gave away the resource and the whole thing fell down around our ears. We are not going to get into an Upper Churchill-type of agreement where we were blackmailed into doing something, and the people who were supposed to save us from such blackmail did not have the backbone, and did not have the common sense and did not have, you know, the perception. They saw about three inches, if that far, from their noses. We are not going to get into that sort of rubbish. This government says, 'We

DR. COLLINS: will reach an agreement. It is going to be a good agreement. It will do good for you and give you what you should get, it will do good for us and give us what we should get. We will reach that agreement, but in the meantime we are expecting you to change that law, and we know you are going to change it because the Canadian people are a great people. We are going to push you to get it done at the earliest possible moment and we are obviously going to succeed.' That is just a few, quiet little words I wanted to say about the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) foolish remarks. I am sure that he will probably jump to his feet now and apologize for making them because I have shown them to be so ridiculous and so nonsensical.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: And if he does not want to do that, I will just accept it anyway because I do not want to embarrass him anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has elapsed.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, just listening to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) for the past ten minutes one would never believe that he would be the Minister of Finance for the Province that is in such a state of turmoil. All the minister did in his ten minute speaking was to lash back against members on this side of the House. Now, I would suggest to the hon. minister that if there was anything good in this budget, I am sure it would not be necessary to lash back at the members on this side. First when the minister

MR. WARREN: read his budget on Budget Day, one would believe first that it did not appear to be a very bad budget, but he made one statement in his budget and he said that there are a few increases which will be detailed later. Mr. Chairman, those increases are the increases that will affect many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians more greatly than any member realizes. They are going to get rid of the \$5 fee for wards in the hospitals and they are going to tack it on the semi-private and private rooms. They are going to increase the rate for birth certificates, for death certificates. So the message from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is telling all the women in the Province, 'No more babies', and telling everybody, 'Nobody else can die,' because if you did it is going

MR. WARREN:

no one else should die, because if you die it is going to cost you more. And if you are going to have a baby, it is going to cost you more too. So that is the message that the minister gave. In fact, the minister must have given a message to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) because I have a feeling that the Minister of Public Works is going to have problems with carrying on the good business on which he has been thriving for a number of years, because now a person is going to be scared to die because of the increase on death certificates!

In the estimates yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) was so testy! My hon. colleague from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) brought up a story about a project out in his district and according to what the hon. member said and according to the response that was received from the Minister of Social Services, if there is any need for an investigation, there it is. And, Mr. Chairman, the minister was so testy!

And then we brought up the subject of the four social workers in Labrador who were fired. The minister said, 'Well, they did not follow the law.' Now, Mr. Chairman, I would be only too glad to take my seat and let the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) get up and say, for the number of years that he was a social worker in this Province that he followed the law. Because, I could tell the hon. member that he did not follow the law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: And there is no other social worker in this Province who follows the law as stipulated by the Minister of Social Services, because it is impossible

MR. WARREN: to follow such a law. The law that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has in place is one law for one person and a different law for somebody else. And I could honestly say, Mr. Chairman, that for the hon. member when he was a social worker, as it was for myself when I was a social worker years ago, it was impossible to follow the law as stipulated by the Minister of Social Services. The hon. member knows that when he was a social worker, he bent the rules. I remember when he was a social worker that he came into this House of Assembly and sat in the gallery for two or three days while a conference was on. I remember, Mr. Chairman, all about that hon. gentleman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the government have allotted, I think, in their budget, \$1 million for airstrips in Charlottetown, Paradise River and Black Tickle. The minister got up and announced that in their budget, and 100 per cent of this money is coming from the federal government. Why should the minister crow about money coming from the federal government when they do not even negotiate with them?

MR. WARREN:

Roughly \$11 million is estimated for the Confederation Building extension this year. I agree that the extension to Confederation Building when completed will be a great asset to this Province, but I am wondering what is going to happen to the Premier's buddies in town who are now renting office space to this government? What is going to happen to Atlantic Place? What is going to happen to the Murray Premises and others? Is the Premier still going to pay them for unoccupied space as he has done in the past?

I am sure the hon. the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) knows this is happening. He is on the Public Accounts Committee. He knows that this government, the government that he is part of has been paying for unoccupied space. We all know that.

MR. STEWART: That is not true.

MR. WARREN: That is true. The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), he knows that we have been paying for unoccupied space in the Murray Premises. And who owns the Murray Premises? The bagman for the P. C. Party. That is who owns the Murray Premises.

MR. NEARY: Right on! The fellow who doles the cheques out to the Premier.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, what are we going to do? Let us try to cut corners in the right place. I believe this Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) said on CBC radio this morning that he does not know what his social workers are up to, he does not know what directives are going out to individuals. Surely goodness if a directive goes out to one group of people in the Province the same directive should not apply to everybody. I am sure that an administrator down on the Burin Peninsula would not send out the same directive that an

MR. WARREN: individual down in Milltown would send out to the Conne River Indians. I am sure the administrator in Clarenville would not do it. But all of a sudden this administrator was attacking through the minister, telling the native people what to do and what not to do.

Mr. Chairman, it is amazing how this government can say that everybody should be treated equally. The Premier and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), all they say is that we should have equal opportunities in Canada, and at the same time, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has one regulation for one group of people in this Province and another regulation for another group.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) wanted a definition of a P.C. bagman. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the hon. member knows that when the next election is called the man who has a lot to do with the Murray Premises will be able to pass out the dough to him -

MR. NEARY: Do not forget the convention centre.

MR. WARREN: And the convention centre - will be able to pass out many dollars, whether it is under the table or over the table, and that is what I mean by a bagman.

MR. STEWART: Who is that.

