

PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLEASE RETURN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 83 — 87

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

17 February 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to table a preliminary report on the Trade and Investment Mission led by myself and the hon. Mr. Ottenheimer to China, Hong Kong and Japan. I will not go through the whole report, but I will table it for hon. members. As most hon. members know, the objectives of the Mission were threefold:

(1) To investigate the potential for alternate forms of investment such as joint ventures, licensing and co-marketing arrangements, as well as transfer of technology and direct investment in the fishing and energy sectors.

The second objective was to ensure that foreign investors were aware of the capabilities and comparative advantages of investing in Newfoundland and Labrador, and to provide potential investors with useful, timely information on specific investment opportunities.

And, thirdly, to discuss the potential for increased trade in fish products, ocean technology and other resource based products with the intent of improving markets for our exports.

Those were the three objectives

that we had in mind when we undertook this Mission.

The fourteen member delegation was composed of senior officials responsible for trade and investment in the Province and private company representatives in the fisheries and offshore sectors. In addition to high level government meetings involving the full delegation, individual itineraries were set up for the business people.

In my opinion, opportunities exist in China, Hong Kong and Japan for increased trade in our fish products as well as other resource based products such as pulp and paper and iron ore. The potential for technology transfer and the downstream twinning of marine technology institutions has been initiated and will be followed up. There are tremendous opportunities for both our University and our Institute of Marine Technology, and we are hoping that within the next month or so we will be able to have these things put in place.

In the area of project financing in resource industries both Hong Kong and Japanese business concerns have demonstrated a strong interest in pursuing specific opportunities, and we are following up on these now.

In the weeks and months ahead a lot of follow-up work will be undertaken by both government officials and the private sector. These will be reported on at a later date.

Missions such as these are mandatory, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion. Trade and Investment Promotion is a vital ingredient in ensuring the growth of our export

products. Face to face meetings with the key decision makers in our foreign markets are of vital importance. They set the stage for economic co-operation and facilitate further intervention by the private sector for business ventures in the these markets.

It is our job to open doors, to support our private sector in trade and investment initiatives, to diversify our economy and improve our economic performance. Missions such as these are one of the most effective mechanisms to meet these goals.

I table with the statement a report on some of the meetings that we held and the follow-up that will be taking place. Hopefully within a month or so, Mr. Speaker, I will be able to report on specific initiatives that have occurred, at that time, as the follow-up to our trade mission, and hopefully by the year end have three or four reports on the mission and the specific job opportunities and investment that have resulted as a result of the trip. I would like to table this for hon. members' information.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) are not present, but I will see to it that the information provided the press this morning on our mid-water distance policy and announcements about two new boats being built will be tabled for hon. members in a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side would

like to thank the Premier for doing the House the courtesy of giving it some information on the trip. As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) stated at the time the Premier was about to embark on the trip, we believe this kind of undertaking is useful or can be useful. That depends, of course, on how well the homework is done beforehand and how well the follow-up is done after the fact.

I had occasion recently, Mr. Speaker, to be in the company of some people who had been to China just some months after the last trade delegation, led by the now President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), and I have to say to him that the delegation from Metropolitan Toronto were smiling at what they characterized as the naivety of that delegation insofar as matters relating to shipbuilding were concerned. I will not get into the humorous details, but I thought it was a useful insight. We sit here and we have one perspective on what those trips may do, yet, a number of months after the trip the host country was telling, over cocktails, some fairly humorous and not too complimentary stories about the degree to which that delegation had done its homework.

Now, I just mention that in passing, Mr. Speaker, because I do not want, and I say this sincerely, in any way to detract from what the Premier has done today. I know him well for many years and I know that if he undertook this kind of trip he did it with the proper homework having been done. I do hope, and I say this sincerely on behalf of my colleagues in the Opposition, that the results of his trip will be seen and that he will follow

through in his undertaking to keep the House informed as to the detail, the substance of what might flow from this trip.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any further statements by ministers?

I would like, at this stage, to welcome to the visitor's gallery four high school students from Port Rexton with their teacher, Larry McCarthy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

My question was supposed to be to the Minister of Fisheries, but since he is not in his seat again this afternoon, I will have to direct it to the hon. the Premier, and it concerns the information on the middle distance fleet that was released this morning in the press conference. I would like to ask the Premier where the quotas are going to be obtained for the middle distance fleet and in what areas they are going to be fished.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am sorry. Could you repeat the question?

MR. EFFORD:

Yes. Concerning the middle distance fleet that was announced in the press release this morning, I would like to ask the Premier

where the quotas are going to be obtained for this fleet, in what areas they are going to be fished.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the fish is now available from the Northern cod stock. Under the allocation system that was brought in by the federal government a number of years ago, a number of the companies went under what was called an enterprise allocation system whereby they were given a quota, FPI, National Sea and others, and then the foreigners. That is where Harbour Grace, for example, Ocean Harvesters, have their allocation. It is out of the others category of the categories under the allocation system.

At the same time, the Province pushed to ensure that there was not a quota as it related to the inshore fishery and, therefore, the federal government indicated that they would agree that there should be no specific quota put on the inshore fishery but they would call it an allocation so that it could float up or down from time to time and you did not have to stick specifically to a given number of tons. They put that at 120,000 metric tons. Ever since that allocation came in we have not, in Newfoundland, caught 120,000 metric tons. As a matter of fact, this year we are going to be as low as 70,000 metric tons. I think that is the latest figure. So there are 50,000 metric tons of fish swimming in the water that could have been caught and could have saved our inshore fishery this year from the kind of disaster that it was faced with, leading to the Fisheries

Response Programme and all the rest of it.

At the same time, in meetings with the federal government and the Eastern Provinces, it became clear that the North Shore of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and P.E.I. started to say to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, 'How come we cannot catch some of this fish? Newfoundlanders never caught it, therefore, we should be allowed to catch it.' So there is a great pressure upon the federal government to suddenly start eroding away our allocation of fish.

So, number one, we are bringing in the middle distance fleet to complement the inshore fishery, to ensure that we catch at least 120,000 metric tons, which we have never caught per year yet. If you look at the last four or five years, there were opportunities for us to be able to catch it but we never had the capacity or the capability to do so.

Secondly, in a year when there is a glut situation in the inshore fishery - for example, Trinity Bay might have lots of fish but St. Mary's Bay might not have any, and we have heard those gory stories of fishermen having to dump their fish - what we want to do is have the capacity so that if there is a glut in one area and there is fish going to be dumped, instead of dumping it back in the water it will be dumped in the middle distance fleet, or in those boats, it will be brought to St. Mary's Bay where they do not have any fish.

So the fish is going to come, in the first instance, from the Northern cod stock which has a surplus of fish there under our

allocation, which we have never caught and, secondly, in glut periods we can also assist the inshore fishery, ensuring that none of the fish is dumped if, in fact, the glut does occur. So that is the main thrust of the programme today, Mr. Speaker.

Thirdly, because the inshore fishery is only a Summer fishery, or from May to October or November or whatever, we are also looking at the Winter season, in the January, February, March area, and we are looking in the 3N-0. We have already had meetings with Mr. Siddon and his predecessor regarding allocations of some of the species that are now not underutilized, for example, redfish. There is a great market for redfish, and we can catch more redfish.

So we are looking to get allocations for underutilized species. The fish is swimming in the water not being caught. If we can get a market for it, then we can fish those underutilized species in the Wintertime.

Fourthly, we are also looking for a specific allocation in the 3NO area in the Wintertime. So, if we can get that kind of broad sweep to our allocation policy, then we will have an extremely viable number of ships to complement the inshore fishery at a time when they do not catch the allocation, to help them in glut periods, when there is too much fish in any one area, to fish underutilized species and, also, to fish some of the fish that is now being caught by foreigners in the 3NO area.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

A very short question, Mr. Speaker, but a very long answer. The next part of my question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). The Premier, in part of his answer, gave me what I wanted to know.

My question today is not really concerning the middle distance fleet, it is concerning the number of boats around this Province which are tied up with no fish to catch, no quotas and nowhere to go. I will you an example of five longliners from Port de Grave whose owners have just received a letter from the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon) in Ottawa saying they are not allowed to go in the 3NO area this year to catch either codfish or halibut.

I just heard the hon. the Premier say that there are going to be quotas out there for the middle distance fleet. Well, these fishermen from the area of Port de Grave have spent at least \$50,000 upgrading their boats and putting the necessary equipment on their boats to go out in this area. Would the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) tell me people from Newfoundland who already have their boats, no expense to the government, are put in this situation while the middle distance fleet, which is going to cost the government millions of dollars, is getting ready to go out there? It does not make sense to me, why this is allowed to go on.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, there is a great fallacy in the hon. gentleman's statement in that the present fleet that is in place in the Province is in place at no expense to the government. I mean, those vessels have been financed through Fisheries Loan Board Programmes and so on, so there is, obviously, a great deal of support by the government in those vessels.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there is an allocation of 750 metric tons in 3NO for a middle distance operation. Those vessels the hon. gentleman is talking about had never, up until last year, fished in the 3NO area. He knows as well as I do that most of them are vessels which had traditionally, over the last few years in any case, engaged in the crab fishery.

As a result of the failure in the crab fishery, last year a number of those vessels started to prosecute the halibut fishery in 3NO. The halibut fishery in the right season, Mr. Speaker, with an appropriate by-catch of cod, is a very good effort and one that the federal Department of Fisheries gave allocations and licenses for. The problem, of course, is when those vessels and others want to continue to fish under the guise of a halibut fishery when it is not a halibut fishery and instead of a 90/10 by-catch of halibut/cod it becomes the other way around. The federal officials, in doing their groundfish management plan this year, did not include any special allocation for those vessels in 3NO, but from the point of view of

the middle distance fishery, Mr. Speaker, there is an allocation of 750 metric tons in that area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not against the middle distance fleet, I am not making any objection to it. My question is we have a number of boats in Newfoundland which are fully equipped. I agree with the Minister of Fisheries that they were put there with the help of financing from Fisheries, or whatever, but the point is the boats are there, they are crewed, they are equipped and they have right now, as far as the provincial and the federal governments are concerned, no place to go and nobody cares.

Now, the next point I want to make is that until boats from Port de Grave went to the 3NO area, boats from Nova Scotia fished out there with absolutely no objection. Why is it this objection occurred only after the Newfoundland boats went out there? If we can allocate an area out there for the middle distance fleet, why is we cannot allocate an area out there for those people in Newfoundland who are willing to go out there at their own risk and at their own expense? Why does he not do this immediately?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman fails to realize, and I guess he is deliberately failing to realize it, is that the middle distance effort in this Province will be based largely on resources available to it in 2J3KL. We would never develop a middle distance fishery in this Province with the fishing activity that we

know is going on in 3NO, whether it is Canadian effort, foreign effort, Cuban effort, Korean effort or whatever. We would never be so senseless as to try to develop, until the proper jurisdictional issues are settled, a middle distance fishery based solely on 3NO quotas. The fact of the matter is, there are 7,000 metric tons of fish available to this fleet in 2J3KL that those vessels the hon. gentlemen is talking about have not caught traditionally or cannot, because of distance and capability, catch. So to round out the season, to make those vessels viable, we also have an allocation for them in 3NO. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are two different things.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The people of Port de Grave are traditional fishermen, they know nothing else but fishing. I would like to ask the minister if he is going to ensure that those five longliners from the area of Port de Grave - I will say again, they are equipped and crewed to go out on the Grand Banks fishing - will have a place to go out there this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not need any lectures from the hon. gentleman on the great fishermen who come from the Port de Grave area of this Province, that is traditional and historic and they certainly

have been great fishermen. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, because of the failure of the crab fishery, a number of vessels out in that area fished in 3NO for the first time last year. That has nothing to do with the allocation which has been in 3NO for the last two or three years for the middle distance operation.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary to the Minister of Fisheries. In light of the fears that have been expressed by inshore fishermen, as expressed at their meeting in Clarenville last weekend representing, I believe, about 15,000 inshore fishermen, has the minister met with the Fishermen's Union President or any other representatives of the inshore fishing sector to allay their fear that the middle distance fishery as proposed by government will not have the effect of ruining their fishery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, in the statement I made today I indicated that I have had a number of meetings with the President of the Fishermen's Union on the development of the middle distance concept. The Fishermen's Union is, as I understand it, very unequivocally in favour of the development of a middle distance fleet of vessels in this Province. I know the hon. gentleman is correct to a degree, that there is some fear, some misapprehension, but the fact of

the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the middle distance fleet we will develop in this Province is not meant to in any way jeopardize the inshore fishery or the inshore fishing effort in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, no doubt, in speaking for the fishermen who met recently in Clarenville, will also be interested in the interests of fishermen in his own district. I recall reading a letter from him on just Saturday or Sunday, when I was in my office, in which he very highly recommends to me a fishing skipper in Twillingate who wants to get one of those boats.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, maybe there are several ministers to whom I could direct this question, but I will start off with the Minister of Social Services. I expect the minister is aware of efforts by his federal colleagues to again tinker with the social security system of Canada, and I refer specifically to UIC regulations as they affect pensions. As the minister knows, pensions are now considered to be income. They never were, and I refer specifically to ex-policemen, ex-military personnel, ex-firefighters and this type, people who retire early. Now that their pension is counted as income, of course, this drastically affects their UIC. The amount of benefit they would get would be their UIC minus their pension and, in some cases, this would be very little, sometimes it

would be none at all.

