



PROPERTY OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 78

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

10 February 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
There was a report carried in this weekend's paper to the effect that while the Liberal Opposition was opposed to the Tobacco Tax Bill in all of its speeches, it did not vote against that bill when the bill came to a vote. I do not know whether Hansard will show it or not, but I am sure that the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), who was chairing the Committee at the time, will confirm that as the clauses were read there was a 'Nay' from this side, particularly from myself.

While there was not a division on the issue, I do want to clarify just for the sake of clarification, that indeed the Opposition did vote against the clauses in that bill.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Before calling Statements By Ministers, I have great pleasure in welcoming to this House the member for Bonavista - Trinity - Conception, Captain Morrissey Johnson.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
At this stage, I would like to rule on the point of privilege raised by the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) on Friday, in connection with a newscast on CBC. I think

the hon. minister took the opportunity of explaining his point of view in the matter, but there was no prime facie case of breach of privilege.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome the Premier back from his visit to the Orient and I would like to ask the Premier if he is yet able to identify the number of jobs that he has brought back with him from his trip to the Far East.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his welcome. Talking about jobs, I happened to notice the figures for January, 1986, show that the Province of Newfoundland had a larger reduction in unemployment than any other Province of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Last year at this time, we were looking at an actual unemployment rate of 26.2 per cent and now it is 21.9 per cent. So, actually the unemployment rate has come down 4.3, and that is more than any other Province. Significantly, in Central Newfoundland and the Northeast Coast, it went down 9.2 per cent.

And very significantly, among the young, among the age group from fifteen to twenty-four, it went down 6.9 per cent. So we are having some success already, Mr. Speaker. To the nub of the question the Leader of the Opposition asked, over the next week or so I will be making a more detailed statement as it relates to jobs.

I would just point out to the Leader of the Opposition now that there are negotiations ongoing, as a result of the visit, between the private sector individuals who were on the trip with us and the people in Japan and Hong Kong. For example, I can inform the hon. gentleman that Sealand Helicopters - Mr. Dobbin, who was with us, is a good friend of the Leader of the Opposition - entered into a significant agreement relating to somewhere between \$4 million and \$6 million even before the trip was over, and they are involved in multimillion dollar negotiations right now. So just on Sealand Helicopters and how many jobs it will mean, we will have to wait and see. But there will be jobs involved. That is just one example of what has happened, and this happened as a result of meetings that I had in Tokyo with the President of the Bank of Tokyo, which was then followed up by Mr. Dobbin, himself, the next day, and he had concluded one agreement on \$4 million to \$5 million and is working on another agreement now that should be finalized in the next ten days or so. That is one example of what has happened already, even before we got back from the trip. But I will be making a more detailed statement on it as it relates to fish products that we hope to export to Southern China, Hong Kong and Japan. Also, in the pulp

and paper area, as well, we are in the process of negotiating. The President of the Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology is still in Japan negotiating technology transfers between marine institutes in Japan and our marine institute here.

I will be giving a more detailed statement on the whole trip, because there were tens and tens of meetings involved and I would want to give the specifics of all of those as soon as we have the whole trip compiled and ready for publication. But I can indicate to the hon. gentleman that even before the trip was over, we had negotiated a number of contracts for Newfoundland companies which will see more job opportunities for the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We thank the Premier for that information. We are wondering if the large decline in the unemployment rate over last year's rate, Mr. Speaker, was due to the fact that the Premier was absent, particularly when we consider information which revealed that the unemployment rate in China jumped significantly the day after the Premier arrived in that country. But the Premier, I think, would have to admit, Mr. Speaker, that the unemployment rate last year, in January, hit an all-time record in this Province - and probably anywhere in Canada - of 26 per cent, and that it had no choice but to go down, and we are not yet back to where we were a couple of years ago in this

Province with respect to the unemployment rate.

So I would ask the Premier whether he feels this trip is going to be more productive than the trip to China taken by the then Minister of Development a couple of years ago, where we are still waiting to see any jobs being created as a result of that trip?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, as a result of the trip the now President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) took, there have been container loads of fish to Hong Kong, Southern China and Japan. As a matter of fact, as a direct result of the trip taken by the President of Treasury Board, we have seen fish from Trinity Bay and from Notre Dame Bay in the Japanese market. We actually saw the fish ourselves, which was a direct result of the trade mission last year, and there were tens of millions of dollars worth of business generated for this Province as a result of that. Hopefully, we can do better. We will see, after all the negotiations are finished, whether we will do better or not.

As it relates to the Leader of the Opposition's comments on the whole question of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, we all know that we have had an unemployment problem in Newfoundland for decades.

The significant point is that this Province today can boast, even though the unemployment rate is 21 per cent and unacceptable, that we are going in the right direction.

If the Leader of the Opposition

(Mr. Barry) wants to be sarcastic about it going down while I was away, may I remind the Leader of the Opposition that the unemployment rate has been going down for the last six or seven months. When I was in the Province and when I was out of the Province, Mr. Speaker, it has been going down. At a time of the year when our major industries are seasonal, the inshore fishery cannot work, a lot of the people in the forest industry cannot work, our unemployment went down in January as opposed to December. From December 1985 to January 1986, while our inshore fishery has to be closed down and a lot of our forest activity has to be closed down, the unemployment rate went down. So we must be doing something right, Mr. Speaker. When the unemployment rate goes up we are doing everything wrong, but when the unemployment rate goes down we are not doing anything. I just do not understand it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier may not be aware of the fact that when he was away Statistics Canada background information revealed that 44,000 who are listed as employed are in fact employed, Mr. Speaker, for less than thirty hours a week, one quarter of those listed as employed. Now, is the Premier prepared to accept that situation in this Province and be satisfied with that? I hope that is not the case. We said we would give the Premier the benefit of the doubt and give him time to show

results. We will be interested in his report, in a short while, as to the immediate results of the trip, but having had the public employees of this Province doing the follow-up that has never been done adequately on these types of trips before, will he commit to bring into this House this time next year a report as to the results that have been brought about by the expenditure of public funds on that trip to the Far East?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will bring it in long before that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I will go further. I will bring it in every quarter for the next twelve months, if the Leader of the Opposition wants me to.

MR. FLIGHT:

Like the President of Treasury Board did with his China trip.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

He did a follow-up report on it, which was not carried all that well, indicating the millions of dollars of extra investment and job opportunities that were created, and fish exports that were sent to China, to Hong Kong and to Japan. Mr. Speaker, if we are not going to get out there and flog our assets, I will tell you every other province of Canada and every other country of the world are doing it. We cannot wait for business to come to us. If we do not get out there and promote Newfoundland and Labrador as a good place to invest, number one, and number two, to export the

products that we have, then we will have a lot higher unemployment rate than we have today, Mr. Speaker, I can say that, and the Opposition would be the first to attack us. If suddenly New Brunswick got a new market in Japan, or Nova Scotia got a new market in Hong Kong, then they would say, 'What is the government of Newfoundland doing? How come Nova Scotia got ahead of us?' That is the criticism that would be attached to us then, Mr. Speaker. That is the kind of negativity we would get from the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite. It is really significant and ironic that today will go down in the history of Newfoundland as the day that a bill comes into second reading in this House, which is a bill on a major resource, and that it will be the first bill in the history of Newfoundland where we are doing a deal on a resource where we never sold it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If you go back through history, Mr. Speaker, we never sold it out. How ironic and tragic it is, Mr. Speaker, to be in this House today to listen to the Leader of the Opposition who heads a party who wanted us to sign a deal where we would have no say over levying taxes on land and no management control. That is a party of sellouts, Mr. Speaker, who wanted to sell us out. When it came to forestry in the 1920's, or the railway in the 1890's, it was sold out. We have a bill on the Order Paper today, Mr. Speaker, which will stand us in good stead for decades to come and no other bill in our history can even come close to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

As I indicated Friday, we are pleased to see, Mr. Speaker, the admission by the Premier and the Government of Canada that, in fact, the original clause 54 was a sellout to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We ask the Premier to listen very carefully to the comments that we will be making in this debate which will establish, Mr. Speaker, that if the present wording, the re-wording, the second try is not changed there will be another Churchill Falls contract equivalent, and that we now have another flawed recall clause which could not be enforced as far as the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PATTERSON:

You are falling into The Red Trench.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the debate on sound bones and red trench will be coming. The Minister of Public Works is waiting for that one. But, Mr. Speaker, if I could just finish my remarks.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Is this a point of order?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, if the Premier would have some control. I know he has been away and he has lost control and will lose even more in a very short period.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I do not think there is any point of order so far.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I did not get a chance to finish. In all fairness, I did not get a chance to finish my remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

All right.

MR. BARRY:

It is a serious matter that the Premier has raised. There has been an admission that the original clause 54 was a sellout. We have seen an amendment and what purports to be an attempt to change that. We ask the Premier to listen carefully to the comments we will make in this debate, and we submit to the Premier that just as the original Churchill Falls contract had a flawed recall clause, despite the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) voting for it, so the Province was not able to enforce that recall provision, the existing purported recall for oil and gas, Mr. Speaker, is flawed as well and that must be changed, and we will be making very strong representation to have the Premier do that.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Number one, that is no point of order. I know the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is awfully sensitive now. He left the Cabinet. He did not think anybody could negotiate an offshore deal but him. He thought the government was going to come falling down around its ears because of it, Mr. Speaker. As the Minister of Energy Mines and Resources (Mrs. Carney) said in the House of Commons, and as we said in the election campaign last April, she said and she lived up to her commitment that we would have first call on the oil from offshore and she was true to her word, that that is what she meant in Clause 54, thirty to sixty day contracts.

MR. BARRY:

Do you have the sales contract?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No question. No problem, Mr. Speaker. No problem. We know the Leader of the Opposition is touchy. The very thing he wanted to do when he got in politics was sign this kind of a deal. He has lost, he is hurting badly, and now he gets up on specious point of order which are not points of order. Too bad, 'Leo', you have lost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

I let the hon. the Leader of the Opposition continue on that point

of order because I think it was provoked, if you like, by the Premier, who strayed from the strict answer to the question. So there was no point of order and the comments were unnecessary.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have another question I would like to put to the Premier. We have seen that childish level of debate time after time, Mr. Speaker. Everybody in this Province admits - this side of the House, that side of the House, everybody in this Province - that we are into dealing with a resource that can be very important to this Province. Now, we would ask the Premier does he intend, does he wish to have the debate proceed on the basis of petty partisan politics, as we just saw, which both sides can engage in? We are prepared to get down in the trenches, if that is the level the Premier feels that this debate has to be fought on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We would submit to the Premier and we would ask him whether he would agree that it will be doing no justice to the people of this Province and to the protection of that resource to have that level of debate.

And if there is anything that came, Mr. Speaker, from the Upper

Churchill contract and the debate in that House, the Premier of the day, the government of the day could not be accused -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

I think the hon. member is getting into debate at the present time.

MR. BARRY:
The Premier of the day and the government of the day could not be accused of supplying information, Mr. Speaker, and having the debate at a level that permitted a clear choice to be made amongst members of this House and the people of the Province. Now I ask the Premier, will he engage in a serious debate on this topic or does he want it to go to the level of petty partisan politics of the nature that we just saw?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is scared now that we are going to bring up that he ran away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
He is scared now that he ran away, that for three years the Minister of Energy was maligned by business people in this community, by the Liberal Party, and by just about everybody else. We were maligned! "Sign the Nova Scotia deal and get on with it." "Give her away." "Sell it out."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Now, Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to forget about all those times, when he tried to bring down the government, when leading business people tried to bring down the government - 'Sell it out, get what Nova Scotia got and forget it.' Now that we have succeeded, he, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), the politician who tried to bring down the government, wants to forget the past. I guess he does, Mr. Speaker. But there is nobody on this side going to forget the way they wanted to sell out this Province, I will tell you that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, in the context of the recent Gander controversy, is the minister aware of any moves on the part of CN to downgrade employment in Port aux Basques by transferring jobs to St. John's?

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, I do not know what kind of an analogy he was trying to bring forward but certainly at

CN it depends on whether he is talking about CN Marine, whether he is talking about TerraTransport, which is a -

MR. BARRY:
Either.

MR. DAWE:
Either. So I got a multiple choice question. Well, perhaps I can give a multiple choice answer, Mr. Speaker. There is absolutely no intention, Mr. Speaker, on the part of CN, either CN Marine, or CN National, or TerraTransport, to downgrade the service in this Province. A number of months ago, CN Marine changed its corporate structure so that there would be a corporation that better reflected the requirements of Atlantic Canada and put a Vice-President in each of the provinces to deal with the various matters that CN Marine are involved in, and we have seen this process continue. In the process of doing that, in the process of the Province and the other provinces in Atlantic Canada agreeing that perhaps CN Marine could be better streamlined so that there would be an opportunity to save Canadian dollars as associated to overall administration of CN Marine, we saw an opportunity to better improve the service to the Province. In the process of doing that, Mr. Speaker, there have been adjustments, but certainly in no way is there a downgrading of the service of CN Marine.

MR. DECKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

I am soon going to start asking the minister aware. Obviously, he is not aware. Will the minister confirm that last year the provincial government requested CN to establish three reservation clerk positions in St. John's and, at that time, assured Port aux Basques that these three positions would not cause a downgrading in Port aux Basques?