MR. NEARY: The one who passed the cheques over to the Premier from (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, it is unreal that we can have a government today seeing people suffering while at the same time we have monies being passed over to individuals in this Province for space that is still unoccupied.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think it is ridiculous! I think the most ironic thing about this whole budget and the last year's budget is that in the past twelve months -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN: By leave, Sir?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, he is not making any sense anyway.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Yes, the hon. member has another ten minutes after I am finished, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to get up and say a few words about what basically is happening in this debate. We are supposed to be discussing Interim Supply and the hon. members are not talking about Interim Supply at all. They are talking about the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) and the fact that he is discriminating. I mean, it is the same old balderdash they get on with every day, every month, every year in this House of Assembly. It is the Catholics against the Protestants, the Indians against the whites, the people in St. John's against the people outside St. John's, trying to get these foolish little arguments going, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said it right, for cheap political points.

The hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) got up and talked about the offshore and how that agreement that Mr. Chretien had on the table was such a good agreement, that we had some say in the management. And what did the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) get up and tell him point blank? Yes, they had three and three on the board but who made the ultimate decision?

AN HON. MEMBER: The federal minister.

MR. DINN: The federal minister. I mean, is that what he is talking about joint management of a resource? Who would the employees of this Crown corporation be paid by? The government in Ottawa. Is this what we are talking about? Is this joint management?

MR. SIMMS: Certainly not.

MR. DINN: Is this 'He who pays the piper calls the tune'? And what are they going to pay these employees on? They are going to pay them out of what they get out of Hibernia. They are going to take our money out of our pockets and they are going to give it to their employees so that they can decide which way they want the resource developed. And if they do not do it right then, the federal minister will look at the decision and say, 'I do not like that. I am going to change that now because that is not exactly the way we want it. We are going to do it our way.' So, you know, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) -

MR. TOBIN: Just his cover up.

MR. DINN: Yes. The Member for LaPoile gets up and, I mean, you would think he would make some sense sometime. If he is not going to talk about the estimates, if he is not going to question ministers on this side about what they are spending these moneys for, then the least he can do, the least people in this Province expect - the gentleman is the longest serving member of this House of Assembly. He knows no rules of the House yet and he gets up in the House and makes these foolish statements about what Mr. Chretien is going to do. He is an apologist for Mr. Chretien. He used to be an apologist for four or five other 'Johns', now he is an apologist for Mr. Chretien.

MR. DINN: And then the Member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) gets up and talks about social assistance. Mr. Chairman, it has been a prerequisite of this government that before any person serves as Minister of Municipal Affairs in this Province that he read the Mifflin report on how not to be Minister of Social Services. That is what they do. They have to do that. That is a prerequisite to becoming Minister of Social Services in this Province. Because you have to know how not to do things and that is how not to do them. There is a book written on it, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I got up this morning in this House of Assembly and talked about the offshore. And the hon. member got up and, you know, he - we are trying to get some jobs for Newfoundlanders in the offshore. Surely, nobody can be against that. Is there any man in this Province against that?

MR. TOBIN: Oh, yes, there is.

MR. DINN: I am not talking about the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Is there any man in this Province who would stand up against something like that?

Mr. Chairman, right now in the offshore, and the onshore directly related to the offshore, we have in Newfoundland 1,487 jobs, nothing to sneeze at!

MR. SIMMS: Certainly not!

MR. DINN: Three times Come By Chance, Mr. Chairman, and, added to that, 560 Newfoundlanders who started out here in our offshore, because of our local preference regulations,

MR. DINN: who started out in our offshore are now working throughout the world. They are working off Nova Scotia, they are working in the North Sea, they are working in the Indian Ocean, 560 of them.

MR. DAWE: Why are they working now? What is the reason? Is it that the federal government allowed them to work?

MR. DINN: Oh certainly. Oh certainly. Well, they had a big hullabaloo here a couple of years ago because we had something like 8,000 people registered for the offshore and one of the companies advertised in the papers that they had positions available for the Discoverer Seven Seas offshore, they had some ninety positions available, and the Newfoundlanders who were registered went in to those offices attempting to get the jobs and, of course, all their experience was laid out there, and we had two people from Alberta who came down - they were originally from Nova Scotia - here and there were something like 600 people in the office of this company, in the office or waiting downstairs to try to get into the office to apply for these jobs, and lo and behold the two Nova Scotians - I mean, I do not blame them, they are looking for jobs like any other Canadian - walked down and they walked up to the front of the line, pushed everybody aside and said, Look, we just got a ride from Alberta, we were promised jobs down here by our federal member - the federal member apparently called and said, Do it this way. But apparently they were called and told to go to Newfoundland, there were two jobs waiting for them. They walked down and they walked up to the front of the line. They never apologized or anything, they bulldozed their way in, walked up the the front of the line and said, We are here, we are ready, and what happened?

MR. DAWE: That is not true. That did not happen. A bunch of Liberals.

MR. DINN: What happened because of that? Well, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), and hon. gentlemen opposite got up in this House and accused this House of discriminating against other Canadians. Now, that is what I have been accused of. I do not force companies. I do not believe I have ever called a company to ask them to get John Jones a job.

MR. NEARY: You send letters, you do not even let them approach you in conversation.

MR. DINN: The hon. member should read his own book about how he operated as a minister. I do not even consider his interruptions as interruptions. Mr. Chairman, I want to deal with the meat of what is going on here in the Province.

Two gentlemen came from Alberta, because they were a little tired, they were not close enough to their own homes in Musgrave, Nova Scotia, and they came down here and pushed all the Newfoundlanders aside and walked up to the head of the line and because the company said to them, Well, now, I mean, you are going to have to take your turn. With all due respect to your federal fellow, we have people here who have been working in the offshore, who are qualified, who have more experience than you. Gerry Dinn did not call the company and say, You will hire these Newfoundlanders or else! I did not have to do that. The company said, We have people here who are qualified, who worked in the Beaufort Sea, who worked in the North Sea, who are drillers, who took eight years to become drillers. You people have worked on land rigs, you know nothing about the ocean. We cannot hire you. And what did they do? Well, they went back to their member and complained, they sent their little notes

MR. DINN: to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and others, and they got up in this House condemning this government for discriminating against Canadians.