As the minister knows, this has created quite a rift with the federal government in Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member is making a speech. Maybe he would ask his question.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I was getting to the question. In view of the fact that his colleagues, Mr. Clark and Mr. Nielsen, have made strong representation to Miss MacDonald to have these rules changed, I wonder where the minister and his government sit, whether it is with Mr. Clark and Mr. Nielsen who see the injustice of this situation, or whether it is with Miss MacDonald, who seems to be callous and insensitive to this situation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, that is strictly a federal problem and I certainly would not be involved in it. However, I would suggest to the hon. member that somebody who had worked for thirty years as a policeman, or thirty years as a teacher or in any other profession, or anybody who worked anywhere long enough to qualify for a pension, it is most unlikely that a person like that would be coming to one of our offices looking for assistance. So, really, you know, the chance that that would have any affect on the type of person who would come to us for help is practically negligible.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister does not understand the issue, he does not understand that this affects thousands of people in this Province who have geared their living accordingly, working four and five months, six and seven months and then applying for UIC. This was a right they earned, this was a right they were given under the legislation of Canada, and now, all of a sudden, the rug has been pulled out from under them in mid stream, without any warning, so has the minister made any representation to Ottawa regarding this unfair and unjust situation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

I would suggest to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that any representation on the part of this government would certainly not be made by the Minister of Social Services. I would not be involved in that sort of thing.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, how times have changed! A couple of years ago, everybody in the Province would know what is going on with respect to this great injustice, this great unjust treatment of people who retire early, ex-military personnel, ex-policemen,

ex-firefighters and the like, people who retire in their mid-forties, who then go to work and who, when they get laid off, have been entitled to receive UI. As I said, it has become a way of life, these people expect that.

I will put the question to the Premier: The Premier certainly must be aware of this situation and aware of the rift that it has caused with the federal government in Ottawa. I now ask the Premier whether he has made representation on behalf of the thousands of people affected in this Province and, if he has not, whether he intends to make representation to protect the rights of the thousands of people in this Province who had been protected under the UIC regulations ever since we have had UIC.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, from time to time over the last year through the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), because a lot of the pension policy comes under both their departments, we have been making representation to the federal government as to changes that they might be contemplating. So to answer the hon. member's question, yes, we have made representation over the last year to the federal government indicating our concerns if they were to move in a certain direction, which it now seems they are going to move in, and not only the Province of Newfoundland has, but a lot of the provinces of Canada have.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. On Friday, I presented a petition on behalf of 120 part-time employees of the Department of Forestry from the Bay d'Espoir area. These people have been working with the Department of Forestry from seven to thirteen years. The Premier is aware, I am sure, that the rate of unemployment in the Bay d'Espoir area of my district is 90 per cent. I say to the Premier, if these people who are going to be laid off were residents of an urban area of Newfoundland, such as St. John's or Grand Falls or Corner Brook, there would be action taken by the provincial government, we might even see a royal commission, but because they are in Bay d'Espoir, the government seems to have forgotten them.

I now ask the Premier what he is going to do for the 120 people who have been laid off in the Bay d'Espoir area by the Department of Forestry?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me put this in context. The situation in Bay d'Espoir is, five or six years ago, or more, we proposed to the federal government a particular programme in the forestry to deal with trees, spruce and fir - mostly balsam fir but some black spruce as well - which had been ravaged by the spruce budworm. If

this wood was not cut, it would not be salvagable and merchantable and we would lose the value of that resource. So we entered into an agreement with the federal government for what was called a FESP programme, we immediately hired people, and Bay d'Espoir was one of the areas.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. member that he might think, and I am glad he does think, that perhaps his district is the only district in Newfoundland, but there was a FESP programme not only in Bay d'Espoir but in other parts of the Province, including my own constituency. So I want to say to the hon. gentleman, because I think he is once again raising that ugly emotive thing as hon. members have a habit of doing lately, trying to put the bay against the city, or trying to show that somehow we are not doing something for rural Newfoundland, that it was not just Bay d'Espoir which was involved here, the Northern Peninsula was, as well. There were many areas of Newfoundland, my own constituency, the Great Northern Peninsula, Central Newfoundland, and Southwestern Newfoundland, involved in this programme. This FESP programme is now expired, and it was through this FESP programme that the 120 in Bay d'Espoir were hired. Now we have tried in the last three or four months to have this kind of programme qualify under the Job Strategy Programme. Unfortunately, the rules of the Job Strategy Programme are such that you take on other people, not people who now have expertise in silviculture and in the FESP programme; they have to be unemployed or they have to have all of their UIC run out. Most of these 120 people do not, so they

are not in that category. We do have a problem in the hon. member's district, but we have the same problem in other areas of the Province as well.

I want to say to the hon. member that we are not ignoring Bay d'Espoir or trying to discriminate against Bay d'Espoir. The mere fact that we have put our salmon hatchery there and are trying to develop an aquaculture industry in Bay d'Espoir is evidence of the fact that we are not trying to ignore Bay d'Espoir.

We tried through the Job Strategy Programme to get an exception made so that the 120 would get on. We have already made representation on behalf of those 120 people to have an exception made in the job strategy programme because of the unique situation relative to the FESP Programme, for Bay d'Espoir as well as for other areas in the Province. The federal government has refused to relax the job strategy programme in this particular area to allow it to occur because they say once you do it for one you have to do it all over the country. So we are back to the federal government now trying to get a new FESP programme established, or some facsimile thereof, to ensure that we can re-employ those people on the kind of programme they had.

So rather than doing nothing, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) has been extremely busy. He came to me last week about it, and briefed me on what he had done to try to get the programme going again. When he did not get that programme going again, he was back with an application to the ministry in Ottawa to get an additional FESP programme so that

we can continue to employ those people, as the hon. member would like to have happen.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Again to the Premier. I asked him what he was going to do for these people, but the answer he gave was they changed the Canada Job Strategy Programme. Now, I understand that this is a partnership between the Bay d'Espoir Development Association and the Department of Forest Resources and Lands. My information to this point is that there has been one project approved creating ten jobs. Now, there are 1,800 unemployed in Bay d'Espoir but there are 120 we are talking about right now. Can he tell me he is going to look after those people, or are they going to join the ranks of the unemployed in Bay d'Espoir?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I cannot absolutely give that commitment because it is not in my purview to do. If I could I would. But I am sure the hon. member does not expect me to categorically stand up here today and say, "I have 120 jobs for those 120 people." If he does expect me to do that, then I should be able to do it for the 35,000 or 40,000 people who are unemployed in Newfoundland. Obviously, I cannot do that. I would like to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member

brought up, first of all, the 120 on the FESP programme. Now, when I went back and replied to him and indicated that we were doing something, he changed his tune and got on to the Job Strategy and the fact they only have one project approved. Now, let us separate the two: We are doing something for the 120, we are trying to get a new FESP programme for them, and we will use every measure we have, all the energy we have to persuade the Minister of Forestry to get that going so we can re-employ those 120.

Now, let us get on to the Job Strategy Programme: On the Job Strategy, all I can say to the hon. member is I do not know how many applications are in from Bay d'Espoir. Hopefully there are 30 or 40. I do not know why only one has been approved. I am sure the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) will take a look at it as a result of the hon. member's question. But if there is only one approved in an area of high unemployment, obviously we have to do something to see why there was only one approved. So we will undertake to find out why there is such a scarce number of applications approved in Bay d'Espoir and if there is any way we can approve more to provide more jobs, we will do it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health. Certain fears have been expressed by people in the St. Lawrence area as to the future of their hospital. Following a trip to the area of St. Lawrence over

the weekend by the Social Policy Committee, is the minister now able to assure the House and the people of St. Lawrence that the hospital in St. Lawrence, built there by the U.S. Government as a memorial to the lives of people who were drowned in a vessel accident in the area, will not be closed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, yes, we did visit the Northwest Coast over the weekend. We met with the council in Grand Bank, with the council in St. Lawrence, and with the Concerned Citizens' Committee of the hospital in Grand Bank and in St. Lawrence. We also met with people of the group interfaith home. The hospital subject matter was discussed in detail and I will give you the answer I was able to give them at that particular time: No final decision has been made by government to close or open either one of the hospitals in Grand Bank or in St. Lawrence.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

While we are on that topic, Mr. Speaker, the people in the Come By Chance/Arnold's Cove/Sunnyside area are wondering about the future of their cottage hospital in view of the new hospital opening in Clarenville. Mr. Speaker, by way of preamble, if I can refresh the minister's memory, he promised that he would have a new decision for people in the Come By Chance area early in

January, or at least in January. We are now into February. Let me ask the minister a twofold question: Number one, when does he expect that decision will be available to the people and, number two, will the minister also take the Social Policy Committee of government to that area? Just before Christmas it went to Clarenville, in recent days it went to the Burin Peninsula, where the future of a cottage hospital is a stake, when will the minister be meeting with the Social Policy Committee of government and the people in Come By Chance to hopefully announce a favourable decision?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

I have never, and I repeat, never made any commitment that I would introduce into this House or say anywhere whatsoever that we had decided to reconsider the application of the Come By Chance hospital. If you can direct me to where it is, I will be pleased to look it up and discuss the subject matter. At no time have I ever done so.

With regard to the Social Policy Committee going to Come By Chance, that is a decision for the Social Policy Committee. I cannot commit myself as one member of that group, it has to be discussed with the other members of Social Policy and with the Chairman of Social Policy.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, in a supplementary to the Minister of Health, I quote from a letter he received in January. It says: "Your interest in our cause is encouraging. We welcome your new decision and we are looking forward to a positive future for Come By Chance hospital." Now, this letter is from the Health Services Action Committee in Come By Chance, so the minister did make a commitment to them. Let me ask the minister again, when does he intend to meet with the committee at Come By Chance?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. SIMMS:

Did they ask for a meeting.

MR. DOYLE:

Not with Social Policy they have not.

DR. TWOMEY:

You asked about the social policy?

MR. CALLAN:

The minister himself.

DR. TWOMEY:

I have met with them I believe on a number of occasions, I spoke to them on the phone, I cannot even remember how many letters I have sent, and they are similar to the extract that you have taken from that particular letter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Government House Leader, who happens to be the oil boss at the same time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Husky-Bow Valley -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I wonder if the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) would consider rephrasing his question? Instead of calling the hon. member for St. John's East the oil boss, I would much prefer he called him the energy czar.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. They are trying to eat up my time, as you can see.

Robert Blair, Husky Oil Limited President, indicated recently that this was a company, or two companies together, Husky-Bow Valley, which had ten drilling permits off the Scotia Shelf and the Grand Banks and they had written commitments that these ten wells would be drilled. Sometime in November, they were quite taken aside by the Energy Minister in Ottawa (Mrs. Carney) and encouraged in strong terms to lower their expectations to seven wells. Two months after that, they found out that the PIP grants would apply to only two of their wells, in effect devastating their drilling programme, and since January they have been trying to

get their drilling programme back to where it should be. Now, my question to the minister is simply this: What kind of input has the minister had into these kinds of decisions having to do with drilling permits? Since last November, what kind of input has he had into the reduction of wells that are being permitted to be drilled under the PIP programme by this Canadian company?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, nobody is trying to eat into the hon. member's time. We are not even trying to eat into the hon. member. He is doing a good job eating himself up in the position he has been taking in this Province in the past couple of weeks. He talks about ten drilling wells. Now, are we concerned about the wells? I gather we are concerned about the wells off Newfoundland and not off Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman seemed to be a bit concerned about Nova Scotia, as well, but we will confine our concerns to Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, hon. gentlemen there opposite have a very unusual philosophy.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, is he going to answer that question or not?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen think that PIP discovers oil. As a matter of fact, I think they thought at one time that Mr. Chrétien and Mr. Lalonde and PIP discovered oil. It is not PIP,

Mr. Speaker, at all. What it is is the prospect of a discovery out there, where it is a most prospective area. I am very happy to tell the hon. gentleman that the most prospective area for offshore development in North America today, if not in the world, is off the East Coast of Newfoundland. It is the Grand Banks of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

I am sure he shares the happiness of all Newfoundlanders, as well, to know that all of this will be developed on the basis of the Atlantic Accord, joint management and revenues as if they were on land. So it is not PIP that creates oil and gas. As a matter of fact, it happens to be the Almighty who has created oil and gas and the Almighty has deposited oil and gas off the Grand Banks.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not privy directly to Mr. Blair's statements that he made to The Globe And Mail and that the hon. gentleman is quoting, but I will say to hon. gentlemen there opposite that the federal government has come in with a very beneficial, imaginative and forthright energy programme which cleared out the old National Energy Policy which was an anathema to this country and which caused the country's economic activity, in part, to ground to a halt.