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

MR. DAWE:
Mr. Speaker, are you asking if the provincial government asked CN Marine to put three reservations officers in St. John's?

MR. DECKER:
Absolutely. Absolutely.

MR. DAWE:
No, we did not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, I wonder who speaks for the government of this Province? Is the minister aware that BRASC, the Brotherhood of Rail, Airline and Steamship Clerks, the local branch of the union in Port aux Basques, have received ninety days notice that six reservations clerks will be laid off, three of them temporary and three of them part-time, and while those six are being laid off in Port aux Basques, the three

positions in St. John's, which were requested of CN by this government, are being kept? Is this another attempt on the part of the provincial government to resettle all Newfoundland employment in St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, the kind of rhetoric that the hon. member is getting on with is the same stuff he got on with last Thursday and it is the same kind of thing he got on with in the previous sitting of the House. It has no substance. It has no basis in fact. It is an opportunity for the hon. member to philosophize in an area that the Liberal Party is very familiar with. He is trying to justify in his own mind, what little there is of it, the fact that the former Liberal administration was involved in resettlement programmes that Newfoundlanders from one part of this Province to the other fought against and continue to fight against. This particular administration, in areas like Petit Fort and Ramea and other isolated communities around this Province, is ensuring through transportation infrastructure, through social infrastructure, that people can continue to live and operate a viable community in whatever part of Newfoundland and Labrador they wish to live.

Now, that being aside, he can try to justify that in his own mind if he can, I would just like to point out to the hon. member that reservation information was being carried out in Nova Scotia. I suppose, in the hon. member's mind, that was probably all

right. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we were not satisfied with that, the provincial government wanted the reservations system to be in Newfoundland so it could serve the activities of CN Marine in Newfoundland. Now, during the process of doing that, the reservations office was set up in St. John's.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors, or the administration of CN Marine, indicated that they want to move the whole reservations system into St. John's. Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), the good, new Tory member for LaPoile, has already gone on record publicly, he has gone on record in correspondence to Mr. Mazankowski and to the CN Board. I have had conversations with Mr. Newman of the CN Board, and I have meetings scheduled with the Board of Directors for later in the week. Mr. Speaker, they have indicated over the past week or so they are going to transfer all reservations into one area, and we want to make sure that the reservations system - the most likely place for it is the origin of destination and debarkation of the boat from Newfoundland and to Newfoundland - should be in Port aux Basques. We are going to make sure that that happens, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

In the absence of the hon. the

Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and his Parliamentary Secretary, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. Would the Premier confirm that there is currently a move or plan afoot to centralize Newfoundland Farm Products broiler operation to St. John's by closing out the West Coast operation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker. That is another rumor. We all know what the Liberal Party is about. Over the past five or six years we have been decentralizing just about every department of government around the Province. If you look at Clarenville, or Gander itself, today, or Grand Falls, or Lewisporte, or Corner Brook, more provincial employees have gone outside St. John's in the last six years than ever before. There are more people working outside the Avalon Peninsula from provincial government departments than ever before. We started to decentralize the Department of Municipal Affairs when it was the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and we have decentralized almost every government department. Most of Rural Development, as the hon. member knows, is where? In Happy Valley - Goose Bay. Just about all the Northern Development Division of the Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development is where? It is in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, in another part of the Province, and we are going to continue to decentralize rather than centralize. Look at the Department of Forest Resources and Lands and the number of jobs that

are outside. And the Constabulary. We have been decentralizing, and we have been building buildings. So contrary to closing down the broiler operation on the West Coast, which is very critical to that part, we are going to maintain and enhance that and do more not only in agriculture but in every government department.

A Consumer Affairs office was set up in Gander when the former member for Gander was a member of the Cabinet, I remember. There was one set up in the last few years in Corner Brook. We are going to be setting up a Consumer Affairs office in Happy Valley - Goose Bay in two weeks time. So rather than centralizing we are decentralizing. We have no intention of closing down the broiler operation, that is critical to the West Coast. And we are not only going to keep the broiler operation on the West Coast, but we want to do more of that kind of thing on the West Coast, or wherever we can be of any assistance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Perhaps I could point out to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that I am not asking a partisan type question. I am quite concerned, because I have had representation from the West Coast regarding this. Perhaps, based on the Premier's answer, I should note, too, that I am aware of the

Consumer Affairs offices and the other points that you mention, Mr. Premier. Would you confirm, then, in connection with my first question, if there has been a feasibility study carried out, or if you plan one in the near future, with a view to centralizing the broiler operation in this Province under one roof, whether it is St. John's or some other location?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know. I cannot say off the top of my head. I will have to take it as notice and get the information for the hon. member. I know what we are doing. I remember over the last few months we have been trying to do feasibility studies on Newfoundland Farm Products to make it more efficient and this kind of thing. I do not know, but there might be a feasibility study to find out how we can make the broiler operation on the West Coast work better. That is the kind of thing we would be doing. We have no intention of closing it out, but we want to make it work better and be more efficient for the farmers in that area. I think that is the kind of feasibility study that we would be doing, but there is absolutely no intention of closing out the broiler operation on the West Coast, and I will give the hon. member the assurance that it will not be closed out.

We will try to make it more efficient and try to make it suit the needs of the farmers, that is the kind of thing we will be doing, but there is no intention of closing it out. As a matter of fact, in the last year and a half

or two years, and the member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) can confirm this better than I can, the farming industry has grown substantially not only in his area but throughout all of Newfoundland. The Agricultural agreement ran out between the two governments, the former Liberal government did not want to renew it, the present federal government did not renew it and we, ourselves, as a government replaced the money from the agreement one hundred per cent, well over \$1 million this past year in the farming industry. The farming industry can play an increasingly large role in the GDP of this Province over the long term. That broiler operation not only will it not close out, it has to be improved and enhanced over the next five years because farming has got to be very much a part of our strategy.

MR. SPEAKER

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a response to questions on the Order Paper of February 6 from the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward). First of all, "How many Crown corporations come under the Department of Development and

Tourism?" The answer to that question is that there are six presently reporting to this department.

Secondly, "Are these Crown corporations funded and, if so, how much does each receive?" The answer is that with respect to the current fiscal period, funding is extended to the Economic Council of Newfoundland and Labrador to the extent of \$300,000 per year; to the Harmon Corporation, none; to Marystown Shipyards Limited, none; to Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited, none; to Newfoundland Ocean Research and Development Corporation, \$800,000; to Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, for operating funds, \$700,000; to the Venture Capital Programme, \$500,000; and to its loan fund, \$4 million.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Implement An Agreement Between The Government Of Canada And The Government Of Newfoundland And Labrador On Offshore Petroleum Resource Management And Revenue Sharing." (Bill No. 59).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- the bill read, I guess.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) has already gone through a vote. I think he is the only member of the House or one of the few members in the House who voted in favour of the Upper Churchill contract. If members opposite are prepared to heave themselves blindly into voting for this without listening to the debate, then God help this Province if we see the sort of slavage approach that members opposite are applying.

The minister asked for leave to have some extra time the last day and we are happy to give the minister extra time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON:

He is going to have it regardless of whether you give leave or not.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) I do not think is quite up to House rules and Standing Orders which set a certain time for debate, but we will be happy to give the minister additional time.

We would ask, Mr. Speaker, if he could conclude his remarks in time to permit the Opposition spokesperson on energy an opportunity to start his remarks today. I think if we could have at least half an hour, that would give the minister an hour and fifty minutes, which should be

more than enough time. If we could have that assurance, Mr. Speaker, the minister will know how much time he has to go into debate.

I know the minister could probably go on much longer, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, we would be happy if it became necessary, if the minister felt that he did not have the opportunity to present all of his remarks fully, we would be happy to let the minister have another opportunity at the next sitting of the House. We do think it appropriate that in order to get both sides of some of the issues that are at stake here out today we would have to insist upon our right to have some participation in the debate this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I have absolutely no objection to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FENWICK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. member for Menihek.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is if the time is not going to be taken up in points of order.

MR. FENWICK:

My first inclination is to deny the leave but, in view of the fact it will probably take at least that long to explain the entire bill, I will give leave as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. That was just a procedural point.

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very proud and happy time for us and for we, Mr. Speaker. In this bill, every time I use 'I' I want Your Honour to understand that 'We' is not 'I' and 'Me' certainly ain't 'He'. That would sum it up, Mr. Speaker, as to the way which we were in September or October of 1981.

Mr. Speaker, I would think that this is the most important piece of legislation that has been presented to this House, certainly since Confederation. Not only does it indicate the end of a long and arduous struggle on behalf of this administration to gain a measure of equality in the Canadian Confederation and the rights for management and revenue sharing offshore, but we are here, and I think this should be understood by everybody, and we are enacting into law by these measures the basis on which the offshore will be developed, not just for tomorrow, but from now to the end of time.

This bill, with the corresponding federal act that has been tabled and presented to all members today, will decide for so long as Canada exists how some 700,000 square miles of offshore land will be managed and the benefits shared within Confederation by Newfoundlanders and by Canadians as a whole.

While ownership was, and very appropriately remains, set aside, it is obvious that the rights of management, benefits and revenues are the essential ingredients of

ownership. After all, you do not want the floor of the ocean to look at and to own it so that you can admire it as a piece of art. You really want it to get a measure of control with respect to it so that we could have it managed for future generations of Newfoundlanders and the revenue shared in the same way as other provinces share the revenues of their resources. This is what we have achieved.

This bill deals with how these rights are to be treated in a land mass that represents approximately six times the total land area of Newfoundland and Labrador. I think then, in order to get the bill into its proper perspective and scope, we have to understand this.

So, therefore, it is the most important, I think, piece of legislation that has come before this House since Confederation, if not the most important piece of legislation that has ever come before the House of Assembly.

I suppose one could look at another piece of legislation or another bill that was enacted in 1933 when this government suspended or when the then country of Newfoundland suspended self-government. But that particular act, Mr. Speaker, related to a surrender of rights and this relates to a securing of rights.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, even though those rights were suspended, I suppose the bills are really related in a way because we found ourselves in 1933, when our forebearers, in

effect, gave away or surrendered all their rights to self-government, but it took this administration, with respect to the offshore, to secure them within the Canadian Confederation.

So that is why it is a very proud moment for us in this administration, for the Cabinet, for the members of caucus, and also a proud moment for the people of the Tory Party and our colleagues in the Tory Party in the federal Government of Canada. I would say as well that it is going to be a proud and beneficial moment for all Newfoundlanders, particularly the younger people in generations yet to come.

It represents then an achievement - and let this be understood - of both the provincial government and the federal government. I think any fair-minded person would realize that this achievement, I think, was all the more significant when one realizes the rights of management and to revenue, those elements of ownerships to which I referred to a moment ago, were negotiated after the duly constituted courts of this country had ruled that we did not have ownership within the Canadian Confederation. I think really that that makes the achievement all the more, the fact that we got a decision in a court case of the nature that we received and, at the same time, we were able to negotiate the rights, which will become apparent as I go through this bill, that we were able to negotiate and which we are now today enacting into law, and which is being enacted into the law of the Parliament of Canada and which will inure forever and a day to the benefit of the people of Newfoundland and Canada as a

whole.

Notwithstanding this, we have acquired, and this bill before us today confers, and I want to say this as well, notwithstanding the fact that we lost, if you want to use the word, the court case - notwithstanding the fact that we lost the court case - I say that we have in this bill today as full a measure of rights as we would have wished to have exercised within the Canadian Confederation had we obtained ownership outright in the first place. These rights were based upon and are based on equality in Confederation. We sought nothing more and we certainly would accept nothing less. That is what is represented in Bill No. 59 which is before the Assembly for consideration at the present time.

In noting this achievement, and noting what had been achieved despite the obstacles that have been put in our way, let us also pause and give credit where credit is due. It takes two to make an agreement and I think it should be understood, particularly in relation to the court decision, how the federal Mulroney Administration has reacted in an open way to this particular Province. Notwithstanding the fact that we are a Province with only seven seats; notwithstanding the fact that we had lost the court case; notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court of Canada by its own reasoning had indicated that the offshore was owned by the Crown in Right of Canada; notwithstanding these facts, what happened is that they responded in an open way.

I would like to pay tribute today particularly to the Prime Minister of Canada who is prepared to

recognize us as equals within Confederation and to the Federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Ms. Carney, who has been so open with this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

I think everybody here should recognize they could have taken the same attitude as their predecessors. They had the court case in the back of their pocket and they could have said, "Look, that resource is going to be administered in a way where Newfoundland is going to have nothing to do with. It is going to be administered by the federal government. We are going to collect the monies and it is going to be ours." But they did not do that and they did that at a particular time when they made that particular decision.

So this is a very positive act and it is a very positive day, Mr. Speaker, despite the actions of the hon. gentlemen there opposite trying to obscure it because they are very embarrassed, and rightly so, as to their involvement in this.

The happy news today is that forever and a day 700,000 square miles of land, a land mass equal to six times the area of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and its offshore resources, will be administered on the basis of equal joint management, where we are equal partners. Forever and a day, whatever structures are put out there - and there is very good indication that it is a very prolific area - for the next 100 or 200 years, this Province will have the ultimate choice as to the

means of production or the choice of production system.