We have a 21 per cent unemployment rate in this Province and we are discriminating because we supply information to companies that work in the offshore so they can see that Newfoundlanders have qualifications and, please, have a look at them and see if you can find positions in the offshore for these people who have all the qualifications necessary to work in the offshore.

I got up this morning, Mr. Chairman, and I made a Ministerial Statement about how we were going to continue to supply this information to the companies. Why would I do that? Why would I make that Ministerial Statement this morning? Because I have gotten calls since the Supreme Court made its decision. Contrary to the fact that companies do not want to have anything imposed upon them, they want the information. I have gotten fifteen calls from fifteen - is the hon. member listening? I want him to get this, this is good information.

MR. NEARY: How many?

MR. DINN: Twelve to fifteen. I am not sure of the exact count, but twelve to fifteen companies, foreign companies, different companies that work in the offshore and work onshore directly related to the offshore, fifteen companies have called me and said, Mr. Minister, surely because of this silly decision, this decision that has been made,

MR. DINN: you are not going to stop supplying information. It is the best information that we get anywhere in the world. We can actually look at a book and say that this gentleman is a driller, John Jones is a driller and he worked four years in the North Sea on these different rigs.

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

MR. DINN: I was just getting into full flight, but I will have another opportunity, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, you will.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman,

MR. CALLAN: Go out and call some people back from Fort MacMurray.

MR. WARREN: I am amazed the government would stoop so low as to pick an individual such as this to speak on interim supply. I am surprised that they would go so low in the barrel to get this kind of a minister who saw Labrador City practically become a ghost town.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Government employees in this Province having to sacrifice, and that is the best they have to offer. However, to go back to what I was speaking about earlier, what an hypocrisy! In this budget there is money provided for the completion of the Arts and Culture Centre in Labrador City. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where the priorities of this government are. I believe the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), in all due respect, I believe he is listening attentively and I believe he is of the same opinion as I am now.

MR. MORGAN: What are you talking about?

MR. WARREN: I can tell from the look on the minister's face that he is concerned too. Why would this government spend \$2 million on an Arts and Culture Centre in Labrador City/Wabush when there are so many other needs in this Province? And not only that, Mr. Chairman, instead of putting a hold on the Central Newfoundland Hospital, which they have done, surely goodness the least thing they could have done was put a hold on the Arts and Culture Centre for Labrador City because they have already lost about 6,000 people in the past year. The population is not there to warrant an Arts and Culture Centre. In Labrador City/Wabush, with all due respect to the people there, they have lost 5,000 or 6,000 people, they are going to lose more in the years to come, and here we are going to have a monstrosity of a building there that is going to cost the government thousands and thousands of dollars to maintain. So instead of putting a lid on the completion of the renovations at the Central Newfoundland Hospital in Grand Falls where it is needed, where the population is stable and increasing, there should have been a lid put on the Arts and Culture Centre for Labrador City.

Another concern, Mr. Chairman, although it is not spelled out in the budget.

MR. TOBIN: What about my district?

MR. WARREN: What about the hon. member's district? I would say, Mr. Chairman, God bless Ottawa! God bless Ottawa!

MR. TOBIN: For what?

MR. WARREN: For what? For an \$8 million ferry that is going to be built in Marystown. And where did all -

MR. TOBIN: They are not building the ferry.

MR. MORGAN: That is not federal money.

MR. WARREN: Hold on now, hold on now! Just relax. Do not get too excited! Where did all of the money come from that kept the Marystown Shipyard in operation from the beginning? Where did it come from?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: No, way. How many dollars, how many millions of dollars have gone into the Marystown Shipyard from the federal government? And who built the Marystown Shipyard, Mr. Chairman?

MR. WARREN: Was it this government?
Was it this government that built the Marystown
Shipyard? Was it federal money?

MR. TOBIN: Good Tory money.

MR. WARREN: Now, I finally get the
hon. gentleman to admit that there would be no ferries
built this year if it were not for the federal government
in Ottawa. So, Mr. Chairman, I should advise the hon.
member that his days in the House are numbered. His days
in this hon. House are numbered. I would venture to
say that if he is not careful, the member Pat Canning
beat sometime ago, he may be back to challenge the hon.
member.

I can also show the
hon. member excerpts from Hansard where the hon. member
praised the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry). In his
second speech in this House he said the member for
Mount Scio was the best member that was ever down on the
Burin Peninsula. So he will take these little trips down
to Marystown, and Burin, and Rushoon, and Baine Harbour,
and Boat Harbour, he will take these little trips down
there and he will remind the hon. member that he is only
passing through.

MR. TOBIN: I will tell you something,
I have no worries about anyone over there running in
Burin - Placentia West next time.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, the member's
big advantage in the last election was that he was a social
worker. He went directly into politics from there and the
Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) had these little
blue slips that went out to his district and right away
everybody thought the blue slips came from the candidate
instead of from the hon. minister, and that is why he was
elected. He was elected because of the little blue slips.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did you get your pink slips?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, it is amazing. Years ago when people would come in from around the bay -

MR. TOBIN: What about the hospital?

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, it is terrible listening to this hon. gentleman. Could you ask him to be quiet?

MR. CHAIRMAN(Aylward): Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, what about the hospital? If ever a group of people deserved a hospital it is the people on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. TOBIN: That is right.

MR. WARREN: Do not say anything else to me. The reason I say that, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect, is that I had the opportunity of visiting the Burin hospital in 1959, when the hon. member was still wearing diapers, and at that time the Burin hospital was a disgrace. One thing this government has done that has been positive for the Burin Peninsula is turn the sod for the new hospital. I think that is a plus and I think the people should be proud that the former hon. member for Placentia West(Mr. Barry) has time and time again written to the Minister of Health(Mr. House) saying, We need a new hospital down there. It was only after the members changed down there that the government decided to go ahead.

Remember the budget of 1979 and the budget of 1980?

MR. TOBIN: 1972 and 1975.