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The hon. minister is once again, as I mentioned earlier, trying to kill time and eat up the time of Question Period. Mr. Speaker, already a member on this side has been told to get to the point, get to asking his question. Mr. Speaker, these hon. gentlemen over there can go on and on and on not talking about the question at all but going on with their speculations, going back through history, getting into personalities, and doing everything but answering the questions. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should either answer the question or sit down and let me get to another one.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. Actually the time for Oral Questions has elapsed, but maybe the hon. the President of the Council would like to just sum it up.

MR. MARSHALL:

If the gentleman would like me to answer, I will conclude my answer.

MR. BAKER:

According to the Speaker, has not the time for answers also elapsed?

MR. SPEAKER:

I did say that maybe the hon. the President of the Council would like a short period just to sum up. He was in the middle of an answer.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman does not want the answer I will not give it to him. Do you want it or not?

MR. BAKER:

You have already had about three minutes to answer that one.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, they do not want it, Mr. Speaker. That is fine! That is great!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if they do not want the answers, they should not ask for them.

MR. BAKER:

We should not ask you, obviously.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome to the gallery a group from Marystown Shipyard Ltd., Leo Walsh, the President of the union, Bill Mayo, Garry Brenton, and Bern Hardy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

Petitions

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from 132 residents of Ramea. The prayer of the petition is: "We, the undersigned, take issue with

the Department of Forest Resources and Lands over having to pay \$75 per year for a permit to occupy Crown Lands at White Bear Bay. We protest for the following reasons: One, the cabins are recreational cabins, and due to weather and ice conditions can only be used for a maximum of six months each year; Two, the provincial government gives no service to the area, for example, no roads, insect control, forest fire protection, or monitoring; Three, the area can only be reached by boat or aircraft which is very costly, another added expense for the residents of Ramea; and Four, the cost of a permit to occupy has been increased from \$25 to \$75 a year. Please petition the provincial government on our behalf to have the permit to occupy fee reduced to \$10 per year."

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious petition for the people who live in Ramea, because, firstly, it is their only physical connection with the Island of Newfoundland. These cabins were not built there yesterday. It is their recreational area. For anyone who has ever been to Ramea, they will know there is very little land suitable for a recreational area on the Island of Ramea. Down through the years, since 1960 when those cabins were put there, this has been the area where they go to fish, to have their Summer holidays and things like that. It seems to me, officials should realize that this is the only physical connection they have.

Because of the economic conditions in the area, some of the people who have cabins there now are seriously considering selling their cabins. They just cannot

afford to use them because they cannot afford to continue to pay the permit that is now being asked.

It is the only recreation area for the majority of residents of Ramea. In other words, by increasing the cost of permits, we are having a way of life denied to many of the residents of Ramea. It is another example a cutting back on the rights of an outpost Newfoundlander. In an isolated area like this, it is the only recreational area, as I say, that they have.

I would support this petition and ask the minister to adhere to their request and lower the permit in this particular case, in this isolated area where it is not going to be developed. You have no worry about people rushing in there to get permits. It is only someone who lives in Ramea and has the access to go by boat to get there who would be there. It would be too expensive for other Newfoundlanders.

In view of this, I would ask the minister to adhere to the request and reduce the required fee to \$10.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

I will just briefly address the petition. I wish I had seen a copy of it or something beforehand, or the individuals in question had made some representation to me before or earlier. I certainly would have had a chance to look into it. I would hasten to add that the permit fees that the hon. member

is referring to, of course, are permit fees that are standardized throughout the Province. It does not just apply to the residents of Ramea. That may have been a message that he perhaps may have tried to pass on there, but that is not accurate.

In the case of Crown Lands generally speaking, I think the Department of Forest Resources and Lands over the last couple of years, in particular, under the leadership of my colleague, the former minister, has made considerable strides in improving the situation with respect to Crown Land and Crown Land applications. A lot of these situations that you deal with are situations that have developed over the years and have existed for years. What we have been trying to do is legalize as many of them as we can because a lot of them have been there illegally, in fact. So there are a number of things that we have been trying to do.

In the case of the situation that he describes in Ramea, I would be quite happy to take his petition as representation and have the matter looked into. But, I again hasten to add, the fees that are charged to the people of Ramea who have these cottages are the same as the fees charged everywhere else in the Province.

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

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I wonder if the hon. members opposite for ten seconds would allow me to revert to Answers to

Questions?

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on the petition.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Oh, you want to go on on the petition. Okay. Sorry.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition and I will put two points to the minister, very briefly. One: we support the idea of cost recovery in these matters. That leads me immediately to the point that this is not a cost recovery issue because these lots have been identified as belonging or being used by these people from Ramea for some years. It is a question of somebody in the office doing minimal paperwork, if anything at all. So the administrative cost to the government is very, very minimal. It is not as though you are going into Deer Park on the Burin Peninsula or somewhere else and creating new lots at substantial surveying and other planning costs. There is no cost involved here. Somebody has just jacked the fee from twenty-five to -

MR. SIMMS:
It is not only for places like Ramea.

MR. SIMMONS:
Yes. That is the point I am coming to. Perhaps the minister ought to give thought to a graduated set of fees. I do not think the present system is fair to the person who is using White Bear Bay, at some difficulty. He

has got to get there by boat. It is not an area that has a lot of utility. He cannot drive there every evening after work in his car. I put it to him that in that context it is a very different recreational lot than the fellow in Grand Falls has on the Badger Lakes, for example. The utility is quite different and you do not have the same concerns about cost recovery. Perhaps he ought to give some thought to a graduated set of fees which would take into account the concerns of the people from Ramea.

I do not think the intent of this programme is to make money off those people but to recover any costs that are involved. I say to him that the seventy-five dollars is recovering a lot more than the cost that is involved in issuing that bit of paper to give a person the appropriate permit. I support the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier, on a point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, all I want to do is table two ministerial statements given by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and the Minister of Development (Mr. Barrett) this morning so that hon. members will have copies on the middle distance thing.

Thirdly, I want to reply to a question that was asked a couple of days ago about the fishing vessel subsidy programme. One of the members asked me, perhaps the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), and I wanted to reply to him. I

said I would reply on Friday and I should have, but I forgot about it. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) had contacted the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa expressing his concern over any reduction in it in a telex and asks that at least a component on the replacement of vessels be reconsidered so that the subsidy would stay on that. We are waiting to hear back from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) on that.

Fourthly, in Question Period today, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) said he had one project in his area. I have just got some facts. There is one fisheries project approved for \$18,000 and a Jobs Strategy Programme in your district. There has been \$489,000 expended. I do not know how much of that went to Bay d'Espoir.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) three years?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no. There is in the Jobs Strategy Programme to date \$489,000 approved for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir and \$18,000 under a fisheries programme.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

I said there was one project approved in the forestry programme for ten jobs. For the rest of the district, I do not know. I have not got a list, but there is one forestry project for ten jobs. There was only one applied for, as

far as I know, through the Department of Forestry.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two hon. members. Secondly, and more importantly, the hon. member is getting on his feet saying there is only one forestry project approved and goes on to say there was only one applied for. Well, how could you have more approved?

MR. TULK:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

What the hon. gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) has said, and the Premier well knows what he is talking about, is the negligence of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) in this Province, yes, the inability or the incompetence of that minister to get a forestry agreement or a FESP agreement with the federal minister in Ottawa. What he is saying is that nothing has happened in this Province since the minister took office, since we have had a PC government in Ottawa and, as a result of that, he has 120 people laid off in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir. He wants to know what the Premier is going to do about it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

What we are going to do about it is to see that over \$500,000 is spent in Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir this Winter to help job creation. That is what we are doing about it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

There is no point of order. It was actually irregular to bring this matter up at this stage.

Are there any further petitions?

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 22, Bill No. 59.

It was ruled on Friday that the hon. member for Bonavista-North (Mr. Lush) should conclude his remarks and I suggest he would have two minutes to conclude his remarks. That would be by leave from both sides.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

It is my understanding that the ruling that was given from the Chair on Friday was that unless there was some objection given to members speaking, they would be allowed to continue. Are we now reverting to a position where we are having the Speaker set time limits or telling the government side what they can or cannot do? To set a time limit of two minutes, in my opinion, is

completely contrary to what was ruled here on Friday. As a matter of fact, what was said was that since there was no objection given to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and we had agreed to have leave to go as long as was necessary for people to explain their points, unless there was objection received from the government side or from our side, if there was a government member speaking, then there would be no interruption. Now Your Honour is saying to the Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) that he has two minutes. What rules are we to abide by? Are we going to have the Speaker at some point say, "cut it off, you are finished and somebody else can go on longer?" It seems to me that that is not the way to go, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would like to quote from the Hansard of Friday the remarks of the Deputy Chairman of Committees. At the time he concluded his remarks by saying, 'I therefore would rule that the member for Bonavista North should wind up his speech.' I suggested that by leave he would have two minutes and I suggested that he have two minutes.

MR. TULK:
On a point of order Mr. Speaker, let me say in all fairness to Your Honour, you are saying he should have leave of the other side and yet, at the same time, you yourself are limiting that leave. Now either there is an objection from the other side that the hon. member be disallowed leave, that he not be allowed to continue, or he goes on.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon member for St. John's North to that point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:
I will supply an objection if he wants one. Mr. Speaker, I object to the hon. member having any more time. He has had far to much.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, two points: First, I would have hoped that the earlier understanding would have prevailed, that we had just a little more time. I am not sure we need unlimited time in all cases but maybe a bit more than a half hour. This is an important issue. The government has said so and we believe so, and I say two things to the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall). First, in responding to this point of order, he might consider some latitude on the matter as it effects all members yet to speak.

Secondly, I say to the Government House Leader my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) was operating under the assumption that he had unlimited time and, in that context, I say to him that two minutes might be a bit restrictive. He has indicated to me that if he had about ten minutes, he could pull his argument together and conclude.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

To that point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I want to welcome the comments made by the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) and I want to say to the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that we do not operate the House in the way that he did. His words, Mr. Speaker, were tinged with questions of Your Honour as well. You do not get up and challenge Your Honour from the floor of this House at any time or any place, otherwise the whole system brakes down.

What had happened as a result of the ruling is that the Standing Orders are to be applied, unless leave is given. So it is thirty minutes per person. But I think that what the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has said is appropriate, that the hon. gentleman was proceeding on as if he had unlimited time, so certainly, but we would want him to draw his remarks to an end within ten minutes or otherwise we will invoke the rule to give somebody else a chance.

MR. W. CARTER:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

When the hon. the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) introduced the bill on Monday past in the House he said this is probably the most important piece of legislation that has ever been presented to this House. That was the statement he made.

Mr. Speaker, now the same hon. member is up objecting to members having enough time to express their views on this legislation.

DR. COLLINS:

That has all been dealt with.

MR. W. CARTER:

That has not been dealt with. We are dealing with it now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, surely a piece of legislation that by the House Leader's own admission is the most important bill ever brought before this House should mean members would have the right to get up and to express his views on that legislation without being restricted by a thirty-minute time limit, especially in view of the fact that the ground rules were laid out Friday when the minister introduced the bill at first reading. It was clearly understood by my colleague, all by of us, and obviously by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), that there would be unlimited time in this debate.

So the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is a piece of legislation is billed as being the most important act to be brought before this House and now we are being denied the right to speak on it, certainly for a period beyond thirty minutes.