Forever and a day, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this legislation this Province will have the same rights to recover revenues from that resource as if it were located on the land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

In actual fact we had always contended it was located on the land because it is located on our land. I mean no disrespect at all to the decision. You accept legal decisions but they are often on narrow legal precepts. But all the king's horses and all the queen's men or neither can Her Majesty's judges, whoever they may be, ever deny the fact that we bought this land mass with us into Confederation with us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

So forever and a day we will have the rights to those resources, Mr. Speaker. Forever and a day we have secured the right to the benefits for young Newfoundlanders of generations yet to come to get a fair share from the jobs that are going to be derived from the activity that it is going to take in exploration and development off the shores.

Forever and a day as well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have the satisfaction of knowing that we are going to be equals in Canada and we are going to have an opportunity to contribute something to the Canadian nation, rather than being given the feeling that we are recipients of

welfare and handouts and what have you.

This is a resource that we brought into Confederation with us. It is one that we gladly commit to the Canadian Confederation but only on the basis that we get the same rights to it as any other Province of Canada has to their resources. What other red-blooded government representing the interests of the people of the country could take any different attitude, Mr. Speaker? The wonder of it is that that particular premise could ever in any respect have been debated at all.

So it is a positive bill, Mr. Speaker, and it is a positive move. It secures, not for now, but for generations to come, our rights, the rights of the people of Newfoundland. It is something we could have a good feeling for. It is something we could feel positive for.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A few years ago nobody thought we would ever get close to where we are today.

MR. MARSHALL:

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, it is something that perhaps even, who knows, that is in the long term, but maybe in the short term you might see the negativity of the here and nows there and gone because I think we need to see the negativity of the here and now in this Province there and gone because we have a basis now to be positive in the way in which we are going to develop.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the bill, I will mention the struggle we had. No debate of this nature would be complete without a reference to the gargantuan

struggle that we had in order to bring this about. I think we need to mention it not just to give a flavour of the climate and the atmosphere in which this agreement was negotiated and which we see before us today, which is going to become the law of this Province and the law of the country, but to just show how it was intended really to treat this Province and how this agreement compares with the treatment that we were to have meted out at the hands of the unmerciful centralist merchants, the Trudeaus, the Lalondes, that happy executioner, Mr. Jean Chretien, and the hon. gentlemen there opposite.

It all started, Mr. Speaker, quite some time ago when there were initial discoveries offshore of our Province. It had been a very vital concern to this Province, to this government, to the Progressive Conservative Government, to both Progressive Conservative Governments, that we obtain a measure and a proper measure of control and revenue sharing with respect to that resource. But in the contemporary situation that has resulted in this piece of legislation, I think we can start at the beginning when, in June of 1981 the then Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, came down and addressed the students at Memorial University and he stated, and I quote, that he wished to have a negotiated partnership between our two governments and joint management. He said, "We consistently maintain that ownership is not the important issue and that reaching a negotiated agreement on shared management is the vitally important issue." Now this came, by the way, after it became obvious that Hibernia was a very, very viable resource and one that

could reap large returns to the owner of that particular resource. We had gone through a catharsis with respect to ownership up to that period of time and obviously the statement of the Prime Minister of Canada made down here at that particular time was a matter that excited us and interested us and flamed the thought: at last a settlement for the people of Newfoundland! So we openly entered into negotiations on the basis of that statement hoping that we would achieve a settlement.

We sat down, Mr. Speaker, we plotted our strategy and then, lo and behold, what happened! My predecessor, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), as he then was, decided to resign. Now, what was the effect of that resignation? Obviously, the hon. gentleman was a senior member in the Cabinet of this administration at the time and obviously such an act of that nature was very serious because it destroyed the united front which we had attempted to put up to the Government of Canada, which was necessary in order to maintain our position.

I can say now, clearly and unequivocally, if there was one thing that destroyed any possibility of any settlement with the Liberal Government, and I do not think there was one, but if there was anything that contributed to the impossibility of achieving a settlement, Mr. Speaker, it was the resignation of the hon. gentleman.

I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and I want to say before the public of this House that every time that I sat down and talked with Marc Lalonde and Jean

Chretien, when Marc Lalonde was not emitting Canada Lands, he was holding up the fact that we were not united because of the hon. gentleman's resignation. Every time, Mr. Speaker, that I would say 'the Province of Newfoundland, Mr. Lalonde, will not accept the regime of federal ownership; they will not accept a regime where all we get for return is our equalization payments,' every single time he said, "Well, Mr. Barry thinks differently than you." It destroyed, Mr. Speaker, the united front and it amounted to really what was a sabotage of the efforts by this government to bring about a resolution.

I think it is clear now, if it has never been clear before, Mr. Speaker, it must be clear today, that his whole modus operandi and the reason for that resignation was that the hon. gentleman put power ahead of principle, and his own person ahead of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. MATTHEWS:
You cannot take it, 'Leo'!

MR. BARRY:
I can take it, Mr. Speaker, and I can give it, and I will do both if I have to.

I have mentioned it to the Premier and I will mention it to the minister. This will be my last interjection on any personal attack on me. But I will say to

the minister that he can have it one of two ways: he can have a debate that will be informative, that will reveal whether or not, Mr. Speaker, there are flaws and defects in this bill which should be corrected, which should be dealt with, as we have already seen come about as a result of our criticism of Clause 54. We saw the need to amend that.

The rules of this House are clear, Mr. Speaker, that one member is not allowed to stand up and question the motives and the principles of another member. Now, I ask you to have the minister, if he is not able to engage in a debate, Mr. Speaker, that rises above the level of petty, gutter politics, to have him obey the Standing Orders of this House with respect to reflections on the character of any member here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
All I can say is I am debating - this is very relevant - the history of the transactions. The hon. gentleman cannot take it in this House. I will say, I had to take it at the meetings with Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Chretien.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
The people of the Province of Newfoundland are going to learn about the type of Leader of the

Opposition who puts his own personal desire for power against the rights of the people of Newfoundland and it is time, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman was exposed for what he is, a self-centered, power-seeking gentleman who was prepared to sabotage the effort right from the first to hoist up his own ego.

This is not out of order and I intend, Mr. Speaker, to go through it because it is very relevant to the matter before the Chair.

MR. BARRY:

Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Further to that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The minister is questioning my motives. It is clearly accepted under the Standing Orders of this House that one member is not prepared to do this. Now, I ask you to have the minister withdraw those remarks and withdraw them without qualification.

Let it be known for the record that the minister had walked away from the bargaining table before I ever left that crowd opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, I think it would be wise if we did leave personalities aside when we are debating in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A good ruling.

MR. BARRY:

Withdraw! Withdraw!

MR. TULK:

Come on, be a man.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am not talking about personal things. It ill-behoves the hon. gentleman to talk - I am talking about his conduct and I will stay away from personalities. But I will, Mr. Speaker, talk about the conduct of his office as predecessor and the effect it had on these negotiations.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order. He has not withdrawn! He can say what he wants, Mr. Speaker, about the consequence of my resignation on the negotiations. That is fair ball. He can give his own twisted interpretation of that, but he cannot question my motives and I ask Your Honour to demand that he withdraw those remarks.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

On that point of order, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there is any after having heard the submission from the hon. gentleman opposite who basically said that it was out of order to question motives and make references of a personal kind. The Chair repeated that quite universally accepted principle. The Chair did not direct anybody to withdraw. The Chair stated essentially that that

is correct, there should not be those kinds of personal references but, the Chair did not in its ruling direct anybody to withdraw anything but, merely reiterated what is a universally accepted principle.

I think there is quite a distinction between the personal kinds of references against an hon. member which the hon. member opposite hurled against the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) for weeks. There is quite a difference between that and a statement or a criticism of a person's political principles. What the hon. President of the Council is criticizing is the political principles, the political philosophy of the Leader of the Opposition, not his personal characteristics but his political philosophy. Surely that is what debate is about, differences of political philosophy and that is certainly debatable. There have been no personal references whatsoever.

If the hon. gentleman wishes to take my picture down, he can take it down because I could not care less about that picture.

MR. BARRY:

You should be ashamed as a former Speaker of the House.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

But the difference is that the President of the Council is criticising the political consistency, the political record and the political philosophy of the Leader of the Opposition, not any personal inuendo.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, if I could have some quiet from that nuisance for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) can try all he likes to squeeze his seat partner out from under what he just said but the truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) did say that the Leader of the Opposition, in his self-seeking way, and he said that for power, rather than principle, he left the other side and it destroyed the Atlantic Accord and destroyed the negotiations that were going on.

Mr. Speaker, I would refer Your Honour to Section 319 of Beauchesne. "A member will not be permitted by the Speaker to indulge in any reflections on the House itself as a political institution or to impute to any member or members unworthy motives for their actions in a particular case." The President of the Council has done that. He has said that the motives of the Leader of the Opposition were unworthy of a member of this House and, therefore, Your Honour should ask him to withdraw. It is black and white, Your Honour. It was not a political principle that he was talking about, it was a principle of behavior in this

House.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Before I make a ruling I will recess the House and check Hansard. The House will now recess.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Due to the time that it would take to get the exact wording from Hansard, I will reserve judgement until later this afternoon.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the only way I think I could really explain the situation is it is almost like, I suppose, if you look at the Edmonton Oilers, because everybody likes analogies, and Wayne Gretzky. It was almost like a situation where they are led right off to the play offs and Wayne Gretzky or in that case, a person who thinks he is like Wayne Gretzky, decides he is going to pick up his bags and move off because he will not pass the puck and the coach tells him to pass the puck and he is the only one who thinks he is going to score. But, I apologize to Mr. Gretzky because Mr. Gretzky has infinitely more humility than the hon. gentleman and it shows when he is on T.V.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if anyone wants to know the effect of how his

resignation bolstered federal/liberal attempts to crunch the Province of Newfoundland under their heel, just listen to this: The Evening Telegram, September 12, 1981: "Lalonde Feels Sad Over Resignation," is the caption. "Federal Energy Minister of Mines and Resources Marc Lalonde said Friday that he was 'shocked and very sad' to hear about the resignation from the Newfoundland political cabinet of Mines and Energy Minister Leo Barry."

It goes on to say that Lalonde said he was very sorry to see Barry go. I guess he was. I guess he was. He suggested it would be, 'a very serious loss to the Government of Newfoundland.' I know he cared about the loss to the Government of Newfoundland. It was a loss to Mr. Lalonde as I am sure the Premier and others will show when they speak in the debate because if the hon. gentleman has been there, it would have all been given away long ago under a Nova Scotia type of agreement.

At the same time he added, this gentleman who has long since gone from politics said, now get this quote Mr. Speaker, and note this: he said, 'It is almost like I lost a friend in politics.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, regardless of Your Honour's ruling, can when he gets up - there is another clipping here, the same time September 12, 'Barry Quits The Cabinet.' I assume it is the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. There is a person there with a beard and a perm.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

A permabeard.

MR. MARSHALL:

A permabeard, yes. He says and I quote, Mr. Speaker, the reason why he resigned. He said in his letter, this quotes Barry's letter to the Premier, "Frankly I do not think your approach will achieve that which it is crucially important for our Province to achieve, namely, a fair division of revenue and a substantial degree of control in any joint management scheme for the offshore resource."

Barry added that while he realized it was essential for government to go into negotiations united, oh, yes, he worried about the approach mind you, he said it is more important to assure that our team will be effective and properly prepared.

We will all be very interested to see how the hon. gentleman votes in this. If he votes for it, Mr. Speaker, when he cannot vote for it, he will have to explain to the people of Newfoundland why he did probably the worst act that any minister ever elected in the Province of Newfoundland has done, ran away and weakened the position of the government of this Province when it was entering into the most serious negotiations that could possibly be contemplated that it entered into. Mr. Speaker, I think it will become crystal clear shortly that the hon. gentleman has really one alternative.

MR. BARRY:

An astounding majority.

MR. MARSHALL:

An astounding majority, Mr. Speaker, that is something else. He did not have the courage to

face the Premier in 1981 and go across the House. He chose to get elected on the coattails of the Premier while he was sabotaging the interests of this Province and only afterwards, Mr. Speaker, when it became apparent that only because of the financial condition of the Province that we are operating under, as we manage it is very difficult times, and everybody knows that, but only when he saw that did he skidder over to the other side. He is not direct in his dealings. He has not been direct in his dealings. He did not have the courage to go across the House when he resigned the first time and neither did he have the courage to conduct those negotiations because, Mr. Speaker, at the time there was the SIU application, at the time there was this horrendous responsibility coming on poor old Leopold.

It is so much easier, Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, to tear down than to construct. It takes years to construct something. It took years to construct this agreement, but it only takes seconds to tear it down in the hands of somebody whose ego is such that it knows no bounds. To hear the hon. gentleman talk you would swear that he rather than the Almighty invented oil and gas, let alone the other things.

MR. BARRY:

"Brian", do you remember your old saying, "Keep to the high road."

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, let us depart from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and get back to the struggle and to the Lalonde meetings.

