

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
PLACED WITHIN



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 84

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Tuesday

FEBRUARY 18, 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements by Ministers I would like to rule on the point of privilege raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on Friday morning regarding interpretation of Section 67 of The Financial Administration Act, 1973. While the hon. member has raised an interesting legal question, no prima facie case of breach of privilege has been made. It is not the responsibility of the Chair to rule on questions of law or unconstitutional matters. I refer hon. members to Paragraph 240 on page 79 of Beauchesne.

Oral Questions

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. We are looking forward to a federal budget next week and I would like to ask the minister to what extent has he been consulted with respect to matters pending which can affect this Province, for example, financial cutbacks with respect to CN, which can have an impact upon the railway and the coastal boat service, cutbacks with respect to the Department of Fisheries-

MR. J. CARTER:
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! The hon. the member for St. John's North on a

point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:
I notice with regret that the Leader of the Opposition is back after having been forced to leave the House because he insulted the Chair, and as yet has offered no apology to the Chair. I realize the same person was not in the Chair at the time, Your Honour, but it was the Chair and I think that at the first opportunity on coming back into the House he should apologize. I notice there is no such apology, even though he has had ample time to do it.

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

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

MR. BARRY:
The very fact that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) spent all of yesterday sleeping in his chair, in my absence, I thought that would be justification enough for him to welcome me back, to try and keep him and other members awake. The hon. gentleman will have a long wait, and I hope he does not hold his breath while waiting.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order. I think the matter was dealt with on Friday.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, we will continue to speak out and ensure that all

members are dealt with fairly and, when there is a breach of an agreement, to give full and open debate on matters that that agreement has lived up to, Mr. Speaker, and when members on the other side start to hear matters they do not like, they are not given the opportunity to break those agreements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have had indications that there are further cutbacks coming that can affect programmes in the Department of Fisheries, there have been indications with respect to cutback in transfer payments dealing with Health and Education, there have been indications that unemployment insurance changes may occur to tighten up that programme, there are decisions with respect to a new forestry agreement, the new secondary roads agreement, regional development programmes and so forth, would the minister indicate to what extent he has had input into these potential matters affecting this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is true to say that there always have been consultations of a pre-budget nature between the federal government and probably all the provinces. Certainly, since I have had the honour of holding this portfolio, I have attended many such meetings. I do not like to sound pejorative about this,

but I have to be accurate. I have to say that during the Liberal administration in Ottawa these meetings were very, very perfunctory, they would be for perhaps a half day and very little went on in terms of getting a point across, and you felt that they were not hearing what you were saying.

Now, when the Clark administration came in, we had the great fortune of having a Newfoundlander as Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie), and one of the first things I remember he did was he visited me. I was a tyro at that time, just a new boy on the block in terms of being Finance Minister. He visited me and we sat down and had a whole morning's discussion on various things that might come out of his federal budget. He subsequently invited me to go and attend the House of Commons when he was presenting the budget, and we had certain other discussions before and after that.

Unfortunately, when the Clark administration was defeated, the same old thing occurred. I am absolutely delighted to say that since the Mulroney Administration has been in power they have even outdone what the Clark Administration used to do. We have already had three full, and when I say full I mean over a day - one of them, I think, was two days - federal/provincial Finance Ministers and Treasurers conferences with the federal Finance Minister to go over certain things of great importance to the Province, in particular transfer payments.

In addition to that, I have had quite a bit of correspondence with Mr. Wilson on this whole matter, he has initiated some and I have

initiated others. We have presented in summary form, on at least one occasion, all the points of great concern to us in terms of economic activity in the Province, and the subsequent financial spin-offs and financial affairs of the government of the Province itself.

I am not saying that I am anticipating that everything in the budget will be to our liking. I regret to say that I think there will be some sour things in the budget because of the circumstances in which Canada finds itself. Nevertheless, I think I can say that at least we have been given a full and sympathetic hearing and we hope that that will, in actual fact, put things in the federal budget that would not otherwise have been there that will be of benefit to this Province.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that we have had confirmation that that consultation and co-operation is still continuing, we look forward to next Thursday and the minister's response next Thursday as to how effective he has been.