MR. MARSHALL:

Your Honour has ruled on that but I would like to speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I do not want the hon. gentlemen there opposite to try to depict the government as being dictatorial. We have tried to show that we are not that in response to a reasonable point brought up by the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons).

I just want to say this, there never was an agreement. When I got up and asked for sufficient time to introduce the bill, the Opposition's request was, 'I suppose we will be given the same by way of response' and certainly, by way of response, that time was granted. The person they chose to respond was the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), the energy critic. I never got up in the House and asked that all members of this House be given unlimited time. In any event, that is beside the point, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is that we will give the ten minutes for the hon. gentleman and then anyone can get up and they can speak for their thirty minutes. If they say something that is extremely interesting and want to go on, I am quite sure both sides of the House would consider that speaker at the time as to whether they want to hear them continue. Those are the rules.

The hon. gentleman was here on Friday and he knows what transpired. He should really, I think, be more concerned with what occurred on Friday from the point of view of the assault against the institutions of this House, but let us hope now that we can proceed on this debate in a

different framework than had occurred on Friday. We will hear what the hon. gentleman has to say now.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have heard enough on that point of order.

The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has ten minutes to conclude his speech by agreement and by leave of the House. All other hon. members, according to our Standing Orders, will have a half hour to speak.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank hon. members. As one knows when you have geared yourself to a certain time that it makes things rather difficult to switch in midstream and to finish up in two minutes, so I thank hon. members.

Mr. Speaker, in the last session I was really finishing up my remarks and was recapitulating what I have said, putting it into shorter form to make sure that everybody understood the essence of the points I was making. Mr. Speaker, what I had said really could be summarized in two points. One was that I had said that due to the fact that the Premier had made a political football out of the Atlantic Accord, we had lost a lot of time. I demonstrated the fact that the Premier had made a political football out of this by having three elections, 1979, 1982 and 1985. If that was not a lot of electioneering and making a political football out of an issue, I do not know what was.

In 1982, prior to that election, not only was the election called

on the offshore but the Premier then had made the biggest mistake that he has ever made by putting the offshore ownership issue to the provincial court, and we lost there, and to the Supreme Court, and we lost there. That, Mr. Speaker, gave us a weak hand. That weakened our position. Hence, when the Premier came to 1985 to negotiate a deal with his colleagues of the same political stripe, it really did not become a negotiated settlement. It was the one that was forced upon the Premier by his colleagues in Ottawa because he had bungled the whole affair. Through the Premier making this a political football, we had lost considerable time and, with that went a loss of revenues to the Province, a loss of jobs, and a loss of opportunities that will never be able to be retrieved. Also during that time, Mr. Speaker, we lost valuable time with respect to training our people so that they would be well equipped to be able to take whatever opportunities were offered by the offshore. We have lost that opportunity.

So this loss of time, Mr. Speaker, was crucial. It meant a lost opportunity, a loss of revenues to the Province, a loss of income to the Province, a loss of jobs and a loss of training time. That is what is so important, Mr. Speaker, that we lost all of this time through the Premier's politicking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:

Hon. members seem like they want to joke and want to make games out of this. The Premier completely caved in on this one, Mr. Speaker. Where he started off with ownership, it was a complete

caving in. It was a complete capitulation. This is what it was.

One side issue here was in 1982 or 1983, when we lost the court case provincially and then it went to the Supreme Court. Mr. Crosbie sort of shook it off and said, "We do not care what the Supreme Court said. We are going to give Newfoundland ownership," and Mr. Mulroney supported him. But what did it come down to? Mr. Speaker, it was not ownership.

MR. TOBIN:

We got better.

MR. LUSH:

No, it was not better. I do not have the time but my colleagues will prove that we do not have ownership. The deal is not the same as if we had ownership, not even close.

Mr. Speaker, the first point then was the great loss to us that came about as a result of the Premier playing politics with this issue for six or seven years for his own political advancement.

The last point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this agreement, like every other agreement that government has entered into with a company, has one major weakness. It has got the imperfection of all major industrial agreements that this Province made has. The major weakness, of course, is that we are going to be relegated to producing raw material only. We are just going to be exporting raw crude oil. We will not get into the secondary refining or the petro-chemical manufacturing. We are just going to be shippers of raw crude oil. This agreement has relegated us, Mr. Speaker, to be primary producers of a raw material. That is what this

agreement has done. So, Mr. Speaker, that, in substance, is what I have to say.

I will just conclude by saying, I think it was the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) on Friday, the last day of the session, when we got into the kerfuffle about unlimited time, made some reference to the fact that I was saying nothing anyway and that I had said nothing. I want the member to know and I want it to go into the record that I was responding in substance to his speech and you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

The member for St. John's East spend three parts of his time trying to put down the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), Mr. Speaker, by innuendo. That, in itself, I said must have told us how little content, how little advantage was in this Atlantic Accord or in this Bill 59, as we now call it, when the member for St. John's East, who was introducing it, could spend three parts of his time trying to ridicule and put down the Leader of the Opposition. That, in itself, should have told us that this contains very little.

Instead of getting down here and telling us what the substance was, to telling us what the price per barrel would be that was going to make production economically viable, he attacked a former minister of energy. He should have told us what the training programme was. He should have told us about the \$34 million that was given here a couple of days

ago and tell the people what types of training specifically was going to be made available and tell our young people what the programmes are so they can get in there now.

I am afraid we will not get in on the ground floor because that should have been done five or six years ago. That programme that was announced here last week should have been announced five or six years ago, then we might be in on the ground floor.

So these are some of the issues that the minister, when he was introducing this bill, should have been addressing instead of trying to put down the Leader of the Opposition. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that in itself should have told us that this bill is not as financially advantageous to the people of this Province, it is not as financially beneficial to the people of this Province as the Premier would like to have done. It represents a capitulation, it represents a caving in from a position of ownership to, "yes, we will take whatever you give us." That is what it boiled down to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, this House has been very indulgent giving the hon. member ten minutes, by leave. By my watch and by that clock, the time is now up.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member's time is up at 4:15. He still has a few minutes left.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So I for one would certainly like to have heard the minister, when he was introducing the bill, give us some specifics in terms of the price per barrel of crude that was going to make it economical for Hibernia to go into production. But the minister responsible for the offshore avoided that deliberately, avoided talking about anything to do with the price per barrel. He did not tell us anything about the royalties and he did not tell us anything about the training and the research. What is going to be the commitment of the companies to training and research. What is their commitment? We have heard about the commitment from the federal government. What is the commitment from the companies?

Mr. Speaker, I think that there are many things in this bill that need to be debated and we intend to debate them, and when my colleagues speak, they will certainly show to hon. members how it is that this bill is not the kind of deal that we would get if we owned the resource. It is vastly different.

We do not have the same kind of control, Mr. Speaker, that Alberta has with respect to its oil development. My colleagues, as they speak, will develop these points and demonstrate that we do not have the same type of control as if we owned the resource. We do not own the resource, we had to capitulate on that point, we caved in. We did not have a strong hand because the Premier put it in the courts and we lost our only ace in

the hole. It was a mistake.

Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for allowing me the extra time. I will now take my place and let hon. members get up and answer some of the questions that I have raised.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Let them answer the questions. Let them tell us. The Minister of Forestry is there taunting me. Maybe he knows the answer. Maybe he knows at what price per barrel it will be economically feasible to develop Hibernia. Is it \$20 a barrel? Maybe he will tell us. The people of Newfoundland need to know that, they want to know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member will conclude his remarks.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I want the Minister responsible for the Offshore, the Minister of Forestry or anybody to respond to the questions that I have raised. Let them tell us about the royalty regime, let them tell us about the price of crude oil and let them tell us about the training programmes. Let them specify. Let them tell us how many refineries there are going to be in this Province. Let them tell us whether or not Come By Chance is going to open. The people of Newfoundland would like to know that and they would like

to hear it today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Having had to listen to the rhetoric and the garbage from the member who took a couple of hours on Friday, I think, to try to make some cheap political points, and having had to listen to him for fifteen or twenty minutes today, I will take a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, or the time that is allotted to me, to make a few brief comments on this very important bill that is before the hon. House.

One of the things I think we should realize at the outset, on such an important bill, is that it is an agreement between the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Government of Canada. Presently, it is before this hon. House, as likewise, it will be before the House of Commons in Ottawa. This is a bill dealing with offshore petroleum resource management and revenue sharing. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the parts of this important bill that has failed to be addressed over the past few days.

We have listened to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) a few days ago, saying nothing. He has not committed himself as to where he wants the federal prison,

whether in Windsor or Buchans. He talked about electricity rates and any other thing he could think of except the bill itself.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You start!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Maybe you want the prison.

MR. PEACH:

Well, it would be okay out in Carbonear district, yes.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we should begin with some of the original parts that brought such an important bill into being. Let us go back to only June, 1984, when we saw, Mr. Speaker, an agreement that was reached between both governments and put out to the people of this Province in the form of a news release by the Premier of the Province. At that time, Mr. Speaker, there were quite a number of issues addressed in that somewhat brief but concise press release on the difference between the proposed agreement, which eventually became the Atlantic Accord, and the agreement that had supposedly been reached between the government of this Province and the then Liberal government of the day in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, it was put out in the release in the form of questions and answers. As the member who just took his seat wanted some answers to questions, many of the answers, Mr. Speaker, were outlined in this release. Two of the issues that are addressed on the front page, in fact, in the naming of the bill, were addressed here. The question was: In what ways is this latest deal better, referring to the deal that

originally had been supposedly in place between the two governments of different political stripes.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, to that - Is the deal better? - is yes. In what ways is it different has been very simply outlined. In management, Mr. Speaker, which is the crux of Bill 59, the latest agreement has both governments sharing in management equally with three federal appointees and three provincial appointees, which was not the case in the previous agreement. The last agreement between the Liberal Government in Ottawa at the time and the Conservative Government here in this Province, the one that the members opposite at that time wanted signed for the sake of signing so that they would have, as they thought, input into the signing of this, was no sharing of management at all. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is very important to note.

It is no good for any of the members opposite to get up and deny that that was not the policy, the philosophy and, in fact, the agreement reached by the federal Liberal Government in Ottawa who tried to make a deal with our same Energy Minister that we have today in this Province.

With regard to revenue sharing, the other important component of this Bill 59, the latest agreement that we have, and I refer to the news release, says that revenues will come to the Province at the same level as if the oil and gas were on land. The Province referred to, obviously, was Alberta. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is stated specifically in the Atlantic Accord. It is stated specifically, if the members could read, in Bill 59.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that members opposite cannot read and cannot understand. If they can read, they do not understand what they do read. I am simply referring to three documents: A press release put out in June of 1984; an Atlantic Accord signed in February, 1985; and Bill 59 before the House in February, 1986. It indeed and clearly, Mr. Speaker, shows consistency in what this government wanted and what they got. The agreement that was reached at the time with the federal Liberal Government in Ottawa did not allow for revenues to come to the Province the same as if the oil and gas were on land.

There is no point in the hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the now new leader of his party since his so-called leader has to sit in the galleries today, denying that. We were to get no more revenues from that particular agreement.

It should be also noted, Mr. Speaker - and the member should indeed listen - the agreement that was noted and stated in that release of June, 1984 said that the agreement was in writing. The agreement that we had supposedly reached before was not written down. Mr. Speaker, all of that, since June, 1984 until the point that we have come to here in this hon. House in February, 1986, to be not only written last year in the Atlantic Accord, but to be here before this House in the form of legislation in Bill 59 surely is one reason why the Leader of the Opposition is crying and is sulking. His comments, I think, on Friday past were very clear that he is hurting and today we saw him sit in the gallery.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I know that wherever the Leader of the Opposition is, if he is listening, he is trembling in his shoes to listen to the hon. gentleman attack him. But I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that if he wants the trembling of the Leader of the Opposition to take place, he should have at least had the courtesy of waiting until the hon. gentleman is here and then attack him, and let him have it tit for tat. We will see who gets the tit and who gets the tat. I suggest it will be the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach).

Mr. Speaker, it is the lowest form of life, similar only to what you would get from the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) because he stood in this House for an hour and a half or two hours and we heard nothing out of him only bile and poison, whatever he could throw out of him. I suppose the hon. gentleman for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) is taking a lesson from him. I would suggest to them that with this great so-called bill that they have here they should be more like statesmen and get out of the mud and out of the gutter.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon gentleman only has thirty minutes and I do not think it is necessary for spurious points of order to be made. I say that if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is out of the House today it is entirely and completely his own doing and to his own shame for derogating the rules of this House.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is being relevant to the debate. The history of this transaction is just as relevant as the transaction itself. He should be allowed to continue.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. I take it if the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) wishes to abide by the suggestion of the hon. member, it is up to the hon. member.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is obvious that on Friday the Leader of the Opposition was hurting from the comments that were being made, because of the facts of the Atlantic Accord. It is not what he wanted and today their House Leader is hurting from the same kind of knowledge I am trying to impart onto him.