When Mr. Lalonde was not mentioning ownership was supposed

to be set aside, and when he was not saying, "These are Canada Lands," and when he was not saying, "Mr. Barry does not agree with you," what he was offering us was - this was his concept of joint management and what they were trying to trap us into - joint management with three federal and two provincial.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On an advisory board.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, on an advisory board with the GOGLA, the federal department giving instructions to the board, that was joint management. It was to be all covered under federal legislation. There would be no Bill 59 as is before this House today at all. It would be all federal legislation and all controlled by federal legislation. On revenue, their idea of sharing was 'what we will do is give you from that resource that you brought into Confederation, but we will not say you brought it into Confederation, we will give you the amount that we are now paying on equalization payments plus 10 per cent.' They would have ended up forever with about \$50 million or \$100 million. And the hon. gentleman talks about a sell out, that is what the hon. gentlemen have been supporting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, what he wanted to do with the development fund and what Mr. Lalonde was offering in the development fund was a loan we would have to pay it back afterwards. Of course all this was incorporated, Mr. Speaker, into the Nova Scotian agreement

that was subsequently accepted by Nova Scotia.

Then after Mr. Lalonde departed from the scene, there was another ripple, as if they were interested. Mr. Chretien was appointed and there might be some possibility. So the Premier and I went up to the Prime Minister's Office and the Premier sat eyeball to eyeball with Mr. Trudeau. I want to say for the Premier of this Province, very fortunate indeed is the Government of this Province and the people of this Province that between 1980 and 1984 when Mr. Trudeau was in for his last years and was trying to centralize Canada and trample on the rights of this Province that we had a Premier like A. Brian Peckford who could sit down and look eyeball to eyeball at him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the cupboard is bare in this Province but they were trying to take the cupboard as well.

Then, when they came out of that meeting, and I remember it quite well, they both gentlemanly said, "We agree to disagree." We maintained our position and they theirs. Mr. Chretien, who I style as the happy executioner, was pulling on my sleeve and saying, "Now Bill, we can do something ad referendum, I am sure we can. We should get together." I said, "Well, John, you could have fooled me. That is not really what is being said." "Well," he said, "we should get together and talk about it."

So we would strain to do anything we possibly could to get an

agreement, an agreement of honour mind you, for the people of the Province of Newfoundland. So what we did was I met with him, and this is the man, the thing that characterized him, he refused to allow anything in writing. He wanted an agreement but it was almost like it had to be written in the clouds, I suppose so it could change from time to time, but he would not take any writing. He told us one thing in his negotiations that he was prepared to do. We were striving to do certain things, trying to secure such things as gravity-based systems which we have now, trying to secure rights with respect to revenue, and he would say, "Now, Bill, you know that is fine. I can handle the Prime Minister." I kept saying to him, "But John, you know your Prime Minister said one thing and - "But I can handle these," and what have you. So when we would get into the officials meetings they would say the exactly and completely opposite.

I have here, Mr. Speaker, amongst my many memoirs what Mr. Chretien said and what the final offer was. Just listen to this so we can compare it to what we now have before the legislator. I cannot go into it all but I will go through the main things.

Their idea of joint management was - this was, by the way, imparted upon him in the Meridian Hotel by lieutenants of Marc Lalonde who came down and told him that he was giving the shop away but, of course, he had no intention to give the shop away. All they were trying to do, Mr. Speaker, and they badly misjudged us, was to give the impression down here to this poor, starving Province and the people down here, 'at last you

are going to get a settlement and at last you are going to get all this development that has been put in Halifax.' That is another story too. They were pushing it in Halifax to try to bring us to our knees. So understandably people were getting very positive towards it and there was a great deal of enthusiasm. That is where they missed the boat, Mr. Speaker, because they misunderstood the determination and resolve of this administration. We were not going to be taken in in that manner.

But this is what they offered, a federal/provincial board. Well, yes, they offered that but it had no staff of its own. Its administration would be done by an administrative agency staffed by federal public servants who would be hired by Ottawa. It would run the offshore on a day-to-day basis, effectively, management in the hands of Ottawa. Of course then you have the board that was there, but they would be completely ineffective.

Now, what do we have today? We have, before this, going into legislation here and in the Parliament of Canada, we have three Newfoundland appointees, three federal appointees and a mutually appointed chairman, all operating under laws that cannot be changed under federal and provincial laws as agreed and, Mr. Speaker, all staffed with people who are employees of the board and employees of neither government. Now, I ask you, is that an improvement?

The next thing, one of the big issues was when energy self-sufficiency and security of supply occurred. I will get to that when I get to the act because that was an important criterion

because certain rights would switch from the federal to the provincial government. We would only have the right to choose the production system in the event that it did not interfere with energy self-sufficiency and security of supply. Well, you know, we accepted that and we accept it. What we could not accept was the fact that it was Mr. Chretien or his successors who would decide as to whether or not energy self-sufficiency and security of supply had occurred and, furthermore, whether our choice of production system entered into that. So in other words, they had full and complete control.

What we have today is we have the choice of production system and, in the event that it interferes with energy self-sufficiency and security of supply, it has to be demonstrated before an independently-appointed arbitration board. So we are not at the mercy of Ottawa and we will not be at the mercy of another successive Liberal government that could trample on us as the one would in the past.

On revenues, they were prepared to see that we would receive less than 50 per cent of the revenue initially which is worse than they would give to the Province of Nova Scotia and also 12 per cent of what was then the PGRTs. Do you know what we have today? We have the right forever and a day, not just Hibernia, not just West Ben Nevis, not just Terra Nova, not just Whiterose and not just Hebron, but every single discovery that is made out in that 700,000 square miles, the people of Newfoundland will get the same rights for royalties and taxes as if the discovery had been on land.

They also wanted a regime where the federal government could unilaterally change it with their laws, which they did not get. So they were difficult times, Mr. Speaker.

They were made all the more difficult by the irresponsible resignation of the hon. gentleman there opposite which has yet to be explained and we want it to be explained. If he can explain, Mr. Speaker, the basis of the resignation were other than his own ego and if he can explain, Mr. Speaker, it was not because of jealousy towards the Premier, if he can explain it was not because he thought he could make a better Premier, if he can explain, Mr. Speaker, that he did not get cold feet at the responsibility of meeting it in the first place, well then let him do it. In the meantime, he owes it to the people of the Province because he foreclosed to a large extent any possibility of putting up a united front to the Liberal Government at the time.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the times were made rather bad as well by certain elements, unfortunately, that are always with us, within the Province itself, who were trying to press us to sign an agreement like Nova Scotia. I do not think that that should be forgotten. I will not mention any names at all, Mr. Speaker. All I would do is just express the hope that when we and successive governments over the next hundreds of years exercise the rights which we have attained that these people will be, that type of person anyway, because I do not expect certainly them to live for hundreds of years, but that that kind of attitude will go, they will have certain faith in the people who

are administering their affairs and they will realize there has to be a latitude given for rational negotiations in the best interest of everybody.

Last but not least, of course, the whole resolution was made, almost insurmountably in appearance, difficult by reason of the court decisions. I am not getting into the court decisions, Mr. Speaker, except to say that they were unanimous, our court, or the Court of Appeal of Newfoundland and the Supreme Court of Canada. The reasons were different. They came to the same conclusion, and with great respect to them, all of their decisions are always subject to examination in legal periodicals by lawyers and I can tell the hon. gentleman I might just do that after some twenty years more in the Peckford Administration, and, Mr. Speaker, when I can get back full-time to my conflicts. I will see what I can do to draw up a rational critique of those particular decisions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
But those decisions are there and those decisions were there and let us not overlook the fact of what an obstacle it was to try to negotiate really when they had all of the cards in their hands.

To the eternal credit of Mrs. Carney and to the eternal credit of the Prime Minister, they were prepared to negotiate with us on an equality basis as equal Canadians which the other people were not prepared to do, notwithstanding the fact that they had all the cards put in their hands by the Supreme Court of

Canada as a result of Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Trudeau forcing the issue before that particular court.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:
So notwithstanding all that, we stood firm and the caucus stood firm and that is why it is a 'we' situation in this particular thing. It is not an 'I,' it is everybody in this caucus now and those that was there before in the Tory Party. I also want to give thanks to all the red-blooded Newfoundlanders out there who have supported us over the elections on this issue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
I might say, Mr. Speaker, supported us in the last election which I view to be the most significant election we ever won in the hardest type of economic times because the people of Newfoundland knew what we were about and knew what we were trying to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:
Anyway then the light dawned, Mr. Speaker, and make no wonder we said, and we were criticized for it, but after all of these frustrations we said, 'we are not going to deal with those guys, we are going to deal with the next government.' Make no wonder, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- we said that. We endured some criticism at that time, but quite frankly it did matter not what because if nobody was prepared to offer us that, we were not prepared to sign ever for anything less.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

There were other governments who have been in who had given it away, but we were not.

Then we negotiated, Mr. Speaker, with the then -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- the story is know - with the then Opposition, the present Government of Canada, and on June 14 we got this letter, which is a letter that is already known. It is six pages long and it finds itself translated today, very proudly, in the 220 sections of the law that is before us, where Mr. Mulroney at the time, and I think it is worthwhile noting this, he said, "the equality of both governments and the management of the resource will be central to our position."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

He was prepared to treat us as equals. He also said that "the principal beneficiary of the wealth of oil and gas will go to

Newfoundland and Labrador."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

So then we proceeded on. We got the Atlantic Accord and we now have this draft legislation that is before us today.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into this legislation I want to say, first of all, that it is necessarily, as one would expect it to be, complex, but the major elements of this, I think, is essential for all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to understand. It is a very perfectly drafted piece of legislation.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, at this time to pay compliments to the people who drafted it. It was Mr. Ron Penney, who was the Chief Legislative Draftsman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

He is in the gallery today. He was the former Deputy Minister of Justice and is presently the Channing Fellow. Mr. John Noel who is the Chief Legislative Draftsman now, and Mr. Jim Thistle was the Assistant Clerk of the Executive Council, because this is truly an outstanding piece of draftsmanship that anyone with any knowledge of legal drafting going through it would see.

Let us get to the bill. The bill has two elements; the bill that we are bringing before the House and this particular bill here that has already been tabled, filed in the House of Commons on Monday. Both of them represent a comprehensive legislative framework for the full

implementation of the Atlantic Accord. It is necessarily complex, as I say -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

- and contains many checks and balances, but underlying the Accord and the legislation, Mr. Speaker, as I said, is one single premise, that both the Canadian and Newfoundland Governments have entered into a partnership, a partnership of equals, Mr. Speaker, to manage the offshore. All else in the Accord and the legislation flows from this principle of equality that Mr. Mulroney undertook when he gave that letter that we negotiated.

The major features of the joint legislation are, first of all, the requirement or the mutual consent for amendments to the legislation and regulations; 2) The establishment of the joint board and the joint management system; 3) Provincial control over the mode of development and ultimate provincial authority over all fundamental decisions once self-sufficiency and security of supply have been accomplished; 4) Arbitration provisions in the event of dispute; 5) Preference for Newfoundland workers' - I know the hon. gentleman does not like to hear that. The hon. gentleman would not understand it - Preference for Newfoundland workers, goods and services; 6) priority access to crude for Come By Chance; 7) A detailed management system for the offshore and the Offshore Development Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I would like it

understood that the federal legislation, in addition to the above, provides for the application of the Newfoundland royalty system and our various consumption taxes, the application of substantially all Newfoundland labour laws and the orderly phase-out of equalization. Together, the provincial and federal legislation, then, fully implements the Accord.

This Accord implementation act that we have here is divided into four parts: Part one sets out the joint management system, which is most important; Part two sets out the petroleum resources law; Part three sets out the production and conservation law; and Part four establishes the Development Fund.

The bill is complemented by the mirror legislation of the federal government, which incorporates by reference a Newfoundland royalty system, which is contained in the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act, and I refer members to Division 9, Part 3 of the federal act. I refer them also to the amendment to the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act that has been filed. The incorporation by reference, as I said, of substantially all Newfoundland labour legislation, including the Labour Standards Act, the Occupational Health and Safety Act and other relevant labour legislation.

It should be noted that detailed Occupational Health and Safety regulations will be made jointly by both governments, under the authority of the Canada/Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation Act.

Three, the incorporation by reference of Newfoundland consumption taxes, including the

Retail Sales Tax Act, the Tax Act, the Gas Tax Act, The Tobacco Tax Act, the Insurance Premiums Act, the Newfoundland Income Tax Act, together with the Newfoundland Insurance Companies Act, in other words, all of our taxes are incorporated in it and we can assess them as if they are on land.

There are fiscal equalization offset payments which means that, as we know, Mr. Speaker, we will not lose dollar for dollar equalization payments.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
Some of these things, Mr. Speaker, are concessions that we would not get if we owned it outright.

I wonder if Billy Goat Gruff, Mr. Speaker, could keep quiet. I would appreciate it if the hon. gentleman could.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
Anyway, Mr. Speaker, if I may get on now to the preamble to the legislation.

The preamble confirms that neither government will introduce amendments to this act or any other regulation made thereunder without the consent of both governments, and that is also in the federal act itself.

In addition, regulations made under the act by each government are subject to the approval of the other government, Section (7).