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is right. The hon. member for Mount Scio, when he was there, it was promised then. So, Mr. Chairman, what happens is if you are a Tory in a Tory Government you will get a hospital.

MR. TOBIN: That is not true.
There are a number of Tories who did not get a
hospital.

MR. MATTHEWS: Port aux Basques got
a hospital and they have never voted Tory.

MR. NEARY: What a member! What
a member!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, the
fortunate thing about it is the people on the Burin
Peninsula will have a hospital, but I have a funny
feeling that one of the first patients may

MR. WARREN:

be the member. I apologize, the member is sort of getting me off the track.

MR. TOBIN: Tell us about Cow Head now.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, no, I am not going to speak about Cow Head at all because Cow Head completely depends on a settlement on the offshore and as long as this government is in power, there is not going to be any settlement on the offshore. Another reason, Mr. Chairman, is that Mr. Mulroney in Ottawa will not form the next government. Mr. Chairman, let us face it, it is going to be John Turner, or John Munro, or Chretien, or MacGuigan, or Roberts or Coutts. You know there are about seven or eight who could be more powerful leaders than Mr. Mulroney or Mr. Crosbie could ever be.

MR. TOBIN: Who are you supporting?

MR. WARREN: Who am I supporting? I wish to advise the hon. member I will be supporting on the first ballot the person whom I think will be the best Prime Minister of Canada. Now that is who I am going to be supporting on the first ballot. And, Mr. Chairman, in about another ten days, if the hon. member asks me the question, I am sure I will be able to answer him and I will even give him my answer. But I want to advise you that I am not going to jump on the bandwagon right away, I am not going to wait until we get the best deal for Newfoundland, because I think we are going to get the best deal for Newfoundland regardless of who the Prime Minister is.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed again.

MR. WARREN: By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Does the hon. member have
leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. TOBIN: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did I hear a no.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, in the absense
of anybody -

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: I will yield to the hon. the
member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: This is not a hockey game as I
indicated the other day. Mr. Chairman, the way the rules
work in this House whoever stands in his place and is
recognized by the Chair is the one who addresses the Assembly.
Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman cannot leap to his
feet and then pass the puck over to some junior member of
this House. He cannot do that. It does not work that
way, Mr. Chairman. Each man has equal rights in this
House under the rules and the one that is recognized by
the Chair is the one who addresses the Assembly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

If the hon. the Leader of the
Opposition (Mr. Neary) had to wait for a minute I was going
to make the point that the hon. the President of the Council
(Mr. Marshall) had been recognized, if he does not wish to

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): speak, usually it goes to the other side for the next speaker.

So, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The only thing is I just thought - I did not think I knew that nobody had more to add to the deliberations of this morning than the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and undoubtedly that hon. gentleman will get time to speak before the morning is out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here we are again, I want to remind the hon. gentleman there opposite once again just so he knows, because the hon. gentleman has been in this House for far too long, as everybody knows, it has been a number of years but he still does not know what we are about. We are about the consideration of interim supply. As I said yesterday the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) once again, in very timely fashion, has brought in his budget before this House so all the details are known and there has not been one question voiced or posed on the amount of interim supply. They do not seem to know what we are debating. What we are debating is the provision of \$630 million which represent three months supply, and there has not been a single question asked of any of the ministers on this side of the House as to what the money is being used for and why you need that much. In some cases it does not divide by four, if you took the

MR. MARSHALL: total budget, and this is obviously because of the fact that in certain areas, such as in the Department of Transportation, for example, more is needed as we embark on the roads programme that we have implemented. But they are not interested in that. Mr. Chairman, all they are interested in is disrupting the House, I say, and trying to make the same old tired points that they have made from time to time in the past. All they do really is table Hansard for the previous years.

Mr. Chairman, I am sad that the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) could not get recognized. I know he will have plenty of time to talk in the debate, but it is a fact that this interim supply bill includes expenditures which are very beneficial for the hon. member's district. We do not hear in this House, Mr. Chairman, the Opposition talking about the position that this government has taken with respect to the Marystown Shipyard. Despite the meager resources which this Province has, there is provision in this interim supply and in the estimates, for the construction of a ferry which is going to employ some 100 people in the Marystown Shipyard this year. And I think that is a considerable contribution by this Province and a considerable recognition by the Province of the support of the Marystown shipyard and the Burin Peninsula in particular. If you left the Burin Peninsula to the hon. gentlemen there opposite it would be desolate, there would be no employment down there and everyone would be gone to Alberta or to Ottawa or where have you. For in the district of Grand Bank, also, there is reference in the Budget Speech

MR. MARSHALL: and in the Throne Speech to some very, very important measures that this government is taking with respect to the Burin Peninsula such as the attempt to reactivate the fluorspar mines down in St. Lawrence, in the Grand Bank district. And the hon. gentlemen do not talk about that, and that reactivation is taking place as a result of the efforts of this particular government in seeing what possibly can be done to reactivate it. In the first instance what we did was enact legislation last year to take back the assets that had previously been owned by Alcan. We have taken this position and we take it as a matter of policy. The people who come into this Province and want to develop are certainly entitled to use the licenses which they are granted by this Province. But it is an unwritten condition of every such license that these licenses have to be exercised for the purpose of the provision of optimum employment for the people of this Province. Consequently, when Alcan came and they tried to sit on their licenses we would not agree with it and we passed legislation in this House last year to take the rights back. And that was the first measure that enabled us to proceed with our attempts to reactivate the mines. And we have met with what we hope is going to be real success in that area. And what are we going to use to finance that? We are going to use in part the Burin Peninsula Development fund.

MR. NEARY: Federal money.