Mr. Speaker, the new era of co-operation between our provincial and federal governments was very evident in the signing of the Atlantic Accord just a year ago. The Atlantic Accord, I think, if members opposite had referred to that second document in a series of happenings that brought this great piece of

legislation before the House, members who have looked at and read with any careful attention the material, the purposes of the Accord are spelled out very carefully. I just want to take a few minutes to briefly look at a few of them: "to protect, preserve, and advance the attainment of national self-sufficiency."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

I think, Mr. Speaker, it has to be clearly noted here that we are not a Province that is selfish. We wanted to have an Accord, an agreement that was not only good for the people of our Province, but an agreement that was good for Canada as a whole and that, Mr. Speaker, is clearly and has been clearly set out in the purposes stated in the Atlantic Accord just a year ago.

We wanted, of course, "to provide that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador can establish and collect resource revenue as if these resources were on land." The hon. member who just took his seat said that we were not going to collect any revenues and it was not going to be treated as if it were on land. That is not correct. We are, Mr. Speaker, to collect resources from this great development off our shores the same as the other oil-producing provinces have and can as they are on land. Revenue sharing, Mr. Speaking, was addressed in the Atlantic Accord and I refer members to Page 11 Section 36.

MR. TULK:

And Bill said read that.

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to be told in this hon. House what to read or what questions to ask.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

I do not go to Rex for advice. I take advice in consultation with my colleagues who I sit with. I am sure from the questions that we have heard the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) recite, not ask, but recite, from a piece of paper here in this House, it is very clear where they came from.

"The federal legislation," Mr. Speaker, "implementing the Accord, therefore, will permit the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to establish and collect resource revenues and provincial taxes." I think it should be noted that the two governments as well recognize that there should not be a dollar-for-dollar loss of equalization payments as a result of offshore revenues that we would collect. Members opposite failed greatly to understand the agreement known as the Atlantic Accord and to actually understand what is in Bill 59.

Mr. Speaker, the Offshore Development Fund does provide the funding that the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) referred to. "We were behind in our training programmes," he said. Mr. Speaker, the comments and the initial spending or expenditure of funds from the Offshore Development Fund, announced last week by the Federal Minister responsible for Energy (Ms. Carney), is a clear indication of what we need to do and a clear indication that we do have a handle on training

programmes.

The reorganization of our vocational school system in the Province also shows that, which was announced about a year ago. It was indicated at that time that in March of this year some clear indication of where our vocational school system is going would be further clarified. We do now have a development fund and there were announcements made last week. Just to comment on a few of those, Mr. Speaker, a \$25 million Centre for Earth Resources Research at Memorial University, was announced. For the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) to say that "we are not taking part, we are not going ahead, we are behind in training programmes," is far from the truth. It is misleading the youth of this Province.

The youth of this Province know well where this government stands with regard to training programmes. I am sure in the weeks ahead when the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) clearly indicates the new dynamic role of the vocational schools and our colleges in this Province with regard to training for offshore oil-related jobs, the youth of this Province will be very much more knowledgeable of the great advantages that they can take.

The \$1 million computer-aided design facility and a \$3 million skills training project to be introduced into our provincial colleges and vocational school systems have also been announced. Mr. Speaker, for the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) to get up and say "we have done nothing, we are behind and we do not know where we are going" is far from the truth.

Mr. Speaker, the skills training projects that consist of programmes to provide short term training is a clear indication of where this Province wants to go. It should be also noted, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the programmes that we want to introduce, most of this was clearly indicated by the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) about a week ago when he, in a Ministerial Statement to this hon. House, indicated the tremendous impact that this would have on the education and training of young Newfoundlanders. In reference to the Earth Resources Research Centre, it has been clearly indicated by industry and by the educational experts that we have available to us, over the next few years, we will be short of people in the geo-science disciplines. It is now that we have to have people trained and in place.

The important spinoffs that is associated with this centre is a clear indication, Mr. Speaker, that we will be taking the maximum advantage of any advantage that can come to us as a result of the offshore.

Six training programmes in a number of vocational schools and colleges are being introduced. Mr. Speaker, how can one say that we are not taking advantage of training programmes? It was indicated that this fund that was announced from our Offshore Development Fund will permit the purchase of welding equipment and instructional aids to establish a welding technology programme to train at the journeymen, technician and technologist level. This, Mr. Speaker, is a very important part of the work force that will make up the entire

work force as it relates to offshore oil development.

Mr. Speaker, this and the information related to this one can gain if one has a very serious look and has at heart the desire to develop this Province for the betterment of all of our young Newfoundlanders. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to visit and look at a number of training programmes that some of the larger companies have operated and have been involved in in offshore oil-related activities in the North Sea, in the Beaufort Sea and in the Gulf. Mr. Speaker, our people, who are involved in the vocational schools and our fisheries and marine institutes, have also been in very close contact with those companies over the past year to make sure that we can rely on those people who have had the experience and had the expertise to bring in here to our Province so that our people can be retrained.

Let us not kid ourselves that the retraining of many of our skilled workers that we have in the Province is not a long, drawn out process. We have many welders in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who, with two and three and four weeks retraining, through a refresher courses in our schools, can take part in that offshore oil development and will be among the best in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

Let us not kid ourselves.

MR. EFFORD:

You will not be back in Carbonear if you keep talking like that.

MR. PEACH:

I will be back in Carbonear, Mr. Speaker, as long as democracy prevails and there are elections held. The member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) should be very careful.

Mr. Speaker, it was also noted in that development fund, as it relates to our vocational schools, that programmes for diver welders and submerged arc welding will be introduced. We have people who can take advantage of this. We do have welders around who have taken part in diver welding and I am sure, with a very brief retraining programme, can, today, take part in this programme as well.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it should be noted that there is an offshore survival center. I am sure my colleague here from Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt) was very pleased when that announcement was made. It is a great addition to the MED Center that presently exists off the Foxtrap Access Road.

Mr. Speaker, that center, we have to keep in mind, is not a center only that is related to offshore survival as it relates to oil. We have to keep in mind the backbone of our economy in this Province, the fishery. That is a center, Mr. Speaker, that will enable all offshore survival programmes to take place. I am sure that this has been a welcome expenditure of money, not only to the people in Conception Bay South, because it happens to be the center where it is going to be located, but to all of the people in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

As the long term plans for our vocational school system and our college system in the Province are revealed, Mr. Speaker, it will be

noted that it is this government's intention to spread these training programmes throughout the Province, not that they are to be located inside the overpass. All residents of this Province, Mr. Speaker, will have access to these training programmes.

MR. CALLAN:

Did you write that?

MR. PEACH:

Nobody wrote that, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) is not knowledgeable enough to get up and make some positive comments on what will come out of our offshore development fund. He will get up and criticize a certain clause on the Come By Chance refinery. He will get up and say that there were not enough Jobs Strategy Programmes out in his district. He will not get up and make any positive comments on what will probably happen to our offshore development fund and how it will benefit our young Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the legislation in the form of Bill 59 that we have before this hon. House now in the next few days and few weeks will be passed.

I think, Mr. Speaker, all Newfoundlanders should and probably have passed along a vote of thanks to the many people who made all of this possible. I am sure we should not forget the many provincial and federal government officials who have worked many long and many hard hours over the past two to three years to see that the Atlantic Accord and the legislation was in place.

We too, Mr. Speaker, thank our provincial government and our federal Conservative Government in

Ottawa today. We have to exclude the Federal Liberal Government. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, there is any person of any age in this Province, whether they live in St. John's, St. Anthony, Quirpon, Wabush, or wherever that would not want to send a bouquet to our own provincial Minister Responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

I think, Mr. Speaker, we should stand in this hon. House and thank him for his long, dedicated and devoted hours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. PEACH:

I must be getting to them now, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

We will agree to that on one condition and that is that even the hon. gentleman has power enough to get the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) in the Cabinet. If he will make the commitment that he will go in the Cabinet, no problem.

MR. PEACH:

That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order, the hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. MARSHALL:

He will be there a lot sooner than you ever will.

MR. PEACH:

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that my chances are better than his because you never see a member from Opposition in Cabinet. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) will be in Opposition for another year or two and after that, who knows?

As well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we should thank our present four Federal Conservative M.P.s in Ottawa: -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. PEACH:

- the hon. John Crosbie, the hon. Mr. McGrath, Captain Morrissey Johnson from Bonavista - Trinity - Conception and Mr. Joe Price from Burin - St. George's. All of these people, Mr. Speaker, since September 4, 1984, worked very hard to see that this Atlantic Accord and Bill No. 59 was put in place.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Energy Minister, the hon. Pat Carney, has showed her concern and her devotion to this Province on two occasions when she came in here to indicate very clearly, Mr. Speaker, the way that the federal government wanted to treat this Province. Mr. Speaker, I guess, although I just said thank you and indicated that those are the people that should be thanked for this great piece of legislation -

MR. LUSH:

What is on the note?

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, it is only a note that I have five minutes left, but

I am sure, by leave, I can go on.

In reality, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province did thank those people on April 2, 1985. That thank you came through loud and clear.

MR. TULK:

With a reduced majority.

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, it was one of the greatest majorities and the greatest victory in the history of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

When the member opposite, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) was sending around his fliers that he was going to be the next Minister of Transportation and the member, who had just resigned his seat as the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) -

MR. CALLAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PEACH:

I struck a nerve again, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Carbonear knows quite well that he was quoted in *The Compass* out of Carbonear the first time he ran that he was being promised a Cabinet post.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. CALLAN:

I did no such thing. I was not quoted in any Compass or any Packet or any newspaper. All I suggested in my letter to my loyal friends in the district of Bellevue is if we formed the government -

MR. PEACH:

That was a big if.

MR. CALLAN:

- this is what will be happening. That was quite different, Mr. Speaker, from what the member for Carbonear promised and was quoted in The Compass as saying. I have a clipping.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I would say, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why we got elected was people expected the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) to get in the Cabinet and one of the reasons why they had such an abysmal defeat was at the thought of the hon. member being Minister of Transportation. Mr. Speaker, in the meantime, the hon. gentleman is making an excellent speech and should be given an opportunity to do so.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the member did refer to, as I had been referring to, our great victory on April 2,

1985, when we were returned with thirty-six seats. I think, Mr. Speaker, it came out very clearly on Friday past that the present Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Barry) has been sulking, he has been crying and he has been hurting badly very recently. Yes, I would even call him a big, grey-haired sook and I would probably get away with it. He has been hurting knowing that he had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to be the Energy Minister in this Province who could have had the opportunity and the privilege of bringing in Bill 59. But, he messed it up because he wanted to be Premier of the Province. He could not wait. He had to scurry across the House and face no competition for the leadership of that party. He knew it would be handed to him on a platter. He knew at the time that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) was not ready. He took the party opposite by surprise. Who else were they going to elect?

We all know, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Fortune-Hemitage (Mr. Simmons) is not happy where he is today. He is not going to be there that long. There is a clear indication he is moving. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if he will be there when the next election is called. We all know that if he does not ask to cross the House, Mr. Speaker, he is looking elsewhere for other employment opportunities. The word has gotten out on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, it shows clearly how confident the administration are in this Bill 59.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Is.

MR. CALLAN:
- the administration either is or are, separately or as a crowd, but anyway, Mr. Speaker, it shows. When they have to put the likes of the member for Carbonear up, who is doing nothing in the way of defending Bill 59 in the Atlantic Accord -

MR. PEACH:
You have not been listening.

MR. CALLAN:
- all he is doing is looking at the members on the opposite side of the House and talking about how they will not be around and all this old nonsense. He is not defending the government. If there was anything here to defend, what you would see are the front bench Cabinet ministers up defending it. They have to go to the backbenches once more. What we have, of course, is a member who is trying to use up thirty minutes, Mr. Speaker. He cannot find anything to defend the Accord so what he does is go up and down our benches talking foolish nonsense.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member for Carbonear's time is up.

MR. PEACH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess the members opposite would let me finish up. I can do that in a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave?

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
As we agreed earlier, there is no objection on this side to the hon. gentleman speaking.