Now, this amounts, I think, Mr. Speaker, to a very significant agreement by the Parliament and the Legislature and it gives us real security, preventing any change in the act. It is very unusual for a legislature or a parliament to enact an act that says, 'We will not change it without the consent of another legislative body,' but this is exactly what has been done. In itself, it gives a great deal of security because it would be an act of consummate bad faith for the Parliament of Canada, or for this Legislature for that matter, to change it when that undertaking is in there.

This will not preclude us, Mr. Speaker, from seeking entrenchment into the constitution. We have an agreement where, under certain conditions, it is to be entrenched and we want to get it entrenched just in the unlikely event that anything ever happened and the likes of Trudeau, Lalonde and Jean Chretien ever got back in power again and were supported, as they would be, by the hon. sops there opposite who would give everything away and be glad to cut it out. There is also a great deal of security in this because there is a marked difference between agreements and laws. The hon. gentleman would not understand. The hon. gentleman is devoid of understanding anything anyway.

Mr. Speaker, I want to also refer, when we are talking about this particular arrangement, that there would be no change without the consent of the other.

I would also like to refer Your Honour to a clipping that I have here and it is entitle 'BC is looking to land a Newfoundland-type deal.'

MR. DINN:

The same agreement.

MR. MARSHALL:

Exactly the same agreement. British Columbia, it says, wants the same control over offshore resources given to Newfoundland earlier this year, federal and provincial officials say. The counterpart of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Garde Gardom no less of British Columbia, has written to the federal Energy Minister Pat Carney requesting a meeting to seek an agreement on control over offshore resources similar to that of Newfoundland.

I am informed as well, Mr. Speaker, that the same request is being made from other jurisdictions of Canada, from the Yukon, the Northwest Territories and Nova Scotia, lo and behold, I understand is renegotiating an agreement as well. So the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, this particular arrangement is being adopted. I think the hon. gentlemen should recognize that Newfoundland is the leader in this and this particular arrangement is going to be adopted by other provinces. The fact of the matter is, that that would give us added security because the more provinces that adopt it, less likely is the possibility of there being any change in it. Of course there would not be because it would be an act of bad faith, but we are still going to seek constitutions entrenchment.

You will not find a clause in this agreement, Mr. Speaker, indicating that if another agreement which is better is entered into that we have the right to substitute that agreement for this because we are confident that this is the best

agreement that can be obtained and that there could not be another. Obviously, British Columbia, the Yukon Territories and others agree with us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now to get back into the legislation, so the hon. gentleman can follow us. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman can read but he can probably see numbers. Sections 5 and 6 follows Sections 4 and 5 and provides for the delimitation of the boundaries of the offshore area by the federal minister. Any decisions with respect to this delimitation are subject to the approval by the provincial minister under Section 7 and in the event of a dispute between the provinces, once again, with respect to the boundary, the federal minister must refer this dispute for an independent third party settlement.

That, in itself, is the whole basis of the act. Where there is a dispute in any way at all it goes to an independent panel. The normal way in which surveys of this nature would be conducted would be by the Surveyor General of Canada having all jurisdiction with respect to it, but the fact that they have gone even to that extent to allow an independent arbitration in the event of a dispute is indication of the equality that is throughout this act.

The act also provides that in the event of any inconsistency between this and the Canadian Laws Offshore Application Act, this act will apply. The Offshore Application Act will apply normal provincial and federal laws to the

offshore area.

Our bill and the federal bill has application from the low water mark and thus applies within provincial bays and the territorial sea presently within the jurisdiction of Newfoundland, as a result of a decision of the Newfoundland Court of Appeal.

Other federal/provincial resource legislation, such as the Canadian Petroleum Resources Act, the Oil and Gas Production Conservation Act and the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act in Newfoundland will no longer apply in the offshore. So that means that this act clearly prevails.

Part one of the legislation also provides for a joint management system. Sections 9 to 11 contains provisions for the appointment of a joint board which consists, as I have already indicated, as opposed to the three and two with all decisions being made by the federal government, we have a joint board here which consists of seven members, three appointed by each government and a chairman jointly appointed by both governments.

As hon. members will know, this board has already been established. It is in operation now. Mr. Ted Baugh has been appointed the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of it. We count ourselves very fortunate indeed that Mr. Baugh, who is very respected in the industry and throughout the country in oil and gas matters, has assumed the chairmanship of this board and has assumed also residency in this Province, which is one of the conditions of the board itself, that the permanent members be resident in the Province. We are

delighted that a person of his caliber has accepted the nomination. The other members, of course, are Mr. John Fitzgerald, Mr. Diego Henao, Mr. Zwolinski, who will be shortly a former advisor for the World Bank, Mr. Deyell, who is well known in Western Canada in the industry, Mrs. Janet Gardiner who is a businessperson in Newfoundland and Dr. Peters, who is the head of the Engineering Faculty. So we have an extremely strong board to start with. I think it is a testimony to the way in which this process is working. Neither side had to, Mr. Speaker, nominate which one was provincial and which one was federal because they were all the unanimous nominations of both governments.

Section 12 provides for an arbitration procedure, as I say, for the failure to appoint a chairman, but we have not had to use that and I hope we never will in the future.

Section 21 provides for offices for the board to be located in the Province. Under Mr. Chretien and Mr. Lalonde, there were no offices in the Province. It was all to go to Ottawa.

Section 22 provides for the establishment of a facility for storage of records and geological samples. Under their arrangement that was all to be done in Ottawa as well or in Halifax.

Section 25 provides for the appointment of a staff and the mobility of staff between the government and the board. Under their arrangement, of course, there was no staff. It was all the federal government. It was made quite clear that the staff and the board are employees of the

board and not of each government.

Section 27 provides for the budget, half of which is paid for by the Province.

I would like to turn, Mr. Speaker, to probably the most important features of the bill, the exclusive exercise of fundamental decisions which are set out in Sections 31 to 38 of Part One. There are certain decisions which are fundamental to the interests of both governments and the ultimate decision will be made, in the event of a disagreement, by that particular government.

The federal government, until energy self-sufficiency and security of supply has been attained, has the right to make fundamental decisions with respect to the mode and place of exploration and the pace of development. But, Mr. Speaker, as soon as energy self-sufficiency and security of supply has been obtained, the provincial government has the right over all fundamental decisions.

The provincial government has the right to choose the mode of production which is the most essential right that is necessary and one that we fought very hard for. We have the right, as I have already indicated, to determine the way and the mode in which a development is to take place. Consequently today, as I say, we have concrete platforms being contemplated for Hibernia.

What we gave, Mr. Speaker, if you want talk about giving, or the only rights that the federal government got are rights which are legitimate for a federal government to have which is to provide for the orderly

development of energy resources in the event that energy self-sufficiency and security of supply is not obtained. I will suggest to you, as any member of the Canadian Confederation, if we had people shivering for the want of oil in Saint John, New Brunswick or any part of Canada, even if the little fellow from Shawinigan was in his retirement up there shivering in the Province of Quebec, we would not want to keep him cold. What we would do is provide, on a marketable basis, of course, the crude to do it. So in effect, we have given up absolutely nothing that we would not give as a part of the Canadian confederation or for that matter, Mr. Speaker, I again say, if we had been an independent country and neighbors alongside were in dire need of the energy which we had off our shores, we would provide it.

It represents, really, what amounts to a perfect melding of the interest, Mr. Speaker, of the federal and provincial governments. It is good way in which to balance the situation and to balance the problem.

Obviously, self-sufficiency and security of supply is an important consideration because when you attain that, we get more powers. The way in which the federal government or Mr. Chretien wanted to have it or Mr. Lalonde, is they would decide when energy self-sufficiency and security of supply was attained. Here, throughout this act, you can see there is an arbitration process. You can see it in Sections 36 and 37, where there is no agreement on whether energy self-sufficiency or security of supply exists, or whether a decision by a provincial minister for that matter on the

general approach of development unreasonably delays attainment of self-sufficiency and security of supply, there is an arbitration process that is set there.

In addition, there are suspensive vetoes, which are provided under Section 36 which further fortifies the checks and balances which are maintained in this particular act.

I know wish, Mr. Speaker, to turn to the celebrated Clause 54 that the hon. gentlemen have been deliberately trying to obscure the benefit of this act with over and over the months. They are very embarrassed and it is obvious that even Mr. Baker is very embarrassed because of the statement that he made or the stand they had taken on this issue, which was so diametrically opposed to the interest of the people in the Province of Newfoundland.

Make no mistake that the main purpose of this act and agreement is that it secures forever and a day, the right of equal management of the offshore, the right to choose the production systems to the Province, the right to share revenues and the rights for young Newfoundlanders for generations to come to get a fair shake with respect to the jobs. That is the main basis of the act. The hon. gentlemen have from time to time attempted to obscure it by Clause 54 and Come By Chance. Clause 54 as it appears right now is exactly as was intended, Section 41 it appears in the act, is exactly the same as was intended when Clause 54 was drafted. What was intended when Clause 54 was drafted was to give Come By Chance a preference with respect to any crude it needed for the operation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:

- but, at the particular time, Mr. Speaker, it was anticipated that the workability and future of Come By Chance would be well known before the act was proclaimed. So, Ms. Carney when she was asked by their friend, Mr. Baker and Mr. Rompkey and the hon. gentlemen there opposite, who never lifted their finger to help in this particular thing and actually supported the taking away of our rights, when she was asked in the House of Commons, she clearly indicated that this was the intention and this is what is going to be done.

What we have in Section 41 right now is a perfect guarantee to Come By Chance that it will, on a marketable basis, be able to secure a sufficient supply of crude to operate. It not only guarantees it to Come By Chance but, if you look at Section 41, you will see an indication that it also applies to any new facilities that may replace Come By Chance itself. It has a right to 100,000 barrels a day, Mr. Speaker, and we have secured that, as I say, once again, forever and a day.

Mr. Baker is talking today, in his embarrassment about the fact that it is worst than it was before because there are contracts and they are allowed to give up contracts. You cannot expect people to develop the offshore in this Province and say, "You cannot enter into any contracts with the sale of crude oil." I mean what are they going to develop it for? You cannot enter into any contracts, you have got to wait for Come By Chance or until we get another refinery. I mean, which

comes first, the chicken or the egg? It is consummately ridiculous that the hon. gentleman could make that criticism.

If the hon. gentleman knew anything about it he would know that contracts of this nature are very short term anyway and the basis of what this act does is give the right, if there is a shortfall at the Come By Chance refinery or any facility replacing it, for not the federal but, the provincial Minister of Energy to serve a requisition on whoever is operating out there on the offshore, be it Hibernia or whatever structures may be there in the future, to require them to sell on a marketable basis, not to enter into any further contracts so it would be available within thirty or sixty days, which is quite sufficient, not to enter into any contracts but to sell first of all, on a marketable basis of course, you cannot expect anything other than that, enough to satisfy the needs of Come By Chance or a facility replacing it.

Mr. Speaker, what more perfect solution can you possibly get? This was what was intended under Clause 54.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the hon. minister would permit a question?

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

A point of order or a question?

MR. BARRY:

A question.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will permit a question. Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the minister would indicate why it was that they did not have in the original Accord this reference to, "or any refining facility constructed in the Province to replace the Come By Chance facilities." Was that not clearly an oversight and are we not now in a situation where the present wording is better than we had if Come By Chance is dismantled but, in fact, by reference to the sales contract, is worse than we had if we contemplate Come By Chance still staying there? In other words this second draft seems to be clear evidence of an attempt to dismantle Come By Chance -

MR. J. CARTER:

Come By Chance is scrap.

MR. BARRY:

- and hence - we agree with putting in this additional language - would the minister comment on that? Does he agree, as the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has said, that Come By Chance is trash? Will he agree to having it clearly defined in the second draft of this clause that these sales contracts are in fact only sixty and ninety day sales contracts? Will he have that clause clarified in both the provincial and federal legislations to make sure this is the case?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, how pathetic. I mean, the hon. gentleman is pathetic when he tries to reach for these things. He is grasping at straws. I am going to tell the hon. gentleman first of all I know

that Come By Chance was constructed and it was constructed well and it is a good refinery. It was constructed by Mr. Shaheen and it has been out there now for about ten or fifteen years, but, you know, nobody is immortal, other than the Almighty and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. We are talking about a regime that is going to last not for next year but for ten years, for fifteen years, for twenty years, forever and a day I say, so that some time along the line Come By Chance will become obsolete. Come By Chance will obviously have to be dismantled, not now we hope, but in 100 years time say. This is a full and sufficient protection. I would think the hon. gentlemen would applaud us for having this protection because it says any facility replacing Come By Chance because just as forever and a day, which is the important thing, we have the right to revenues as if they are on land, just as forever and a day we have all the management rights we want, just as forever and a day future generations of young Newfoundlanders will have the rights from the offshore, so forever and a day, Mr. Speaker, we will have the rights to 100,000 barrels for a refinery and I think that is a considerable achievement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman has jumped on that because he hopes to obscure it. The fact of the matter is, and the hon. gentleman knows this, that when he first saw the Atlantic Accord the hon. gentleman said to his caucus, he said, "Boys, I cannot find anything wrong with it. There is nothing I can do to criticize that

particular document." He has come back and he was told by his former leader, Mr. Neary told him, -

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

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

MR. BARRY:
This is the second time that - one time last year the minister went on with the same sort of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, and I did not bother to correct him and one of the news media were foolish enough to interview the minister and let him have this statement go out over the airwaves.