MR. MARSHALL: That is another thing that has been established as a result of the efforts of this government in development. The hon. gentleman

MR. MARSHALL: talks about the Liberal government, if we had left it to the Liberal government Grand Bank would be closed, Burin would be closed, Gaultois would be closed. If we had left it to the hon. gentlemen there opposite we would have resettlement practiced again on the South coast of this Province. I remember they came in and they told us when they were doing restructuring, the hon. gentlemen embrace it, the federal moles when they came in, 'Oh, we will look after the people in Gaultois. We will provide them with a ferry', they said, 'and they can drive into Harbour Breton'. That was a great policy, that was a great way to deal with the social needs of the people of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman does not want to debate what is in the budget and what the budget provides. The Burin Peninsula loan is a recognition with respect to Marystown, it is a recognition -

MR. NEARY: God bless Ottawa.

MR. MARSHALL: - of the viability of Grand Bank, and a recognition of the viability of the Town of Burin, and a recognition of and commitment to the Town of St. Lawrence. Make no wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the Liberals are afraid to go down to the Burin Peninsula and show their heads. I do not think even Mr. Simmons goes down there any more now, I think Mr. Simmons is afraid to show his face down on the Burin Peninsula. Because the people on the Burin Peninsula, as well as the people of Newfoundland know that, left to the wiles of the Liberal Party in the Province of Newfoundland and in Ottawa, Grand Bank would be closed, Burin would be closed, St. Lawrence would be closed, and the Marystown Shipyard would be bankrupt. We are still waiting in the Marystown Shipyard for a reasonable response to the need for construction of a trawler fleet in the fishery restructuring program. And what we want to do, what we are trying to ensure, Mr. Chairman, is that these trawlers should be built in the Province of Newfoundland. Well, where will they be built? If you leave it to the federal government, do you think they will be built in Marystown or they will be built at the synchrolift in St. John's? - well, you cannot build them down there anyway, they do not have the facilities. So will they be built in Marystown? No. There would be a certain number of them built in Halifax, that shipyard that they gave millions and millions to while denying the same amounts to the Marystown Shipyard and to the synchrolift here

MR. MARSHALL: in St. John's which we had to finance ourselves, which was a national and provincial disgrace. And, by the way, when we are talking about the budget, we do not hear the hon. gentleman - do we? - talk about the amount of money that is in the budget for the new graving dock down at the synchrolift here in St. John's. Does it really not concern the hon. gentleman that this is a federal Crown corporation? Now bear in mind we are glad to do it, because we have had good co-operation with Canadian National with respect to the shipyard, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, we should not have to do that. If we were in the Province of Quebec the money would be just erupting, flowing from Ottawa. Or if we were in Nova Scotia, like Ottawa did in the shipyard there. But what has this Province got to do in order to get the graving dock down there? It has to provide approximately 30 per cent of the cost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And we do it gladly because it provides jobs down there, and it will mean that the ferry, which had previously gone to the more favoured province - that is what we will have to call our sister province from now on - that ferry will come in and be able to be repaired here and there will be more jobs. And I know that will cause abject depression to the hon. gentlemen there opposite when they see it, because they cannot stand to see prosperity in this Province at all. The only thing that the hon. gentlemen there want to see are welfare payments and equalization payments for the rest of time. The only thing they want to see is the young people of this Province going off to the Boston states or off to Alberta or off to Toronto, it is getting further and further West; they will be going to Cheyenne and Hong Kong in the years to come if the hon. gentlemen had their way.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentlemen are completely devoid of any policy, they are bankrupt of any ideas or policies. They do not have one iota of intelligence to call their own, All they know how to do is embrace the arms of the federal Liberals and say, 'Lead us into the Promised Land of welfare and equalization payments,' stripping of dignity and raping and robbing the resources of this Province, as they are attempting to do in the offshore, as they are doing up in Labrador and as they are doing to the fishery.

Now that is why the hon. gentlemen there opposite are getting up and making the kind of speeches they are, because they cannot stand to engage in constructive debate. Look, this is the Budget for 1984, let us talk about the Marystown Shipyard. Let us talk about the St. Lawrence mines and the new hospitals, and the roads programme that is contained in this, and every other beneficial thing. What the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has managed to do in this Budget is he has wrought a human miracle by bringing in a budget of this nature.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: And the hon. gentleman there opposite should get off their negative train of thought.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: It is understandable, Mr. Chairman, why the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) could not stomach that sort of attitude and that sort of policy any longer. I am sure there are other hon. gentlemen there opposite who feel the same way as the member for Mount Scio. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, we are told that there is a move afoot in the Tory Party to get rid of the gentleman who just spoke in the Tory Party. The top ranking Tories in this Province.

MR. NEARY: claim that the real problem with the administration there opposite is the member who just spoke. And you should hear, Mr. Chairman, the remarks that I heard the night before last from high-ranking Tories, mind you, from some of the people who pass out the cheques to the Premier every month from the Tory Party.

MR. WARREN: What?

MR. NEARY: Well, the language, it would be unparliamentary to use their language in this House. They claim the real problem, the real obstructionist, the individual who really is causing mischief, is the hon. gentleman who just spoke. And they are trying to get a move underway to manoeuvre the hon. gentleman out of the position that he is in so that we can get on with the business of this Province. The hon. gentleman has a narrow, buttoned-down mind, hates everything that is Liberal, hates Confederation, hates the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman is anti-social. He cannot get along with anybody. And, unfortunately, he has a great influence on the Premier - not that he needs that much prompting from the hon. gentleman because he is quite capable of making anti-Confederate statements himself.

But, Mr. Chairman, we know what we are debating over here. We are debating \$600-odd million, between 25 per cent and 30 per cent of the budget for Interim Supply. And we are being asked to vote that to the administration so that they can continue on their disaster course. We are trying to persuade hon. gentlemen there opposite to change their course of direction. If they do not change their course, they are going to push Newfoundland over the brink of financial and economic ruin,

MR. NEARY: financial and economic oblivion. And there are gentlemen in the back benches, Mr. Chairman, who realize what we are saying over here is dead on. They are fed up with the kinds of speeches they just heard from the hon. gentleman and they want to know what time people can expect action in this Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, talk about confusion! We saw an example in the past couple of days in this Province where the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) made one statement and the Premier made a different statement. Now, the Premier did not qualify the statement he made to the Board of Trade. There were no strings attached to it. He just said, 'The Lower Churchill is dead, it is a myth, forget about it.'