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

MR. PEACH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will not take any longer than the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) did when clueing up.

Mr. Speaker, I think some of the brief comments that I interjected has been hurting, as the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) just had to get up and say, but the great piece of legislation, Bill 59, that we have before the House is the greatest piece of legislation in the history of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:
I am sure that the interest that has been displayed by the leader of the party opposite and some members of the Opposition's caucus in the Atlantic Accord and the offshore oil development, Mr. Speaker, was clearly indicated in a magazine of a year or so ago. I am sure members know what I refer to. I have to say in concluding, Mr. Speaker, that there are very few people who did not greet our Prime Minister with a great deal of encouragement and a great deal of enthusiasm.

You might recall, Mr. Speaker, that when our Prime Minister was here in St. John's about a year

ago he said that he did not mind inflicting prosperity on the Province and the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, I think that is very clear in Bill 59. The door is open to prosperity. The members opposite do not want to see prosperity. They want to go on with their philosophy of doom and gloom.

Mr. Speaker, Atlantic Accord and Bill 59 have provided a great day for this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

It will be, in the few years ahead, Mr. Speaker, the greatest period of economic growth in our Province. The members opposite do not want to hear those things. They are not good for those in Opposition. I fully support the Atlantic Accord, Mr. Speaker, and I speak on behalf of the 11,500 people in my district that I have represented since 1982, and will continue to represent for as long as I feel that I should sit here in this hon. House.

Three years down the road, Mr. Speaker, if our Premier sees fit to go to the electorate again, I will have no hesitation in going out with the Atlantic Accord legislation that we have before us. I am very confident, Mr. Speaker, that at that time we will be returned. It will probably be a sad day for the people of the Province because I feel that in a democratic system you need a government and an Opposition. It is the fear that we might not at that time have an Opposition.

The people in our Province today are very optimistic. There is a

great deal of confidence in our business community and those are the people who will make this work. It is an era, Mr. Speaker, of prosperity. The day for the doom and gloom philosophy of the Liberal Party opposite is over, it is gone.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition who today, because of his sulkiness and his sulkiness, had to sit -

MR. TULK:

Call him a sook.

MR. PEACH:

I can call him a sook again, Mr. Speaker, if he wants me to. He had to sit up in the gallery today to see if his members were performing and they were asking the questions that Rex had written for them. However, they were much better organized today.

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) set the tone for this debate. We have seen it since. If you cannot attack the argument, you attack the individual. That is what the Government House Leader did all through his two and a half hours. What we have now, Mr. Speaker, is a step lower than that. Here is a man, Mr. Speaker, who was impeached from the Cabinet. Here is a man who is attacking somebody who is not in the Legislature to defend himself. So, why would this man, Mr. Speaker, stoop so low as to talk about people who are not in the Legislature. If

you want to attack us here, sure, do it because then, Mr. Speaker, we can get up and defend ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I would not be any longer than the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). Mr. Speaker, I am not attacking anybody who is not in this Legislature. The Leader of the Opposition is not in his seat today by his own choosing. We have seen him there in his seat out looking around the corner. We realize that he is not that stable and, Mr. Speaker, and that was indicated clearly Friday.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the members opposite that over the next few days, as we hear other comments made on the Atlantic Accord and Bill 59, they should stand up in their places, Mr. Speaker, and agree. When the time comes to vote that they should vote for the implementation of Bill 59. They are afraid to vote for it because they know it means prosperity. But I will be proud, Mr. Speaker, to stand in my place and support this government because I know that I am supporting prosperity for the Province well into the next century. That is not something that the party opposite wants to hear. When they have to go to the electorate, they know that the odds will be in our favour.

Mr. Speaker, the interest that their leader had in the offshore gas and oil development of this Province was clearly shown in The Canadian Lawyer of April, 1984.

It is clear there for anyone in this Province and anyone in the country to see - Gerald O'Brien and Leo Barry, total fees of over \$1 million, with no apologies, from the Ocean Ranger disaster. That is his interest, Mr. Speaker, in the Atlantic Accord.

Mr. Speaker, as we go on today and Thursday and Friday debating the Atlantic Accord and Bill 59 I look forward with great enthusiasm to hearing my other colleagues and the members opposite get up and make some constructive criticism on this, rather than get up and make some comments that they perceive only are negative for us.

Thank you very much.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Is the hon. gentleman finished? In spite of the fact that he was getting -

MR. MORGAN:

Is this a point of order?

MR. TULK:

Yes, it is a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

In spite of the fact that he was getting as low in the mud as he could get, if he has something else to say - we did manage to get him back on the track. I want to put in the record that there is no objection from this side of the House to the hon. gentleman going

on. If he has run out of things to say I guess that is his problem, but there is no objection from this side to the hon. gentleman saying what he wants to say.

MR. PEACH:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PEACH:

I have concluded my remarks. What I have said will be recorded in Hansard, and if the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) wants additional copies to send out to the people in his district, I am sure that on tomorrow the Clerk's Office will be able to provide them.

MR. TULK:

No, I would not throw that trash out to my people.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) got up and was recognized in this debate and I presume that now he has spoken. Now, by leave we will let him speak. I have no objection to that, but I would like for the record to show that he has already participated in this debate and has concluded his speech, which was a very good speech; it was all of three sentences long and I am glad he has concluded it.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The Speaker knows that when I rose I rose and said, 'To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I want to clarify something for the hon. gentleman.' The member for St. John's North (J. Carter) is in his usual milieu, he is interrupting and making a fool of himself. I wish Spring would soon come so that he could go back to the savory patch.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, we have heard debate from both sides of the House on this historic legislation, as it is described by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), and so far members opposite have attacked the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). That has been the extent of their argument. We have not heard them say anything positive about this legislation. All they have done is attack the Leader of the Opposition, and when they drift away from that, they decide to have a mutual admiration society and they pass bouquets to the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and the federal ministers who have done such a job in bringing about this Atlantic Accord.

We heard the hon. Mister Crosbie

say that ownership was not going to be a problem with him, because he was going to take it back no matter what the courts did. We have not heard much about that, but I will get into it as I go along. As I stand here in this legislature to debate the Atlantic Accord, this Bill 59, I wonder how the 79,000 Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are unemployed feel about this legislation, those people who have had promises of oil preached to them during the last seven years and yet there is very little happening to relieve their situation? What is it going to mean to those people who are unable to feed their families or pay their hydro bills? What does it mean to the 1800 unemployed people in Bay d'Espoir? There is very little hope that any of those people will be involved in the construction of a gravity based system. What is it going to mean to the 120 forestry workers from Bay d'Espoir who just lost their jobs because the Department of Forestry was unable to conclude a deal with the federal government for a programme that has been in operation in this area for thirteen years? What is it going to mean to those people?

What is it going to mean to Newfoundlanders who are in Alberta, the ones we heard the hon. Premier talk about just before the 1982 election, when he sat and listened teary-eyed to a plea from those people to come home and get jobs? It seems to me that the hon. Premier promised those Newfoundlanders, far from their homes, that he would like to bring them home. It seems that in that same election the Premier said that never again would Newfoundland sell its resources without ensuring that Newfoundlanders were looked after

and were protected, that there was never going to be another Churchill Falls, Newfoundlanders were going to be masters of their own destinies. What has happened, Mr. Speaker? Did he succeed? There is some doubt in my mind.

I would be much more positive about this legislation if we had a refinery operating in Newfoundland. We heard one hon. gentleman opposite describe the Come By Chance refinery as trash. Is that the official opinion of members opposite?

MR. TOBIN:

Stop reading your speech, boy!

MR. GILBERT:

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to ask for the protection of the Chair. I will present my speech in the way that I think is proper, and I would like Mr. Speaker to ask the hon. gofer to be quiet while I am making my speech?

It has been the opinion of the Opposition and the Liberal Party that Clause 54 in the original Atlantic Accord makes this agreement worthless. If we are not involved in the actual production of Hibernia, we have once again given our future away. I heard the Federal Minister for Newfoundland on a radio show last week and he said that because of the whining of members of the Opposition, they had guaranteed Newfoundland the right to produce and to have access to oil from Hibernia.

I was glad, Mr. Speaker, that we heard Mr. Crosbie admit that this clause was omitted because of the concern expressed by the Liberal Party and the Opposition. I would be much more happy about supporting this legislation if I

were assured that before production started the refinery would be operating in Newfoundland and we were going to be involved in the secondary processing that has been talked about by members opposite since offshore oil was discovered. Maybe then we could bring those Newfoundlanders home, the ones the hon. Premier talked to in 1982 as he sat in that hotel room, the now famous hotel room in Alberta. At least, we would know it was one promise the Premier kept.

We are talking right now about production at Hibernia. The latest published reserve figures for Hibernia is somewhere in the 600 million barrels area, down from the original estimate of 1,500 million or 2,000 million barrels. The mode of development we are talking about at present is a gravity base system. We have been advised that the concrete bases are going to be built in Newfoundland. Most of the debate and attention so far has been focused on a fixed concrete base. We seem to have forgotten that the deck and the top-sides could be twice or three times the value of the base. In other words, the concrete base for Hibernia would be around \$1 billion - these are the figures in the studies we have seen - but the top sides would be around \$3 million. This is the area where there has not been much concern, as far as I am concerned, and it is one of the things I think we should consider. Because in the start of construction on a concrete base, we are talking about building a platform construction yard. From information I have been able to gather, the number of people involved in the building of this yard would be approximately 200 workers, mostly heavy equipment

operators, for a period of up to twelve months.

This would be a fair-sized construction project by Newfoundland standards, up \$25 million to \$35 million, but strictly a one-shot, short-term deal. It is highly unlikely that more than one yard would be built because we understand the other discoveries, the Ben Nevis and the other ones, are of a smaller volume and would be, from what I understand the experts say, better developed with the floating system. So with a Hibernia operation, we are talking about one yard and one mixed gravity base system, and the rest of the wells that would be developed on the offshore would be, as we know it, floating platforms which could be constructed anywhere in the world, floated and put into place as they are needed, and moved away.

Now, during the actual construction of a gravity based system, again the figure we have heard talked about is somewhere in the vicinity of 2,000 to 3,000 people, and that is at the peak construction period. This will gradually build as time goes on, and they are talking about a two-year period to do this. I have done some work on it and have tried to find out what the labour distribution would be, because that is the sort of thing the 79,000 unemployed Newfoundlanders want to hear about this legislation. They want to know how it is going to benefit them. Experts on labour distribution whom I have talked with say that in the construction of a gravity based system, 30 per cent of the workers would be labourers, 15 per cent would be carpenters, 15 per cent would be steelworkers and 20 per cent would be technical people

and management. So if there are no more large fields such as Hibernia discovered or developed, this would mean that the sole construction activity in the production of this system would provide short-term prosperity. Those lucky enough to get employment in production, the 2,000 to 3,000, we do not know for sure yet, would have two years work. They would then enjoy maximum unemployment benefits for a one-year period after construction ceases and then, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, they would have to readjust to normal Newfoundland living standards. I would like members opposite to answer the question, What is going to happen after production ceases? What are we going to do with those 2,000 construction workers? Now this seems to me to have a familiar ring to it. It seems to me to have a Churchill Falls ring to it, as a matter of fact, and I think it is a question that should be addressed. Before I can support this legislation, I want to have some guarantee that we are not going to get into a situation where we will have a boom for a period of twenty-four months, long enough to have another provincial election, and then have these workers unemployed, further adding to the unemployment situation in Newfoundland. We have 79,000 unemployed right now.

As we all know, it is the decks and the top sides of those modules that will require skilled labour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, would you ask members opposite to be quiet. I want to make my speech in silence.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you. The Hibernia well has been discussed since 1979, but it was only yesterday that we heard the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) announce plans for specialized training for the production of offshore platforms. This seems to me to be rather strange. Twelve months after the Atlantic Accord was signed, the federal Minister of Energy (Mrs. Carney) made another visit to Newfoundland to reconfirm that the agreement was signed. Was that necessary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. J. CARTER:
You are reading your speech.

MR. GILBERT:
I am using my notes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to think it is a good speech, so if the hon. member would listen to it, he might gain something of interest from it.

I am sure everyone in Newfoundland and Labrador is aware that it was signed a year ago and they were looking forward to the promised benefits.

We hear about the \$300 million development fund not being a loan like the Nova Scotia agreement but an outright grant. Are we supposed to be happy with this when six weeks after last year's federal budget we saw the hon. the Premier stand in this House and admit that the federal government was going to cut \$35 million from transfer grants in 1985 and \$130 million a year starting in 1986? This would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, to be a case of the Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. At least in Nova Scotia they knew

it was a loan.