Mr. Speaker, my first comments on the Atlantic Accord are there for all posterity to see. They interviewed me at an airport, Mr. Speaker, and I had gotten the details over the telephone, had the clauses read out to me, Mr. Speaker, before I made my comments. I gave the interview in a Montreal airport and I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, concerns that I had in living colour for the minister to see, on television, which was carried in this Province before I ever got back to meet with caucus to discuss these matters. Now the minister got that, and he had the concerns that were laid out and there were a number of concerns.

MR. DAWE:
You could not find anything wrong with it.

MR. BARRY:
No, Mr. Speaker, this other minister is as wrong as the first minister. It is in the newspaper, it is on television tape, go look at it and you will see that the

concerns were expressed.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
The hon. gentleman has a right to respond when he wants to. The hon. gentleman in the great haste to get his comments in had not even seen the Accord. He could not have, he was in Montreal at the time, -

MR. BARRY:
Barely acceptable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:
An hour of two after. I can only repeat, Mr. Speaker, I am not a member of the Liberal caucus, I do not listen into the Liberal caucus. But I can only point out that I have been told by somebody who legitimately heard that this is what the hon. gentleman said. Look what he said yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Just look what the hon. gentleman said yesterday. Just look what the hon. gentleman said on Friday when he was interviewed. He made no mention about any defect in this now Clause 41. He made some inane comment to the effect that this does not answer the question, you should have Come By Chance. It seems to be an improvement, he

says - then he hears George -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

I take it the President of the Council was speaking to the point of order. So I would rule that there is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. MARSHALL:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Even yesterday, Mr. Speaker, even as a result of this yesterday, it being Friday when he saw this, he could not say anything about this Clause 51. It seemed to remedy it, he said, but he got instructions from George. George told him about short-term contracts.

Do you think we are going to put in any legislation that people who are developing out there, number one, cannot sign contracts? Do you think we are going to put in any legislation to the effect that if they sign contracts, it has to be on certain terms? The fact of the matter is the hon. genius on the other side who purports to know all about energy matters should know that these contracts have been, are, and ever will be of a short term nature. So there is quite adequate protection there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will just go through a few of these things, because I do not want the hon. gentleman, I am only reading these out, so the hon. gentleman, if at all possible, and I do not think it is possible, there maybe one or two hon. gentlemen there opposite who understand, but it is very difficult to get the hon. gentleman to understand. I will just read this out and you will read it through in Hansard so you will have a better understanding.

Section 42 provides for joint ministerial directions; Section 43 obligates the board to submit an annual plan to call for bids for exploration licences in the offshore. Incidentally, the Board has already called for certain exploration licences, as it commences its work. Section 45 provides for a public review process, which we have already seen taken place in this Province with respect to Hibernia.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
Section 45 a very important one, Mr. Speaker. I hope the hon. gentleman will look at this because this is one that is very important and provides for a Canada/Newfoundland Benefits Plan to be submitted prior to the approval of a development plan or indeed any work or activity on the offshore. These plans, now get this Mr. Speaker, must provide that the companies must maintain offices in the Province, a priority for Newfoundland work on research and development, education and training expenditures in the Province, and

first consideration for Newfoundland goods and services in Newfoundland provided, of course, that the services and goods are competitive in price, quality, and delivery.

Mr. Speaker, compare that to what Mr. Marc Lalonde and Mr. Chretien and Mr. Trudeau were trying to shove down the throats of this Province with the willing co-operation of the hon. gentlemen there opposite as they were trying to get us to accept a Nova Scotia-type agreement. So I, Mr. Speaker, suggest that the hon. gentlemen -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:
- particularly consider Section 45 of the act.

Now we come to Part 2, headed Petroleum Resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL:
I have a great prejudice against Liberals. I think that the Liberals in this Province are absolutely disgraceful and disgusting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
I think your present leader owes it to the people of this Province to resign immediately as a result of the measure that is being brought in today and his conduct in relation to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

There are a few Liberals who personally I might like, but Liberals generally in this Province I have an utter and complete abysmal contempt for.

Part two -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

You know, the hon. gentleman who is looking at me so sagaciously over there, knows where I stand.

Part two of the act is based upon petroleum resources and it is modelled on the Canadian Petroleum Resources Act and provides for the issuance of interest by the board to explore for hydro carbons in the offshore and to produce oil and gas. The powers of the board in both part two and three, which are fundamental decisions, are shown there. I want to just point out to the Assembly that part two and part three follow closely the matter of rights issuance and conservation that we agreed in the Atlantic Accord would be the same as apply to frontier lands. As hon. gentlemen there opposite know, the National Energy Policy has been scrapped and replaced by a new act, called the Canada Petroleum Resources Act. That is presently before the Parliament of Canada, as well as the Act to implement the Atlantic Accord.

I would also point out that there

may be in parts two and three only, most of which is technical phraseology, certain amendments from Committee in the House of Commons, that this is an extremely unique procedure that we are going through, one that we had not gone through ever before in that the acts have to be exactly the same when they come out of both Houses. So we will be having second reading of this bill and we will be holding the bill. We will be putting it through Committee only after it goes through Committee in the House of Parliament, just in case there are any rational amendments that have to be made. Consequently, the procedures of the House of Parliament are probably a bit more cumbersome than they are here, so it is going to take them, perhaps, a little while longer to put through this bill than it would take us to put it through. What we are proposing, so hon. gentleman will understand what our position is - what we are advising the House, really - is we will put this through second reading in this session and we will bring it into Committee in the next session. I would suggest, as I say, that second reading in this session would serve as second reading for the next session, so that at Opening Day we could get up, this bill would be read a first and second time, and wait for Committee. But if that does not satisfy the hon. gentlemen, we would be quite happy to debate it again.

MR. FLIGHT:

Explain that again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

I will explain this procedure to

the hon. gentleman after.

MR. FLIGHT:

I thought this debate did that.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, not this debate, no, not second reading. We will put it through Committee in the next session. That is what we intend to do because of the unique nature of this legislative process.

There are a few comments, Mr. Speaker, I want to make about parts two and three. Just for the record I will draw your attention to certain sections: Section 57 provides that interests are not to be granted in the offshore unless there is a call for bids. This has already been done in relation to a larger section than is presently being developed. Division 5 provides for Canadian ownership rules which, as I pointed out earlier, are within the jurisdiction of the federal government which we, of course, agreed on under the Atlantic Accord.

Section 92 provides that where a share is required to be sold because a company fails to meet the Canadian ownership rules and no private tender is received, an agent of the Newfoundland Government would have the first right to purchase such a share.

Section 129 I would like to draw to your attention because it is dear to the Leader of the Opposition's heart. It ought to be dear to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) as well. It abolishes the Crown share. Now, what the Crown share was, Mr. Speaker, was an expropriation method where, if there was a find, there would be a back-in by the Government of the Province to take

an interest in the development, it would result in monies being derived through the share itself. But since we have the right to assess revenues as if they are on land, nobody could care whether a dollar, I am sure, in the Province of Newfoundland comes from revenues or whether it comes from the royalties which we have the opportunity to assess at the present time.

The Crown share, Mr. Speaker, would give rights to sit on the board of directors of the company and that, to our mind, is not conducive to adequate development in the offshore or effective development. We do not happen to believe that the government belongs in the board rooms of companies, neither, any more, Mr. Speaker, do companies have the opportunity to sit in Cabinet. We feel that this is the appropriate way in which to proceed and we wholeheartedly endorse the abolition of the Crown share. But bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, in the event the Crown share is ever brought in again, the Atlantic Accord reads quite clearly that the Province of Newfoundland would share in it equitably. So we have the protection there.

Section 132 provides that the board must give written authority before any work or activity is carried out on the offshore. Another section, 134, provides for the submission of development plans prior to the carrying out of any work or activity in the offshore, setting out that the approval of such a plan is a fundamental decision. In other words, the governments have the right to pass on it.

Section 136 provides for a technical committee to which

appeals may be made. I would draw your attention particularly to sections 153 and 159 to provide for the control of pollution and a compensation screen together with a review committee of these schemes as set out in the Atlantic Accord.

Part IV provides for the establishment of the offshore development fund. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention that this is not a loan as it was in the Nova Scotian agreement, but this is an outright grant of 75/25 - 75 by the federal government and 25 by the provincial government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like have a few words with respect to revenues. The matter of revenues, of course, is a very important element. It is really the second principal right that we wish to achieve. We achieved the rights of joint management and the rights to assess revenues as if they were on land, and that applies to royalties, sales taxes, corporate taxes, every type of tax that the government as a province has the right to levy and assess. How we exercise these rights will, of course, depend upon legislation. There is presently before the House an amendment to the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act, which we will debate after this particular bill, which will give us the right to deal with revenues in the manner that is set forth in that particular act.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, and I do not want to particularly get into this act, but I could once again draw to the attention of the Assembly other remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) which I think are damaging and I view to be his determination

to try to denigrate this particular scheme and this system, because his Achilles' heel is the way in which he dealt with this matter which was disgraceful and which I say warrants, as far as I am concerned, the hon. gentleman's resignation. He continues, Mr. Speaker, to assail the whole process. In this House, and it is a matter of record in this House, he asked questions with respect to the Hibernia Impact Statement that had originally been filed, which was, as everybody knows, one that was reported - because we never saw it, we would not see it - was reported as indicating a floating platform system for the Hibernia project.

Now, I do not think, once again, anything could be more damaging than somebody on the other side of the House pressing for that to be filed. Instead of it being filed, we said we would not accept it, we wanted to get a balanced treatment of floating and concrete platform systems. We got that balanced treatment and today we have concrete platforms, but it is no thanks to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman seems to want to base his premise on negativity, he wants to base his aim for government on trying to tear things down and he is acting quite irresponsibly when he does it.

It is the same way when he gets on about prices. You hear him on the air talking, "We want the negotiations to be done on the Table of the House. How low a price will it take before Hibernia is no longer economic?" He hopes that Hibernia will not be economic. I can tell the hon. gentleman, in the discussions we have had it is not the price that pertains today, it is obviously the price that pertains, not even

in 1991 or 1992 when Hibernia will first start production, but for twenty or thirty years there afterwards which is relevant. And the hon. gentleman, when he makes statements like that and asks questions like that, is just really denigrating the entire -

MR. FLIGHT:

How much do we need per barrel?

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

I will tell the hon. gentleman what we will do, which is what the hon. gentleman's group did not do.

MR. BARRY:

What is the cost of a barrel of oil from Hibernia?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

If the hon. gentleman wants to look at the amendment to the Petroleum and Natural Gas Act, Mr. Speaker, he will see that we have provided for a basic royalty regime and an incremental royalty regime so we will see, whatever the price of oil is in the future, we will not have another Churchill Falls agreement like the hon. gentlemen there opposite plunged the people of this Province into, because as the price rises, we will share in it. I would also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that-

MR. BARRY:

What is the base price?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, you do not give

information of that nature when you are in the process of negotiating with companies, put this out in the House of Assembly. At the present time, we are in and the process of delicate negotiations. The hon. gentleman would love to have it but, as I say, the hon. gentleman has constructed his whole career on the basis of trying to bomb out any development that may occur. He would be delighted to have it, but it is asinine, infantile and stupid for the hon. member to be asking questions of that particular nature.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, as well, so that we will not in the future be accused of signing any agreement or having any paper that was not brought before the House at the particular time, that we have entered into an arrangement with the federal government with respect to the international levy which will be exacted with respect to discoveries that may be made outside the Continental Shelf margins, outside the two hundred mile limit, and we have entered into an agreement with the federal government concerning the impact of any levy under the Law of the Sea contract. I do not have the document here, I shall table it later, but I can hon. gentlemen the information that pertains to it.

As hon. gentlemen there opposite will realize, there have been negotiations pursuant to Article (82) of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea with respect to international levies which would pertain beyond the two hundred nautical miles to the edge of the Continental margin, and that levy is in the process of agreement. It has not

been agreed by the federal government as yet as to whether or not they are going to ratify the Law of the Sea Convention, that is the prerogative of the federal government. It has been agreed, and we are signing an agreement, that within the context of that that this levy will apply but that will not impair or affect, and the words read: "In the event that the levy is imposed, it shall not affect either government's power with respect to royalties and taxation."

MR. BARRY:

Is this another agreement separate from the Accord?

MR. MARSHALL:

This is an agreement, as I have already indicated, which is separate from the Accord that we will be signing.

MR. BARRY:

Another defect.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

"While we agree that any decision with respect to the ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention is the prerogative of the Government of Canada, it will ascertain the views of the Government of Newfoundland before making such decision."

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

There is something that the minister should know before he sits down today. Wilbur Hopper,

Chairman of Petro-Canada, is quoted in The Toronto Star of January 25, 1986 as saying, "Hibernia will not yield any royalties to either Ottawa or Newfoundland for some time under this scenario" - that is his scenario that he is laying out as to the falling price of oil - "and may even need direct cash infusions from the federal government if oil prices do remain at about twenty dollars for several years." Now, Mr. Speaker, we know prices have gone down on the spot market to the area of fifteen dollars a barrel.