Mr. Chairman, we saw that happen in this Province. Now, let us see what is happening on the national level as far as the Tory Party is concerned and their policy concerning our offshore resources. Let us see what is happening. The member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) may be interested in this, Mr. Chairman, if he has an ounce of decency left in his veins after being associated with that hon. crowd over there. If he is not contaminated and polluted by the poison that has been squirted around and the propaganda that we hear day-in and day-out, if he is not overcome by that, if he still has an ounce of decency left in his body, Mr. Chairman, let him get up and explain to me what the federal Tory policy is on the offshore resources. I ask the hon. gentleman to do that in all sincerity because, Mr. Chairman, I have here in front of me a report of a speech that was made last night in Toronto to the Canadian Association of Diving Contractors, a text of a speech made in Toronto to the Canadian Association of Diving Contractors by none

MR. NEARY:
MP.

other than one John C. Crosbie,

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see if we can find out from that speech what the national Tory policy is on our offshore resources. And I ask the hon. gentleman to get up then and explain to me what the policy is.

What did Mr. Crosbie say?

'John Crosbie, the party's finance critic, last night seemed to limit the range of options for Leader Brian Mulroney.' That was the first thing he did, he limited the options. 'In the text of his speech in Toronto to the Canadian Association of Diving Contractors, Mr. Crosbie repeatedly referred to the policy of former Prime Minister Joe Clarke during the 1980 election campaign that ownership and legislative control over offshore resources should be given to Newfoundland and other coastal provinces.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: "Last night Mr. Crosbie said"-
what did he say last night, Mr. Chairman? -"Mr. Crosbie
said last night the party is assessing whether any changes
may be required to the 1980 policy as a result of a
unanimous Supreme Court of Canada ruling earlier this month that
Canada owns and controls the offshore ocean floor off Newfoundland.
Mr. Crosbie now says they are reassessing their position." And
what else did he say, Mr. Chairman? "Mr. Crosbie, who discussed
the speech"-that is the speech he made in Toronto last
night-"with Mr. Mulroney earlier this week, said, 'The Tory
caucus will complete its review of the offshore and all
other policies at a meeting next month.'" A far cry from
what he has been saying all along, Mr. Chairman.

"An aide to Mr. Mulroney said
yesterday in Montreal that reporters should prepare themselves
for a series of policy announcements." In other words, what
he is saying is they have no position at the present time.
"Tory strategists hope policy statements will help keep the
party in the public eye during the current leadership contest."
And listen to this, Mr. Chairman, here is the cruncher:
"In the final text of his speech, Mr. Crosbie carefully avoided"-
listen!-"carefully avoided endorsing the Newfoundland
Government's position that the ownership of offshore resources
should be transferred to the Province in the same way the
Prairie Provinces were granted subsurface and resource
ownership."

DR. COLLINS: Who said that?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Crosbie.

DR. COLLINS: No, who said that last sentence?

MR. NEARY: "In the final text of his speech" -
taken directly from Crosbie's speech.

DR. COLLINS: No, who made that comment?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Crosbie.

DR. COLLINS: No, no! He did not make that comment,
that was not his speech. Who made that comment you are
reading now?

MR. CALLAN: Jeff Southam.

DR. COLLINS: Jeff Southam, yes, the reporter.
That is the reporter's view.

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is, Mr.
Chairman, is that they are lost in the wilderness, they do
not know what they are doing or saying from one day to the other.
We have the Premier of this Province making a statement that
the Lower Churchill is dead, forget about it, it is only a myth,
and then the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) has to try to
straighten that out and contradicts the Premier. The Premier
is down before the Board of Trade making off-the-cuff remarks
about the Lower Churchill, the same as he did about declaring
a day of mourning in this Province that cost us a small fortune
in wages and revenue. And that is why my colleague, the member
for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the other day tried to pin the
administration down on what the policy of Mr. Mulroney and
the national Tory party is.

"In the final text of his speech" -
and this is in today's Globe and Mail, by the way - "Mr. Crosbie
carefully avoided endorsing the Newfoundland Government's
position on the ownership of offshore resources, that it
should be transferred to the Province." Now, Mr. Chairman,
there is a contradiction if I ever saw one. Only last week
he was ranting and raving from Coast to Coast that the Clark
formula should be followed, that Newfoundland should be
given back the resources through a Constitutional amendment
that would take the next 500 years to achieve in this country.

DR. COLLINS: What!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member
just said, 'What!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman earlier today
got up and made the most outlandish statement that I have
ever heard from a so-called intelligent gentlemen, Mr.
Chairman. They can carry on the squabbling and the fighting
and the ranting and the raving and the frothing at the
mouth that we have seen for

MR. NEARY: the past three or four years, and the charade that they have been carrying on, the pretending and the posturing, because that is all it is, political game playing and bluff, Mr. Chairman, they can carry it on all they want, but it will get us nowhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

After listening to the tripe and the drip that has come from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) this morning, I can only concur and endorse the column that was written by Mr. Rowe back some months ago when he referred to Mr. Neary as going a long way on face. He is certainly not going it on brains or intelligence after the statements he made here this morning.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was prompted to get involved in this debate after listening to the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), who referred to the Burin Peninsula, the hospital, referred to the shipyard, the \$8 million that the government is going to spend to construct a new ferry for Fogo Island, who make such statements as, 'Thank God for Ottawa!' You would not know, Mr. Chairman, but Ottawa had some great input in the construction of the ferry or had some great input into the operations of the Marystown Shipyard. Far from it, Mr. Chairman, far from it. The federal government this year have provided work to basically

MR. TOBIN: every shipyard in Canada with the exception of the Marystown operation. They have provided work, Mr. Chairman, to Halifax, to Pictou, to St. John, New Brunswick and Vancouver, they left out Marystown and St. Catherines, Ontario and I believe they took to the streets in St. Catherines.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you see they announced \$19 million for (inaudible)