Hon. members opposite are trying to tell the people of Newfoundland that the federal government, through the great Atlantic Accord, has given Newfoundland a \$300 million development fund. Not so! They are going to give us \$300 million in a development fund over the next five years, and they are going to take it back in the next two and a half years. Some gift! Mr. Speaker, that is something that has not been pointed out in this legislation. We have heard of the cuts in the federal transfer payments. We have heard of this great \$300 million development fund which is going to be given. We have seen some of the largess of it last week.

During the last seven years, since we heard talks of oil and promises of oil and everything else, some of the hon. members have made trips to Scotland and to the North Sea to gather knowledge first-hand in order that we would be ready, as the federal Tory Leader said, to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland. I am sure they should have noted in their visits to Scotland and to Norway the problems experienced with the shortage of skilled labour. As I said earlier, the labour needed for the base construction is not important. It is there. We have a fine base of it. There is no problem with that. We have 79,000 Newfoundlanders out there unemployed, we will have no problem finding those people. We have no problem with that whatsoever. But skilled labour is going to be required in the module construction, for the topsides, after the decks are on, the module construction which can be constructed anywhere and brought

in. If we had the skilled labour in Newfoundland to do it, it could be the most important part of this development.

We have heard members opposite talk about welders and how we can train them in six weeks. Well, from what I have been able to find out from people I talked to concerning offshore development in Scotland and Norway and the North Sea, they found when they got involved in construction of the platform system that it was almost impossible to find certified welders at the level that is required, and I understand that that is AESMEG6. That is a technical word that I am really not familiar with, but that is the skill level that is required.

MR. MARSHALL:

(Inaudible) Standard.

MR. GILBERT:

I thank the minister for that, but in Newfoundland right now, I understand, there are very, very few -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask hon. members to be quiet.

I understand there are very few of this skill level in Newfoundland. Now, I have heard members opposite say they can be trained in six weeks. Maybe. I would like to see this. Anyhow, there is the situation you have. Are we going to have those workers, and I use welders as one example, trained in time to make sure that we get Newfoundland workers employed in this offshore development?

We heard the Minister of Career

Development (Mr. Power) say the other day that he has started a programme now. Is it another example of government by crisis? Will we in Newfoundland supply the labourers and the semi-skilled while the high-paying skilled workers have to be imported? Now Clause 45 in the proposed federal legislation refers to Canada/Newfoundland benefit but I do not see in it any provision to ensure that Newfoundland and Labrador does get its fair share of the action,

Now, I would like to point out that this is an all-Canadian project and I do not think we should put up barriers, but I think we should make sure, because of the desperate situation we have in Newfoundland regarding unemployment and this sort of thing, that every effort should be made to ensure that Newfoundlanders get their chance in the sun, as we have heard the hon. Premier say.

In the federal draft of the Accord legislation, Clause 42 states that 'the provincial and federal ministers may issue directives to the board.' With the slavish current attitude we see between the federal and provincial governments, it is only for Ottawa to suggest and Newfoundland acts. So in this legislation we are passing here now, can the Newfoundland benefits be changed by a directive from either minister, or by a joint communique from both of them? With the attitude this government has had toward Ottawa over the last few months, we find the Newfoundland minister and federal minister in a 50/50 partnership, Mr. Speaker, and we know how that 50/50 partnership has worked over the last eighteen months. My

colleague for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) referred to the horse and sparrow, but I would like to refer to this as a dog and rabbit partnership, and we know who is the dog and who is the rabbit in this 50/50 deal.

The theory of partnerships developed by hon. members opposite seem to be a little bit askew. There is no 50/50 to it, whatever Ottawa says is what we see happening. So I am a afraid that these two clauses in there, Clause 42 and Clause 45, I would like to have explained.

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) talked about a safety programme for the offshore. No doubt this is very important, and I am sure the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will be happy to know that every effort is being made to protect the lives of people lucky enough to obtain a job in the offshore. But I am also sure that Newfoundlanders will find it hard to understand why the hon. the Minister of Energy was so concerned about offshore drilling in the Winter of 1984 when in 1985 the drilling programmes were plagued by the worst ice conditions of the century; there were all kinds of hazards but there was not one word from the minister regarding safety in the offshore.

MR. TULK:

Why was that? What was it Chretien said?

MR. GILBERT:

I do not know. I wonder was his silence bought by the change of government in Ottawa, from Liberal to Tory? I wonder about that. And my hon. colleague just alluded to, in last year's election

campaign, the hon. John Chrétien said, 'Surely the minister does not expect us to believe that Liberal icebergs are more dangerous than Tory icebergs?' I am sure the people of Newfoundland will remember the callous and hypocritical way the Minister of Energy behaved about offshore safety in 1984, but he did not say a word about it in 1985 or 1986.

During 1984 we heard members opposite talk about all the problems in the offshore, and safety. We have not heard anything about it since, and I am sure Newfoundlanders would like to know why. After the Atlantic Accord has been signed for a year and this fabulous \$300 million development fund they are going to give us in five years and take back in two and a half is in place, they have now started to develop a programme for safety in the offshore. I am sure they will be interested in what the hon. minister had to say about it in 1984, and in his silence in 1985.

Now, as we get into talking about production in talking about this legislation, it is my understanding we heard in this hon. House today that Husky-Bow Valley had negotiated for permits to drill ten wells under PIP grants, which was an agreement put in place by the federal Liberal government. This agreement, as we all know, has now been cancelled and replaced by another one. Production in the offshore was guaranteed by those PIP grants, but we understand that Husky-Bow Valley have had the number of wells reduced from ten to seven and now, we understand, the federal government is trying to get them down to four. To me, this seems to be a cutback in the drilling and the exploration

offshore. We have right now a supply of oil at Hibernia which would possibly last for ten years if nothing else is developed. So surely we must go into exploration. Is this a policy of the federal government, that they are going to cut out exploration? Right now members opposite are sitting there not saying a word about what stand the federal government is taking, they are just agreeing 'yes', 'me to', 'me to'. Is this the type of attitude we are getting? Is this this great co-operation we are getting?

Here it is, a programme that is obviously to reduce the amount of exploration in the offshore, and we find the provincial government has sat there and nodded their head and said, 'Me too.' They are not concerned about the continuing exploration in the offshore. There seems to be something wrong when a government is in a hurry to get one well into production and forget about exploration.

I have been told by some people in this industry that all companies involved in the offshore are thinking about cutting back their drilling programmes in 1986. How active are the various companies now? I understand there was an announcement last Fall, in November sometime, that Gulf was going to get involved heavily in the offshore. Maybe the Minister of Energy could find out from Gulf what they plan to do with the offshore this year. Are they going to go ahead with the programme? What are their plans for the future? The reduction we are hearing about now from Husky-Bow Valley, and maybe Gulf and the other ones, is this a sign of the times? Are we going to see a reduction in the activity offshore as happened to Nova

Scotia over the past two years?

Mr. Speaker, all of us have heard rumors, I suppose, over the past few weeks that because of the continuing drop in the world price of oil - I think it is now down to \$15.73, U.S., per barrel - and the discontinuing of the PIP grants, all the major companies active on the East Coast are going to downgrade their drilling for 1986. I have heard that some of them are taking a long hard look at it. I wonder has the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) or any of his colleagues had any contact with those people to see what they plan to do?

We hear all kinds of rumours out there on the street and some of it is fact, I am sure. We hear that Mobil Oil has delayed awarding the first contracts for the gravity-based system. Are they now having second thoughts with all the new facts such as the drop in world oil prices? We hear this is the sort of thing that is going on out there right now. Is it a fact that Mobil has delayed awarding that contract? We understand that it was suppose to be awarded sometime in April. I have heard rumours to the effect that it has now been extended by another three months to June. Someone over there should give us an answer on this.

I sometimes wonder if we would not have been in a much better position if the members opposite had tried to sit down and negotiate an agreement with the previous federal government rather than wage a war through the media?

We have heard the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) talk about his negotiations with Mr. Chretien.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. GILBERT:
Mr. Speaker, I assume members will allow me the courtesy they have shown other members in allowing me to continue.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:
Leave is granted.

MR. GILBERT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard the hon. Minister of Energy talk about his negotiations with Mr. Chretien. We heard him say what he thought they were, but I wonder could we ask the hon. minister to put on the table of this House the actual working papers that he had from those discussions, what the federal government offered and, in return, what the provincial government was looking at? I would like to see what change there has been in the negotiations since that time. What were we talking about in 1984 and what we are talking about right now? What was this Atlantic Accord then?

We have heard one side of it. If the minister wants to allay the fears that we in the Opposition have that maybe more could have been achieved by negotiating a deal back then, let us see both sides of the argument. I am sure the people of Newfoundland would have a much safer feeling about it and would be a lot happier. I

would be a lot happier to support this legislation if I knew that there had been meaningful negotiations previously. As I understand it, I really do not know if there was, despite what we heard the minister said. If an agreement had been reached two years ago and a start made on the production platforms, it would make me feel much more secure about our chances of getting this well into production.

It seems strange to me that they were waging war with the previous federal government and we were hearing "we must own the offshore oil, we must own the land, we must own it before we could sign a deal and we must have an interest in the company that was doing the exploration and development." I think there were times when a 40 per cent share was talked about. The provincial government referred to the 40 per cent and said this was the only way that the hon. the Premier was going to ensure our future. "No more were our resources going to be robbed and sold down the river," Mr. Speaker. These are some of the questions I have had about it.

We are now supposed to get our monetary rewards from Hibernia from the royalties that are to be paid. A question that I would like to see answered is has there been a monetary agreement reached? What percentage of the sales price of a barrel of oil will be returned to Newfoundland? Is the royalties agreement, if it is reached, or when it is reached, going to give Newfoundlanders a better return than the deal that the provincial government at first wanted to negotiate? We have not seen the previous information and this is the point I am making, Mr. Speaker. We hear about it but we

have not seen what happened before. It has not been put on the table of this House and I think it is only fair to Newfoundlanders, and maybe the Newfoundlanders yet unborn, that they know what was done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how many Newfoundlanders are going to be employed when Hibernia goes into production, when we find that euphoric day that we hear members opposite talk about, when we have the production platforms in place? How many Newfoundlanders are going to be working? This is a question that I would like to hear someone answer, but I want it answered not from the peanut gallery, I want the minister to stand in his place and tell me.

When I look at the overall situation, as outlined in the Atlantic Accord, I fail to see how we have improved our position by delaying the signing of an agreement with the previous federal government.

I support the principle, Mr. Speaker, that it will help the Newfoundland unemployment problem. As I have said about this, there are jobs for possibly a temporary, Churchill Fallian situation involving 3,000 jobs. However, I cannot support the full content of this bill and I also intend to vote against certain clauses of Bill 59. But, from the information that I have gathered from reading this bill, I feel that the Minister of Energy (Mr. Dinn) is going to have his wish, there is no fear of overheating the economy with this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome the opportunity to enter into the debate on this very important bill that is before the House. I want to compliment the draftsmen, in particular Mr. Penney, Mr. Thistle and Mr. Noel, and I commend it to the hon. gentlemen's reading on the other side because obviously, from the three previous speakers, nobody has read it.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today as a very proud Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, you cannot talk to this bill without being political.

AN HON. MEMBER:

And proud.

MR. BUTT:

And proud yes, because this bill comes about as a result of a political settlement between the Provincial Progressive Conservative Party and the Federal Progressive Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, in a preliminary way, just let me say that this is also a time when we should throw out some bouquets because, as we debate this bill today, these are great Tory times in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

I want to get on the public record, Mr. Speaker, because I think there will be a lot written about this debate in years to come. Mr. Speaker, I think there are a couple of people on our side of the House who deserve appropriate recognition for the key role they played in this. Obviously, one of the key people, besides the leader of the party, the hon. the Premier, is the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

He is the careful navigator and the good steward of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. History will record the actions and the work of this minister in a very, very appropriate and positive way.

MR. SIMMS:

And it will record the actions of his predecessor too, the former Minister of Energy (Mr. Barry) over there.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, it is also a time as well to compliment the federal people involved, namely the Prime Minister and that great Energy Minister we have now, the hon. Pat Carney, as well, Mr. Speaker, as our own federal MPs from Newfoundland, namely, Mr. McGrath, Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Price and Captain Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great time for all the PCs or all the good Tories of Newfoundland. It is a very positive time for the PCs and a very embarrassing time for the

hon. gentlemen there opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

I am telling you that Liberals are crawling under rocks since this piece of legislation came before the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

They will continue to do so and come back and ask for forgiveness. But, Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to thank today the Tories in Conception Bay South, young and old, who saw fit to return me for a third time so I could continue to support this kind of very positive legislation that we have before the House today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

On a very serious note - and I would ask hon. gentlemen to pay attention - this came about under very, very difficult times. Hon. members have to realize that this legislation comes before us today after we going through very, very difficult times, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

Who caused the difficult times?