MR. FLIGHT:

Who is this Hopper, anyway?

MR. BARRY:

If the minister thinks that this debate is going to conclude without his administration, the administration of which he is a part taking a stand and setting out what they think is the bottom line at which Hibernia is viable, the people of this Province will rise up, Mr. Speaker. They will rise up if the minister thinks he can look for that blank cheque with respect to this deal on Hibernia.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

We are not asking the minister to get into the delicate negotiations, we are not asking him, Mr. Speaker, at this point.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. Leader of the Opposition come to his point of order?

MR. BARRY:

The point is, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to make the minister aware of these comments by Wilbur Hopper, who is a federal Crown corporation official, and to ask the minister to for heaven's sake remove this uncertainty that is created by this statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will not respond to that. I am elected in this House but in this area, particularly, I have unbounded contempt for the hon. gentleman. He has obviously shown by the questions he is asking that he is taking great delight if Hibernia does not go ahead or anything else does not go ahead in this Province. That is what he would construct his administration on, Mr. Speaker. Much to his sorrow, I have had no such indication whatsoever. As a matter of fact, everything to the contrary, that Hibernia is going ahead.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would rule, therefore, there is no point of order. The hon the Leader of the Opposition has provided some information.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Back, Mr. Speaker, to the federal bill. I just want to explain, as well, that our social legislation has been agreed to apply. It is listed in the federal bill. All of our labour legislation will apply, but Part V of the Canada Labour Code will apply to the certification of rigs and moveable concrete platforms, which one would expect it to do. The

Newfoundland Labour Relations Act will apply to certification of fixed structures, fixed platforms. There is a provision in the federal act, as well, that provides that no collective agreement can interfere in any way with the benefits that have been decided upon with respect to the operation offshore.

Mr. Speaker, that ends the explanation. I have a few more things I want to say, but some of the things I will say on the closing of the bill. I will just say that I am going to be interested to see, when the Leader of the Opposition stands up, whether he supports this legislation and in what way he does not and, at the say time, if he will explain to the people of Newfoundland, as I say, why he left this administration. It is not good enough, Mr. Speaker, to bring in the position that he disagreed with the approach. That approach was exactly the same as the approach that I used, and it is one that has resulted in this bill which is before the legislature. It surely must be evident, Mr. Speaker, as to why he resigned. He was interested in more things, I think, other than achieving an agreement. I think today moreso than any other day it ought to be evident to everybody in this Province where the Leader of the Opposition stands. Quite frankly, I think the hon gentleman is under an obligation, moreso than any other member, to resign. No minister in the history of this Province has so sabotaged negotiations as the hon gentleman did. He prevented us from having a united front with Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Chretien and did everything he could to oppose us. At the same time, he had the audacity to sit in this caucus

while he was bombing us out and did not have the courage to go across the House until some years later. He had the audacity to get elected under the wing of the Premier of this Province, and I think that he is to be condemned with respect to it.

Now, if the hon. gentleman is going to oppose it, let him clearly show where he stands. We will see whether the hon. gentleman is opposing on the basis of rational thought or whether he is just blinded by personal ambition, jealousy and envy and that that is the reason why he has taken the position he has.

I say to the hon. gentleman, it takes infinitely more time to effect something that is constructive, it takes infinitely more time and effort, and sometimes anguish, to build and construct something, but it takes only seconds to destroy a work that has been put together. The Leader of the Opposition should know that those who destroy and continually destroy, eventually the walls fall in on them and I think it is time they did on the Leader of the Opposition.

Now, we must look to this legislation and we bring this legislation in proudly. As I said first off, we bring it in, the whole of the caucus and the Cabinet, and we must look to the future. This particular legislation gives a future and a hope to the young people of this Province. For the first time, Mr. Speaker, we are approaching a development and approaching our relationship in Canada differently. Instead of being differential and going to Ottawa with cap in hand, we are treated as equals in the Canadian

Confederation and we respond as full Canadians. That is what this legislation is all about. What is made of it and the benefit that will accrue in the years to come will depend, of course, on how we exercise our rights, but the basis is there, Mr. Speaker, in this legislation and in the companion legislation of the federal government for generations yet to come. I hope we can use this and use it wisely and that the tendency in this Province to look negatively at everything, as the hon. gentleman does, and try to rip it apart and what have you, will cease, and we will look at this legislation as it is, a positive document which will secure for the young people of this Province for years to come, a good and solid future insofar as the resources offshore can supply it. I can only reflect, Mr. Speaker, on how different the whole situation would be, if our fish and our hydro had been treated in exactly the same way. What a difference Province we would have today! And it is not too late, I do not think, to mitigate the problems encountered in those areas and to see those resources more adequately committed to our future to further secure the hope of young Newfoundlanders and the quality of life of other generations of Newfoundland Canadians for years to come.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this, I want to extend thanks where thanks is due, to the Premier for his full support -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

- to my colleagues in Cabinet who fully support it, and whose full

support was sought all the time. It is not too difficult, Mr. Speaker, unless you are an arrogant ignoramus, to relate to your people who are elected with you in Cabinet or in the caucus, who were also supportive. I also want to express appreciation to the full negotiating team, headed by Mr. Cyril Abery and others, and also to the federal members of the Tory caucus in Ottawa, particularly to Mr. Crosbie and Mr. McGrath, Captain Morrissey Johnson and Mr. Price, but I think most especially to Prime Minister Mulroney and Mrs. Carney, who, although they had all the legal chips on their side of the table, were prepared at last to treat us as a Province, even though we had only seven seats.

And I want to say once again, Mr. Speaker, I will be interested in hearing what the Leader of the Opposition has to say, but I want to note once again that the hon. gentleman never had the capability, he never had the ability, he never had the stability and he certainly never had the humility to bring about a regime like this which will be for the benefit, I hope, of generations of young Newfoundlanders yet to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans).

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the text of my speech that I have prepared, I would like to answer the Minister of Energy's last

question. He wanted to know what the Leader of the Opposition thought of the Atlantic Accord or thought of their performance in the offshore. And I note he picked out the Leader. He did not refer to the Liberal caucus, he referred to the Leader. Well, the Leader of the Liberal Party thinks, by and large, the same thing the Liberal caucus have thought about his position and his government's blatant political use of the offshore ever since it became a reality in 1979, and that was that the offshore and anything that could be done with it was used more to further the image of the Premier and his party, to feed his ego, than it was ever meant for the substantive use of the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

And, to date, all we have, all the people of Newfoundland - and certainly, Mr. Speaker, even in the city of St. John's, although there are signs that in the city of St. John's things will change in the next six months - but all that anybody West of Clarenville, for sure, West of the Avalon Peninsula, all they have, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the offshore, is just that. And they know it now. They did not know it in 1982, but they know now that all that has been important in the offshore to date, and the only thing that this Premier and that Minister of Energy and all his caucus have to show for the fact that there is oil out there is that they have built their image. They set out in 1982 to destroy an Opposition and almost did it, Mr. Speaker. That is the only materialistic thing that has been accomplished by this Premier and

this government to date on the offshore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will try to avoid partisan politics as much as I can.

MR. TOBIN:
Verbatim Rex.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
It has been suggested to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is the most important legislation ever brought before this House of Assembly. It may well be, Mr. Speaker. Some people have compared it to the Churchill Falls legislation. There is really no comparison.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
You can say that again.

MR. FLIGHT:
As the Premier knows, there is no comparison. There was no political debate on Churchill Falls. The three members of the then Opposition, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), the member for St. John's Centre, the present Speaker (Mr. Hickey) and everybody, Mr. Speaker, who was anybody not only in Newfoundland but in the Western World, were running around jumping on the bandwagon saying what a great deal Churchill Falls was. There was no debate.

The best that can be said about this legislation is that 50 per cent of the people who understand the oil industry, who understand what is happening in the world and who are concerned about Newfoundland's best interests, at least 50 per cent of the people, are telling the present Premier and the present administration

that this Atlantic Accord and the legislation that is going to be implemented is not good for Newfoundland in the long run.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. FLIGHT:
Talking about the Upper Churchill, Mr. Speaker, if oil keeps dropping the way it has been dropping this past few days, this past month, the Upper Churchill is going to look like a good deal. It will probably be down to \$1.50 a barrell and the Accord is not going to look that great.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
After the first forty years, the price goes down.

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that this debate is taking place in an atmosphere with oil at \$15 a barrell as opposed to the atmosphere when this was negotiated, when it was \$40 a barrell.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, it was not \$40 a barrell.

MR. FLIGHT:
It had been more than \$40.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
No, no, no.

MR. FLIGHT:
Now, Mr. Speaker, certainly in my memory, and I have read everything, I have been a student of politics in Newfoundland, I have never seen an issue that the people of Newfoundland have been so cowed by as the offshore oil.

Let us take a look at the sequence of events, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if it is a coincidence that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is not in his seat today. Is that a coincidence, or is he away on other business?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Promoting Fisheries.

MR. FLIGHT:
When the Premier first get onto the offshore kick the issue was ownership, nothing less than ownership. We could never have jurisdiction, we could never have control, we could never have refining, nothing, nothing, we had to have ownership. We will see if we have more than ownership. Here, Mr. Speaker, is a speech made -

MR. BARRY:
A new concept now, more than ownership. Super ownership, like a super minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
This is Hansard. The hon. member should read the speech of the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Would the hon. gentleman take his seat. The hon. gentleman has not asked for the protection of the Chair, but I should remind hon. members that there is a point where you have to call order, you cannot let everybody on both sides

talk. Hon. members on both sides, I might say, are guilty.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
The member should get this speech and read it. As I say, there is one thing the Minister of Fisheries has accomplished by not being here, he has avoided being embarrassed, Mr. Speaker, because I would have given this speech in the sense that he gave it, and for the reasons. And if I have to stand here today, and for the next ten days -

MR. BARRY:
What speech?

MR. FLIGHT:
The speech where Mr. Tom Rideout, the Minister of Fisheries, could no longer support the Liberal position on offshore.

MR. BARRY:
What is the date of that?

MR. FLIGHT:
The date was April 18, 1980. The issue was offshore ownership. I will never forget the day, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Public Works stood in his place and jumped, he pretty near reached the ceiling, while Mr. Rideout was walking across the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:
Ownership and nothing less, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:
Who said that?

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Rideout. And, Mr. Speaker,

within a month or two or three, ownership suddenly became, in the Premier's rhetoric, unimportant, when he realized that it was not there, when he realized that it was impossible, that it would never be attained -

MR. BARRY:

When the government changed in Ottawa.

MR. FLIGHT:

When the government changed. When he had his little deal with Mr. Clark, the exchange of letters, he realized that ownership would never be there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) must feel like the biggest hypocrite, and I do not particularly want to call him hypocritical. I sat here and I wondered, am I not as brave as he is, am I not as patriotic, am I not as concerned about Newfoundland's resources as the member for Baie Verte - White Bay? There must be something wrong with all the rest. The member for Terra Nova was here. We were not as great Newfoundlanders as Mr. Rideout. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) was here, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, he crossed on that great

MR. TOBIN:

What were you then, Liberal or Reform Liberal?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Then, Mr. Speaker, after the hon. member crossed, we had a change of government. Our Premier then tried to blackmail the then P.C. Prime Minister of Canada into

exchanging letters, which he refused to do. He subsequently lost an election. Everybody here will remember the day of mourning, Mr. Speaker. When the federal government indicated they were going to put offshore ownership and jurisdiction before the Supreme Court of Canada, the Premier shut down this Province and called a day of mourning which cost us something like \$600,000 or \$700,000. Then, Mr. Speaker, he rushed into our own Supreme Court and, lo and behold, what was the result? He unanimously lost. He lost again in our own Supreme Court. He weakened, destroyed our bargaining position, Mr. Speaker, practically destroyed any bargaining position we had. Then, Mr. Speaker, enter Mr. Mulroney, Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa. The Premier of Newfoundland - it has never been done before - decided to go into an agreement with the then Leader of the Opposition. Mr. Mulroney agreed that if he was made Prime Minister of Canada he would have no problem in coming to terms with the Premier. Then, Mr. Speaker, the Premier called an election and got a mandate. Within months, he called off negotiations, and lost two Supreme Court cases. Then he decided to put all his eggs in one basket and put Newfoundland's position on the offshore in the hands of the Canadian electorate. He decided that he would take a chance on breaking off the offshore negotiations, that Brian Mulroney would win and become the Prime Minister of Canada and he would negotiate with Brian Mulroney. And it worked, Mr. Speaker. But it will show you the kind of politics that has been played with our offshore to date by the present Premier, supported by his caucus. But when he won he lost! Because suddenly the

present Premier of Newfoundland was in the hands of the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Mulroney, and we have paid the price. And we are going to continue to pay the price. We are going to pay the price in this. We will pay the worst price in the legislation that is going to implement it. We have paid the price in the FFT issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will be debating this legislation over the next ten or twelve days in a different atmosphere than when Mr. Rideout crossed the House. We are debating it now in a \$15 a barrel atmosphere. We are debating it after the terrible tragedy of the Ocean Ranger, Mr. Speaker, and we want to know - we have already paid a price, some price - what we are going to get back, what benefit will be there for the price that we will pay starting today?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Atlantic Accord and the legislation that implements it may very well go down as the biggest sellout. Churchill Falls might be small potatoes. The Atlantic Accord, Mr. Speaker, and the enshrining legislation may well be the giveaway of the century. The members' constituents have a right to ask him, Will we have refining? Will we have secondary processing? Will there be any jobs onshore for that oil? The answer is no. There will never be a refinery in Botwood, the hon. member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) can go out and tell his people. There will never be a refinery in Conception Bay. There will be work in Come By Chance, there will be work in Arnold's Cove this Summer, Greenspoon will be down taking down the refinery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Opposition gave its position on the Atlantic Accord, on clause (54). It was pointed out we opposed clause (54) because it did not permit refining in Newfoundland. You have to remember when Premier Peckford was going around this Province telling the Newfoundland people that it was the only thing we had left, we had nothing else except the offshore, and it was all based on our ability to do what we wanted to do with the offshore, to control it, to have refining, to have the jobs. Can the member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) imagine this, that we are producing oil at a \$20 a barrel price, as Mr. Hopper just pointed out?