MR. TOBIN: A typical commitment the federal government has to other parts of Canada. So, Mr. Chairman, I can say here and now that we have nothing to be thankful to the federal government for as it relates to the Marystown Shipyard operation, not one iota of a thing. We, Mr. Chairman, would have more people employed in Marystown today in the shipbuilding business if the federal government had to concur with the wishes of the Newfoundland government when we wanted to build trawlers for the new fish company. This government, Mr. Chairman, was prepared to build, was prepared to finance the construction of two trawlers. And we were prepared to commit our shareholders of the new company to purchase these trawlers. All we asked of the federal government was that they commit their shareholders to doing the same thing, and they refused, Mr. Chairman. They said it could not be done, it was not the appropriate thing to do. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, that brings to mind something that happened during negotiations on the offshore. Remember one time when Mr. Chretien said to the Mayor of St. John's and some other people, 'I have an agreement on the offshore with Mr. Marshall if I can sell it to my boss?' Well, then, Mr. Chairman,

MR. TOBIN: he did not sell it to his boss, his boss pulled the rug out from underneath him. I can say that Mr. De Bane had an agreement to build trawlers, Mr. Chairman, with this government, and I would suggest that the same forces in Ottawa that are out to destroy this Province, that are out to put Newfoundlanders on their knees, keep them on their knees, make them beggars for the rest of their lives, pulled the same job with Mr. De Bane as they pulled with Mr. Chretien.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to dwell and say how grateful I am to this government, to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and to the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), and, as I said, to government for having the foresight, having the commitment to Newfoundland, the type of commitment that Newfoundlanders need, the type of commitment that we need, Mr. Chairman, to have Newfoundlanders employed. I am absolutely sure that if this government wanted to ape the federal government in not acting on the Kirby Report as it relates to trawler replacement. Mr. Chairman, I believe this government could have found a ferry, similar to the one they are about to construct at Marystown for Fogo Island, a little bit cheaper, Mr. Chairman, than the amount of \$8 million that they are now paying for it. But this government has a commitment to Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders to provide jobs. That is why it is very important that we have some say in the offshore. When I look at the district of Burin-Placentia West, Mr. Chairman, which I represent, that great district populated by

MR. TOBIN:

people who have the ability to determine whether or not a representative is doing justice and, if not, make him pay the consequences when the election rolls around, that great district, Mr. Chairman, where the shipbuilding industry is one of the major industries along with the fisheries, and see what has happened over the years! Last year² the federal government refused when this government wanted the oil rigs brought in away from the ice fields for the safety of the people who were involved in the work, when safety was uppermost in this government's mind and the Opposition and the Liberal Party in Canada did not know what safety actually meant, Mr. Chretien said, 'We cannot bring them to Mortier Bay, that is full of ice.' Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the ice-free ports on the Eastern Seaboard being full of ice! That is the knowledge and that is the commitment of the federal government, and that is the reason why this government must have some say in the offshore ownership. That is the reason, Mr. Chairman, why we cannot sit back and tolerate letting the Province fall victim of the whims and the humors of the present federal government in Ottawa, aided and supported by the Liberal caucus, Mr. Chairman, all eight members. The eight members of that caucus would be the most disappointed people that this Province has ever known if we were to get some say and some control of offshore ownership.

And I can tell you that in the district of Burin - Placentia West, the people who are involved in the shipyard there and people from all walks of life are behind us.

MR. TOBIN: During the past number of weeks, I had the opportunity to speak, Mr. Chairman, to about eight or ten or more classes in the high schools. They understand when you explain to them what the offshore really means, when you explain to them that if we do not stand up and if we do not take control of our own destiny that we are in trouble, that there will not be jobs. The Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) this morning referred to the wishes of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) Newfoundlanders keep traipsing on to Alberta and to Ontario, where many of the people from the former district, Bell Island of the Leader of the Opposition had to move when he stood by and let the mine close. Many of these people, Mr. Chairman, would rather be back in Newfoundland today and so they should. And we, as elected representatives in this House, have a responsibility to our constituents, the people of this Province, to forget partisan politics, to forget our own inflated egos, Mr. Chairman. Whether we be committed to the P.C. Party or the Liberal Party or the New Democratic Party, that should be all brushed to one side and I believe that we should unite and try to get something for this Province.

As I look, Mr. Chairman, at the district that I represent and as I look at the budget this year, look at the moneys that have been allocated to the district, and then, Mr. Chairman, look at the reaction, assess the reaction and the response from the mayors of several towns, the Joint Councils and the President of the Shipyards Union, all of the people, I am pretty satisfied. I had the opportunity to spend two or three hours there the other day with the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor). We met with the councils and Union at the Shipyard and several other people, and it was wonderful to see the type of

MR. TOBIN: commitment that these people have to Newfoundland and to see how these people were prepared to accept, Mr. Chairman, very graciously what government was committed to. I am very happy to see that government was committed to doing something for the district. Because it has been some time, Mr. Chairman, since any great amount of money was spent in the district. As a matter of fact, I believe that if we keep the trend going in the next couple of years as we have in the past couple, that there would be more money spent in Burin - Placentia West in this term of office than has been spent in the past ten years, the past three terms, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: The hospital is going to be constructed at Salt Pond, a hospital which was promised back in 1974, I guess, by the member who is now the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) in the Moores administration, a promise which was never fulfilled, a commitment which I am not sure was ever meant to be fulfilled. It was promised again in 1979,

MR. TOBIN: and I am pleased that the hospital at Salt Pond will be built. I am pleased that this government has that type of commitment to the people of the Burin Peninsula. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed very happy -

MR. CALLAN: Who made the promise in 1979?

MR. TOBIN: Pardon?

MR. CALLAN: Who made the promise in 1979?

It was not the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) then.