MR. BUTT:

There are several people really but one of the people, and I am not going to get into it very much today and I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition is not here, but I know that this is a very embarrassing time for the Leader of the Opposition because he deserted the ship at the most

inappropriate time that any minister worth his salt would. Obviously, that put the high ace in the hole over to those who we were negotiating against.

Mr. Speaker, I am a few days late but it was, I think, February 12 or February 11, 1985, when there was an historic day down at the Newfoundland Hotel. If I had my time back over, Mr. Speaker, I would have hauled my youngsters out of school that day and brought them down for the signing of the Atlantic Accord. I missed it. I am sorry I missed it because, Mr. Speaker, that is the most significant event that has happened in this Province. I am sorry that on that historic day, down at the Newfoundland Hotel, approximately one year ago, I left my three youngsters in school, one in a post secondary institution, Memorial University, and the other two in Holy Spirit in Manuels. I should have had them down there to witness what was happening here in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I want as well, in a traditional way, and because members are not back in the House on the other side, just deal with a few of the comments made by the Opposition spokesman on energy, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) who spoke about everything else except what is in this bill. What a disappointment! He concluded his remarks by saying he did not know if he was going to support it. He was wishy washy. Now what is wishy washy in this Province? It

is the hon. gentlemen there opposite. They never took a position on anything.

MR. SIMMS:

Gilbert said he is going to vote against some of the clauses.

MR. BUTT:

Well, he does not know. Where is the hon. member? I was trying to take a few notes on what the hon. member was talking about. The hon. member can see the notes I took on what he has to say. In any event, the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), the Opposition spokesman on this matter, talked about the Upper Churchill, the Lower Churchill, electricity, gas at the pumps, he referred to everything except Bill 59, what we are debating here today and what we were debating then.

Mr. Speaker, once again I have to say that you cannot debate this bill without being political. You have to be political in debating Bill 59. The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), who usually makes a very good speech in the House - I enjoyed listening to him on occasion - he never really addressed anything in Bill 59 either, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Bonavista North was very disappointing. He spoke about elections.

MR. SIMMS:

He was humorous.

MR. BUTT:

He was not even humorous. He is usually humorous but he was not even humorous. The hon. member for Bonavista North spoke about elections from 1979 onwards as if he were on this side of the House. He was actually saying he thought that we lost the election

but we are over here, we are the government. In 1979, I think, we returned thirty-three members to the House out of a fifty-two seat legislature. The Liberal Party at that time was headed up by the best Leader of the Opposition, obviously, since I have been in the legislature, the hon. Mr. Jamieson. He is a very fine Newfoundlander and he saw fit to unload himself from the very precarious position he was in with the hon. gentlemen there opposite. He then went on to say, after 1979, he went on to speak at large about 1982 and taking advantage of the Opposition. Mr. Speaker, how foolish! I mean it just goes to show what kind of leadership we have on this side of the House. The idea of the game in this business we are in, in politics, is to win seats and if you get a majority, you form the government. That is it. In 1982, Mr. Speaker, we returned forty-four members. They were decimated and they will be decimated again, by the way. We won this one in 1985, a very tough election and we returned thirty -

MR. W. CARTER:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, complained a moment ago that members on this side who spoke on this Bill had not made any comment about the Bill itself. He is about half way through his speech and he has not yet said one word relative to what is in the Bill. There are a number of things he can be talking about without the nonsense he is getting on with now. If he is going to speak to

the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that he say something meaningful and something that will enlighten the Opposition and the people of Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
In speaking to that point of order, what the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) has just said now has confirmed precisely what the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) has been saying, that nobody over there has said anything on this Bill because all he is doing is summarizing what everybody over there has been saying. You have just confirmed it.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Fogo to that point of order.

MR. TULK:
The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) has just confirmed something as well and that is that while he has been sitting over there in the gopher's chair, he has not been listening at all and he is, as usual, speaking in ignorance. I use the word 'ignorance' not in the sense

that he is ignorant in his manners but ignorant in his knowledge of what has gone on in this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. minister who is speaking has all the flexibility in the world which has been afforded to all other members of the House in this debate.

MR. BUTT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might add, for the benefit of the hon. members there opposite, I do not mind a bit of chatter back and forth. I think it just makes for good debate, but while hon. member opposite were standing in their places and speaking, I did not interrupt them once.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

Order, please!

MR. TULK:
He has become a prophet, Mr. Speaker. I know he is going to become something. He has become a prophet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentleman that we have no desire to interrupt him at all, but we are all turning blood red over here from his attack. If he will stop provoking us and throwing out bad things that gets us going and if he sticks to the matter under debate, we will not interrupt him at all. We will let him go on in silence, as he should.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was just getting in full stride when I was interrupted on spurious points of order, Mr. Speaker. As you well know this has been a very wide-ranging debate because it is really a political debate.

MR. TULK:

Of course.

MR. BUTT:

This bill will lead to the decimation of Liberals in Newfoundland. As a matter of fact, the pink Socialists may form the Opposition after the next election as a result of Bill 59.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BUTT:

Well, it is a possibility.

Mr. Speaker, I want to get into some of the more important matters on this bill, having dealt with the Opposition on it, I think, in a fair way and without being too partisan, even though they are embarrassed. Hon. members opposite should be embarrassed. I

mean this is a very embarrassing time for the Liberal Party in Newfoundland. It is not my fault. You brought it on yourself. You took the wrong road. You took the wrong approach as usual.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get on now with some of the important things in this bill. I want to pay particular attention as well, because I never forget them, to the people in Conception Bay South, because this bill will obviously have a very positive impact on the people of Conception Bay South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

It was only seven short years ago, Mr. Speaker, that I left heavy industry in Newfoundland, so I know more about a layman's approach to it than most other people there opposite and even some members on our side.

Let me just talk about the training programme and be specific, because the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) made some reference to training programmes. I must say I am not being unkind to the hon. gentleman, but it all came out sort of garbled and I could not really pick out what the hon. member was saying. Just let me take a specific trade in this Province. I heard comments from the hon. members there opposite that we are not geared up for this

offshore. There is not going to be enough time for our welders and carpenters and plumbers and pipefitters to get geared up for this. That is a complete fallacy, Mr. Speaker, because welders in this Province are among the best in this country, indeed, in North America, and in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Just let me tell you something about how we can equip and train our welders to meet the challenge of the offshore. You take a welder now who has a journeyman's certificate, put him through anywhere from six weeks to three months training and in that very short time, because I went through this myself, not as a welder, but in that short time, and you can be a complete welder and have the qualifications that the industry will be looking for. I remember back in the early 1970s you could go to Eastern Nova Scotia Tech at that time. You had to go out of the Province back in the 1960s for almost everything, but now we are getting good facilities around us and we will be able to do it here locally. One of the most accommodating things for a welder to have besides his ticket is perhaps a qualification in ultrasonic testings, so he can take a probe from a small device, an oscilloscope - it is almost like a camera - and check his welds for slag inclusion or lack of penetration. That is the kind of people that Mobil Oil or the head contractors will be looking for when they build the gravity-based systems here in the Province. I am going to get sidetracked now, I realize, but when I think about gravity-based systems I remember what gentlemen

opposite were saying. 'You will never get gravity-based systems in Newfoundland,' was that not the position of the Liberal Party in this Province? "You will never get it. That is pie in the sky. You will never have that here in Newfoundland." Just let me say to hon. gentlemen there opposite that it would take every registered welder we have today in Newfoundland just to make steps and stairs for one gravity-based system.

Hon. gentlemen there opposite were saying, "Sign like Nova Scotia did. Putting floating rigs out there. You can put them out on woodpiles if you like. Get them out there. Get on with the job."

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the member for Conception Bay South to prove what he is saying. It has never been the position of the Liberal Party, as long as I have been here, that we did not want every job that was available and, of course, if concrete platforms meant more jobs than floating platforms, we were for it. I challenge the member for Conception Bay South to prove that in a debate in this Legislature, if he wants to go back to Hansard, or a newspaper clipping or anything else, anybody in the Liberal Party said we were against concrete platforms. We want more concrete platforms. All we are getting out of this Accord, Mr. Speaker, is one.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, I am obviously embarrassing hon. gentlemen there opposite and they are rising on points of order which have no foundation. It is obviously just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER:
I would rule there is no point of order. It is obviously a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me continue. I was speaking, I think, on gravity-based systems. Well, Mr. Speaker, after a long and difficult fight under very, very severe circumstances we are going to have gravity-based system built here in Newfoundland.

MR. CALLAN:
One.

MR. BUTT:
That is the one for the Hibernia structure. There are 700,000 square miles out there. Do hon. gentlemen realize that in ten years time there could be fifteen Hibernias? The same will apply. This is long-term Tory, not short-term Liberal. This is long term. It will stand the test of time. As I said in the beginning, the hon. the President of the Council should be commended, Mr. Speaker, for bringing it in.

I want to get on with a couple of

notes I have here, Mr. Speaker, on this development fund, this \$300 million development fund. What did hon. gentlemen there opposite want us to do back just a couple of short years ago when everything was supposedly going to Nova Scotia? "Sign the deal. We do not care, just sign it," that was the position of the Liberal Party. But, Mr. Speaker, we hung tough and today we have a development fund, and this is a credit to the man who sits in that seat, in that when there was an election called in 1985 under very, very difficult circumstances, we did not go out and spend that \$300 million building roads or putting in water and sewer or anything else.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Slush fund.

MR. BUTT:
No and not used for a slush fund, as hon. gentlemen there opposite would do. We kept it, Mr. Speaker, mainly for the long-term benefit of young Newfoundlanders. That money is to be used for facilities and training. Just think about it! Memorial University, our own university here, just think about that new world-class facility that is going to be built there now for approximately \$25 million, I think it is, to turn out highly skilled, highly trained professional people who will work in the offshore and offshore related industries, take meaningful and responsible jobs, Mr. Speaker. That is very important.

I also want to say, as well, that I was very pleased with the announcement, on a personal note, on a constituency basis, of the \$5 million survival centre that will be built next to the MED Centre

off the Foxtrap Access Road. The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) and I, my good friend from Harbour Main - Kelligrews, welcomed that announcement, Mr. Speaker, it has been a very positive one for the people in Conception Bay South.

Without getting too specific on some of the details, because everyone knows about it and I am only sort of rehashing what other speakers have said, just let me say to hon. gentlemen there opposite, because it is important, that every now and then you have to talk about this because it is a step in the right direction for this government. Who in Canada would say anything negative about the hon. Peter Lougheed, the former Premier of Alberta, who has had more dealings with oil companies, I suppose, than any other person in public life in Canada?

MR. TOBIN:

The old socialist would.

MR. BUTT:

I am telling you, the position of the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, at the time was that we were padding the hon. gentleman's pockets. This is a paper from the West Coast of the Province, a British Columbia paper, and it says: "You have to hand it to Newfoundland Premier Brian Peckford, he knows a good deal when he sees it. Peckford hired Peter Lougheed, who recently stepped down as Premier of Alberta, as an advisor on the offshore oil development." Mr. Speaker, what a catch. What a catch he was.!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Is that a newspaper?

MR. BUTT:

Yes, it is The Prince George Citizen. I get them from all over Canada.

MR. SIMMS:

You have to hand it to Brian Peckford.

MR. BUTT:

Yes.

One other important point: We have an excellent school of engineering at our university right now, but that will be further complemented and enhanced by bringing in a computer design programme. As hon. members realize, most of the design engineering done today is done with computer assistance, or with the aid of computers. So that is another excellent programme for which this \$300 million development fund is being used.

Mr. Speaker, that is the direction this government is taking with the \$300 million development fund and that is why I can stand in this Legislature today, Mr. Speaker, and stick my chest out and say, I am proud to be a Tory.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

I am proud to be a Tory, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to be a Tory because it is a very proud time for us. We have been the careful navigators, not the careless navigators, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No. No.

MR. BUTT:

Well, I have a few more points to bring up. If hon. gentlemen will allow me to adjourn the debate, I will come back at it tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

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., and that this House do now adjourn.

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