Mr. Speaker, visualize producing oil at \$20 a barrel with no jobs onshore. What is in it? What is out there for us? What is out there for us?

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you, whether we vote for this legislation or not will depend on what the minister is prepared to do over the next eight or ten days. We will be moving, Mr. Speaker, an amendment when we get into Committee that every Newfoundlander will be able to relate to, that every person in Botwood will understand, that every person in Grand Falls will understand, we will be introducing an amendment saying it is our oil, there will be no production unless there is refining.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear! Hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Every Newfoundlander will understand that, Mr. Speaker. There will be no production unless

there is refining, that is what our amendment will be. Let me reiterate, let me say it again for the Legislative writers who will have to get the legislation ready, there will be no production unless there is refining. That will be our amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is getting ridiculous here. They are trying to shout him down.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Do you want to throw them out?

MR. FLIGHT:

We have other concerns, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has a right to be heard in silence. We are having some difficulty hearing what he is saying, so I would ask hon. members on both sides to allow the hon. member to be heard in silence, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, we see Clause 41(2) as a recall. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is all right for the minister to stand up here and say that Mobil's sales contract, or Petro-Canada's, or Canterra's, or somebody's sales contract is thirty or sixty days, we will want to see that embodied in the legislation. Remember, Mr. Speaker, there is a recall clause in the Churchill Falls agreement but does anybody ever remember us being able to recall any

electricity? The recall clause is there! That is what this is, Mr. Speaker, a faulted recall clause. We will want that straightened out, we will want to be assured. This Liberal Opposition, under the present Leader, do not intend going to Prince Edward Island to ask them if it is okay if we have a new industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

We do not intend, and the people of Newfoundland do not believe that we should have to go to Nova Scotia and ask if it is okay if we have another industry. Mr. Speaker, that is another concern we have. The Leader of the Opposition has already indicated we have every right in the world to know Mobil's cost for producing a barrel of oil from Hibernia. We are not asking the royalty regime, we are not asking what profit will be available for shareholders, we are not asking how much it is going to cost to finance the long-term debt, none of that, the bottom line, how much will it cost Mobil to recover it's cost of extracting a barrel of oil?

MR. TOBIN:

You are a disgrace to the Liberal Party, sit down!

MR. FLIGHT:

From what I hear, the hon. member was a disgrace to the Department of Welfare when he worked for it.

MR. TULK:

What?

MR. FLIGHT:

From the stories I hear, Mr. Speaker, there are people ready to write affidavits about the way he did his job. Mr. Speaker, if we

want to talk about disgrace, the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) would do well to think back to the days when he was a public servant and the way he treated the people whom he supervised and the welfare recipients.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, every day we have the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) standing up announcing we have Hibernia, we have Whiterose, we have Ben Nevis and we Hebron - there is obviously lots of oil out there - and the more we announce the more ridiculous it becomes that we are not allowed to have refining capacity in this Province. Why is it that Newfoundland is not permitted to refine its own oil?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To look at Saturday's Evening Telegram, "Come By Chance guaranteed Hibernia oil", you would not know but Come by Chance was going to open up the day that we proclaimed this legislation. Do you know what the legislation has done? The legislation has made it simple for Petro Canada to demolish that refinery. Because what will happen, when the word goes out tomorrow that the refinery is going to be demolished, is that anybody who will complain about it will be told, do not worry about that, in the Accord there is provision for

a new refinery, so we will tear down this one and when we are ready we will build a new one. Does the member really believe there will ever be a refinery built in this Province? Does the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) really believe, Mr. Speaker, that a refinery will ever be built to replace Come By Chance?

I have a few things here I want to read.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I thought you were rising to give me the protection of the Chair. I have not yet asked, Mr. Speaker, but I will say this, though, that when the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) was speaking - for almost two hours - after the initial back and forth, this side of the House sat and listened to what the minister had to say.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask hon members on my left if they would give the hon. member a chance to speak. He is being constantly interrupted.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I can take it. The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) talks about embarrassments and disgraces. Mr. Speaker, he is a disgrace the way he has acted this past ten or fifteen minutes. If there is a disgrace in this House this evening it is the parliamentary assistant, the Premier's gofer, the next Cabinet minister, Mr.

Speaker. There he sits in all his glory, shining, Mr. Speaker.

When the people of this Province understand that there is to be no refining from that offshore, they will not stand for it. And the member for Lewisporte (Mr. Russell) might just as well make up his mind, that when they understand that this legislation guarantees that there will never be any refining in this Province, therefore no secondary processing, therefore no petro chemicals, therefore no jobs, that we will be hewers and shippers of oil, they will not stand for it.

We intend, as an Opposition, to make sure that our message gets out this time, and it will get out. Never mind the refining, Mr. Speaker, how about the other things the Premier gave up? Listen to this, Mr. Speaker: 'February, 1980. The Premier, Hon. A. Brian Peckford, decided he would reply to a statement made by Mr. Ed Broadbent, Leader of the NDP Party in Ottawa.' He was staking out conditions under which he would see our oil developed and nothing else. He was the man, Mr. Speaker, who for the first time in 400 years was going to defend Newfoundland's interests and Newfoundland's rights and see that the people were looked out to.

This is the report he made to Mr. Broadbent: 'Mr. Broadbent does not realize' - talking about the regulations - in those negotiations we forced the oil companies to give a provincial Crown corporation, the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Board, a 40 per cent interest in every commercial oil and gas discovery made off our coast.' In addition to all the normal royalties and all the other

slide and scale royalties and provincial and federal income taxes, over and above all that, that Premier was going to retain for us, for Newfoundland, for posterity, 40 per cent of everything found out there.

Listen to what he said about Ed Broadbent. 'Thus Mr. Broadbent's rather patronizing concern for our stewardship of our resource is misplaced. He should not be concerned. I am here. I am going to make sure that the Newfoundland people benefit greatly and the most. In fact, we have struck a harder bargain.' Now, he had struck a harder bargain on the issue of public ownership of offshore oil and gas than Ottawa. 'Under their regulations' - under poor old Ottawa who do not know what they are doing in trying to take our resources now - 'they only have a 25 per cent interest and that is in Petro Canada. We have gone one step better than that and gotten 40 per cent. Of course this is nothing strange.'

Now, where is the Minister of Energy and where is that 40 per cent? Where is the 25 per cent? Had Petro Canada retained the back-in, we would have benefited from that. But where is the 40 per cent? It is gone, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

So, what is gone now? Ownership is gone.

MR. FLIGHT:

Ownership is gone. Refining is gone. The 40 per cent is gone. At twenty dollars a barrel for oil, we will have to subsidize it. What do we have?

MR. BARRY:

What about training.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
What about the jobs?
What about royalties?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
Let us talk about the training for
a second, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:
You are speaking of all the
negative things.

MR. FLIGHT:
No, there is nothing negative
about this, Mr. Speaker. The
people of Newfoundland have a
right to know what happened to the
Premier's position. Why did he
cave in? He got in a position
where he had no choice?

MR. SIMMS:
Your position was that we sign a
deal like Nova Scotia's.

MR. FLIGHT:
Well, let me tell the minister -
he talks about Nova Scotia - the
last clause in the agreement with
Nova Scotia, the last one, it that
is there is any other agreement
made by a Maritime province, Nova
Scotia's deal will be invalid and
the Newfoundland deal will take
over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
Mr. Buchanan is laughing up his
sleeve. Do you know why he is
laughing? Because in there there

is a clause that guarantees that
every one of his refineries will
be operating at 100 per cent
before we get a bloody gallon of
oil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
That is why he is laughing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:
Buchanan does not want to pump the
oil. He does not care. He does
not want any Ocean Rangers on
his hands. He wants the oil. He
wants the refinery with jobs on
land. He wants to be operating
the refinery. He wants to have
his petro-chemical complexes next
to the refinery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:
You made Mr. Buchanan look good
and Mr. Buchanan made you look
foolish.

Let me get back for a minute to
the Churchill Falls deal, and the
member will understand this. It
took ten years before there were
any recriminations over the
Churchill Falls deal. Oil had to
go from \$1.50 a barrel to \$30 a
barrel before anybody realized
there was a problem with that. It
took ten years! The member shakes
hid head. Why does not the member
read? It took ten years. It
will not take ten years before
there will be recriminations
against this deal.

MR. MATTHEWS:

I never supported a deal like that.

MR. FLIGHT:

The member is supporting worse legislation than ever the Churchill Falls deal was.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Not so. Not so.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

The hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews). have you read the legislation?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Yes, three times.

MR. FLIGHT:

Right through?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Three times.

MR. FLIGHT:

Well, I will ask the member a question about a passage? Has the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tpbm) read the legislation?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I have.

MR. FLIGHT:

And are you supporting the legislation?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes, I am.

MR. FLIGHT:

Are you going back to your district and explain to the people in the various communities you represent what this legislation means?

MR. TOBIN:

Yes.

MR. FLIGHT:

That there will be no refining, no jobs. We are guaranteeing the economic viability of Nova Scotia's oil industry, New Brunswick's oil industry, and possibly Quebec's. They are not named, but possibly. Some of the legislation is so vague that we could well be putting oil in there. No recall on oil for Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, we listened to the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) for in excess of two hours today.

MR. TOBIN:

He had something to say.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

If he thinks I am going to stand up here and say everything I have to say from 5:30 to 6:00, he has another think coming. Both sides agreed that we would have the opportunity to finish our speeches, and I understand that that applied to the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West. I would be willing to give leave that he go on longer than a half hour or whatever. This is a very important and great debate. It is important that the people of Newfoundland know what has been given away. Mr. Speaker, it is important that they understand the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we will find out shortly what the Government House

Leader's intention is for tomorrow. We do not know at this point whether the House will be open or will not be open.

MR. DAWE:

It is a regular day, is it not?

MR. FLIGHT:

It is a regular day. Well, we will have it verified shortly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Opposition will stake out its position over the next eight or ten days. Basically, Mr. Speaker, we have an amendment to try to guarantee the people of Newfoundland refining capacity so they will have petro-chemical industries and the jobs that go with them. We will be trying to find out whether or not it will be possible to develop that great resource out there in the present environment. We will want to know what it will cost.

I have not gone into the training, Mr. Speaker. I will get into the training tomorrow. While we were procrastinating, while we were arguing, while we were playing politics for five years with our offshore, why is it that Mobil find themselves in a position to say that of the 3,000 jobs that will be created in the building of structures, only 1,000 Newfoundlanders - maybe 1,000 - qualify. Whose fault was that?

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate with the intention of continuing on whenever the hon. House Leader calls this particular debate again. I presume it will be tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

Tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. myself, the Premier, other ministers and members of caucus - some of them, some of them will be here - will be attending certain functions when the Federal Energy Minister (Mrs. Carney) comes down. Some of them will give members of the Opposition something else to cry about tomorrow. In the meantime, we will be considering tomorrow "An Act To Provide For A District Court Judge" which the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) would like to get through at this sitting. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) will be here to conduct the affairs of the House. Then we come back for Private Members' Day and then we come to the Atlantic Accord. And let it be recorded again, Mr. Speaker, the petulance of the hon. members, that they would not allow us off for this particular function.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot look at the hon. gentlemen, not today. I can hardly stomach them. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

February 10, 1986

Tabled by Hon.
Member
Min. of Tourism
10 Feb' 86

ANSWER TO QUESTION #57

Appearing on Order Paper #75 of 1986/86 asked by the Honourable Member for Stephenville, Mr. Aylward:

- QUESTION:
1. How many Crown Corporations come under the Department of Development and Tourism?
 2. Are these Crown Corporations funded and if so, how much does each receive?

ANSWER: (Date - 1986/02/10)

1. Six Crown Corporations come under the Department of Development and Tourism.
2. Funding for these Corporations, as provided in the 1985/86 fiscal year, is as follows:

(i) Economic Council of Newfoundland and Labrador	\$ 300,000
(ii) Harmon Corporation	nil
(iii) Marystown Shipyard Limited	nil
(iv) Newfoundland Hardwoods	nil
(v) Newfoundland Oceans Research and Development Corporation (NORDCO)	\$ 800,000
(vi) Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation	
Operating	\$ 700,000
Loan Fund	\$4,000,000
Venture Capital	\$ 500,000