MR. BARRY: You should be a little more intelligent than that. That is low.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to stand up here and take my place. The member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) can do what he wishes. The member for Mount Scio can make up his own mind, Mr. Chairman, and I have no hassel with that.

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

The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I am glad the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) raised the question of the Burin Peninsula Hospital. As members know, that was a project that I fought for in 1974-1975. I committed myself to the people of the Burin Peninsula to seeing that that hospital would go through. The government of the day promised that it would go through. Unfortunately, I was involuntarily retired before I had an opportunity to follow through with my commitment. But I was only too pleased, Mr. Chairman, when I got back in the Cabinet, to make that one of my highest priorities as a member of Cabinet to see that that hospital would be committed. And, Mr. Chairman, that commitment took place very soon in my return to government.

MR. TOBIN: You were not even in Cabinet when it was built. You had quit.

MR. BARRY: Is the man gone?

Mr. Chairman, the Burin Peninsula Hospital was committed prior to the 1975 election. The Government,

MR. BARRY: for one reason or another, with many members opposite present in that government, did not follow through with that commitment.

In the new hospital construction programme, Mr. Chairman, I was able to convince my colleagues in Cabinet that that hospital had to have a high priority, and I am happy to see, Mr. Chairman, that that hospital is going ahead. But if the member opposite wishes to maintain his credibility in Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), the member opposite should be the first one to acknowledge the fact that my commitment, my support, and my whole-hearted involvement in seeing that hospital start up has been there, Mr. Chairman, since the early 1970s and has never wavered, Mr. Chairman. Unrelenting pressure, Mr. Chairman, was kept on until we finally saw the commencement of hospital construction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the member opposite, as I say, if he is going to maintain his credibility in his district, he is going to have to learn to give credit where credit is due. And I am sure that the next time he stands up in this House he will give me credit for my involvement and my commitment in working for that hospital. I know that he will. I know that he recognized, Mr. Chairman, that many of his current supporters in Burin-Placentia West are people who recognize my involvement, and who will continue to support, Mr. Chairman, my interest in the Burin Peninsula. I will have the opportunity to meet with many of them down in Grand Bank at the end of this month and by that time we will know whether the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) is going to be honest and straightforward in this House or whether he is going to mislead his constituents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, another point raised by the member for Burin-Placentia West, who holds himself out as one who is quite concerned with the fishermen of this

MR. BARRY: Province, as I am sure that he is, and with the trawlermen, and coming from the Burin Peninsula he will be wise to maintain his support of the trawlerman, Mr. Chairman, what I do not understand, Mr. Chairman, is how emphasis the importance of having drilling on the Grand Banks suspended under Winter conditions until there

MR. BARRY:

is an optimum, the very best, the highest level we can get of Air/Sea Rescue capability. He supports that approach with respect to oil workers, but he does not say anything about the fact that our fishermen and our trawlermen are going out under similar conditions.

MR. TOBIN: Do you?

MR. BARRY: I am saying it now. He does not say a word about the fact that our fishermen are going out. Now why is it that the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) did not insist, demand that his colleagues on that side of the House make the same order with respect to trawlers? Why should our trawler crews be forced to go to sea under those weather conditions if it is unreasonable? The Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) sets forth the notion that it is unreasonable, that it is not reasonable for government to permit Winter drilling, Mr. Chairman, and to have oil rig workers out working on the Grand Banks under certain conditions. But the government has not shown the same concern for the trawlermen of this Province, and that has been pointed out, Mr. Chairman, by the Fishermen's Union, by many trawlermen. The government has been silent, it has been deafening in its silence on its concern for the trawlermen who are going out under similar weather conditions without this optimum Air/Sea Rescue capability. Now we all want to see the very best Air/Sea rescue capability that we can have in this Province and we will guarantee, Mr. Chairman, that we will keep every pressure on those -

MR. NEARY: That is one of the commitments we should get from the leadership candidates.

MR. BARRY: That is right. As part of determining who the next Prime Minister of Canada is going to be, we will

MR. BARRY: have the opportunity to seek reassurances both with respect to the offshore and with respect to an adequate Air/Sea Rescue capability. Before we commit ourselves to candidates for the federal leadership, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be very wise for us to get a thorough elaboration and as much commitment as is possible that there will be a satisfactory approach, Mr. Chairman, to offshore negotiations and that there will be an adequate Air/Sea Rescue capability supplied to this Province.

MR. MORGAN: You will not get it. They want no part of it anymore.

MR. BARRY: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would do well to try and shout me down because, as the minister with the most responsibility in that Cabinet, where has the minister been in calling for the same type of protection for our trawlermen as is being awarded to our oil workers? Where is the Minister of Fisheries? Why has he not called for a ban on Winter fishing? Why has he not called for a ban on Winter fishing if it is unreasonable, Mr. Chairman, to have our oil workers out there under those weather conditions?

MR. MORGAN: Do you want us to close the plants in the Winter.

MR. BARRY: Well, if the member is prepared to throw out of work 2,500 or 3,000 oil rig workers, if those workers must be thrown out of work because it is unsafe, unreasonable, because of a lack of Air/Sea Rescue capability, why does the same thing not apply to our trawlermen? Where have the Minister of Fisheries and the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) been in fighting for our trawlermen and taking the same position and insisting that the minister responsible for fisheries take the same approach as the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) and seek the guards and say that they should not go to sea? Why has that not been done?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: I look forward to getting some of those answers when the House opens on Monday.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

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

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of
Supply have considered the matters to them referred,
have directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit
again.

On motion, report received and
adopted. Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before moving the
adjournment of the House, I would like to advise the House
that on Monday at 9:30 a.m., the Social Services Committee
will be meeting to continue consideration of the estimates
of the Department of Social Services at the Colonial
Building; and also, at the Colonial Building, where all
committee meetings will be held, at 7:30 p.m., the
Government Services Committee will be considering the
Department of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the House
at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at
3:00 p.m. and that this House do not adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, March 26, 1984 at 3:00 p.m.