Mr. Speaker, if I could change to a district oriented question I would like to ask the Premier, the people of Bell Island have been isolated for a number of days now as a result of the ferry The Katherine not running, partly because of wind but primarily because of the ice that exists in the Tickle. I wonder if the

Premier would indicate when the report of the Commissioner, which I understand has been in the hands of government for approximately a month now, will be released and whether the Premier is in a position at this point in time to indicate what he is prepared to do to assist the people of Bell Island, to ensure they have proper ferry services.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice and get the information for the hon. member.

MR. BARRY:
If I could follow up with a supplementary.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of people on Bell Island who are now being forced, in order to get back and forth to work to avoid losing their jobs, to take advantage of fixed wing air services, which have just been put in place today, at a cost of, I think, something like \$15 per round trip. That is very, very expensive, Mr. Speaker. Because of the inability of The Katherine to operate in these ice conditions - The John Guy is under refit or repair - I wonder if the Premier would look into the possibility of obtaining a vessel such as The Northern Cruiser which, I understand, might be available to fill in and to assist and which could operate, I understand, in the ice that exists there.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will.

MR. BARRY:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
I wonder if the Premier would also look into the fact that apparently the Rec. Centre at Torbay is awaiting a letter from the minister in order to - I am not sure which minister, whether it is Transportation (Mr. Dawe), or probably the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) - authorize the use of that Rec. Centre as a temporary hostel in periods when the ferry cannot operate, so that people can take advantage of a place to stay. The letter is probably on the minister's desk. My understanding is that officials are awaiting some indication of the criteria which should be applied, i.e., do winds have to be of a certain force, you know, does it have to be force five, force six, force seven, force eight? Does there have to be ice in the Tickle? Under what circumstances will that Rec. Centre be made available as a hostel?

It would be convenient if people could know beforehand when they can go out there, Mr. Speaker, and take advantage of that facility. Would the minister check into that?

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

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker, I would be more than glad to check into that matter for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I arrived in town just in time to get here to the House of Assembly, so I will check it out at the earliest convenience.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. The minister may say it should have been asked some time ago, but he was away on business, I understand. I am happy to hear the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) confirm that the love affair is still going on between Ottawa and Newfoundland, but I want to ask the Minister of Fisheries a question concerning recent and what seems to be future spending cuts by the Federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Siddon. Of course, the most recent ones are the cancellation of the 25 per cent subsidies on boats and the announced cutback of some 200 employees. Given the fact that we are now supposed to be living in an age of consultation and co-operation, I would assume he has been consulted on all cuts being implemented and I would ask him to assure the Legislature that there will be no more programme cuts that will affect the Newfoundland fishery.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I suppose the hon. gentleman could ask me to assure that the sun will come out tomorrow and I would be able to

say yes with the same degree of certainty that I could say yes to that kind of a question. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we have indications from the federal minister, and from the federal government, that there were not, in terms of personnel cutbacks, any adverse effects on the Newfoundland region in this round of cutbacks, and we have indications that there are to be no further cutbacks in the Newfoundland region.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
The minister has told us that he has been told, and we understand it to be the case, as well, that the first personnel cuts will not greatly affect the Newfoundland fishery. We, on this side, are under the impression that there is supposed to be some \$20 million to \$22 million worth of further cuts coming in the budget, I think next week sometime. Again, I say I know the minister has to be consulted, I know the federal minister must have told him, and if we are to live in this great age we are supposed to be living in of consultation and co-operation between the P.C. Government in Ottawa and the P.C. Government in Newfoundland, the love affairs and so on, would he now indicate to this House, since he is supposed to know everything at this point in time from the federal minister, how the federal minister intends to save that \$20 million to \$22 million?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentleman that one of the things that I have suggested and will continue to suggest to the federal minister, to correct one of the great Liberal blunders, is turn the Western region of Newfoundland and Labrador back to the Atlantic region and govern it from St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, God knows it has always been bad enough between provincial governments in Newfoundland and federal governments in Ottawa regardless of political stripe on either side, and that is not my statement, it is a statement by the Premier of this Province. I want to ask the minister if he is at all concerned about the apparent lack - and it is a lack - of communication and consultation that is going on? We know for a fact he is reading about cutbacks in federal spending in a department that is very vital to this Province, so does he not have any more concern than to just stand in his place and make the kind of flippant remarks we just heard him make?

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, every day that goes over our heads we are in constant contact with the Federal Department of Fisheries on fisheries related issues. We do not need any lessons in concern, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. gentleman. I have often heard the saying - well, I will not say it. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we are in consultation at all times. The cutbacks that we have seen at the central restructuring level of the Federal Department of Fisheries have not and will not impact negatively on this region. As I just said to the hon. gentleman, if Mr. Siddon wants to save some more money for the federal government, then he can take my suggestion, and undo one of the great Liberal blunders, and put the West Coast of Newfoundland back into the Newfoundland region.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the federal minister is giving all kinds of reasons why certain things are happening. It is very obvious that what is happening in the Federal Department of Fisheries is that we are entering an age of user pay concept in that department, where cuts are being made, Mr. Speaker, to make fishermen pay on the backs of fishermen in an industry in Newfoundland, in particular the inshore fishery, that is very vital to Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Now, I would ask the minister -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. BARRY:

It is a good one, too. A good speech.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister if he agrees with the federal minister that everything has to be on a user pay basis, as seems to be the philosophy of Erik Nielsen and Mr. Mayboom, who was obviously put in the department to make those cuts at the expense of the Newfoundland fishery? Does he agree with that or will he attempt to make some effort to have his federal counterpart become more sensitive to the Newfoundland fishery and see that our most vital industry is protected? Now, he can stand up and get on with all the nonsense he wants, but it is a very real issue in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, it is not very hard to stand up and get on with more common sense than the hon. gentleman gets on with when he stands on his feet.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to comment on some whim of the hon. gentleman's imagination. I deal with reality, and the reality is that the hon. gentleman voted for factory freezer trawlers, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

My question was to have been to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) but, in his absence, I will direct it to the hon. the Premier. It has been argued, because of the Terms of Union, that CN is required to treat the Newfoundland railway as if Newfoundland were not an Island and, therefore, the freight rates in Newfoundland have been the same as the freight rates in the rest of Canada, which means that there is, in a way, a subsidy there.

On Friday past, CTC made a ruling that will force CN to increase freight rates on containerized freight coming into this Province so as not to undercut the private enterprise, ACE. This, of course, is going to mean an ultimate increase in the cost of living to Newfoundland consumers. Would the Premier care to explain the implication of this decision on the part of CTC?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transportation is not in his seat right now. We are aware that there were a number of decisions made in the last number of days relative to freight rates. We do not know how many. There were innumerable issues in that hearing, some of which have been adjudicated by the CTC, some of

which have not been. We are presently studying the decision. We have opposed the increase of freight rates to the minister and to CTC, and we will have to examine what our next course of action is if, in fact, there are rates that have increased which we opposed. I will get more information for the hon. member, over the next several hours, so that we can have a more detailed answer for him. But obviously we have opposed the freight rates in Newfoundland being different than those in the Maritime Provinces. There was a decision in 1950 or 1951 - I think it was a court decision or a CTC decision - which affirmed the Terms of Union along the lines of the freight rates being the same as those in the Maritime Provinces, and we have used that argument in our opposition to having the freight rates different. Because not only could one interpret the Terms of Union to mean that, that interpretation was confirmed by a decision of the CTC in 1950-51. So we have opposed the increase and making it different than the Maritime provinces. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) mentioned to me this morning, around 12:00 or 12:30, that they were studying the decision that came down because there were - I forget how many - tens of issues involved, it was not just five or six, and they were going through the decision to find out which ones impacted upon Newfoundland and to then recommend what course of action the government should take from here.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary to the Premier,

Mr. Speaker. From where I sit, there should be no discussion whatsoever. The thing is, the railway is ours by right and the freight rate, as you say, it was already decided it was ours by right, so would the Premier concede that in even negotiating, in even discussing the matter he has gone back on his commitment to Newfoundlanders not to even open the negotiations a squeak? The fact that he is going to discuss whether this ruling is accurate or not, is that not opening the negotiations a squeak?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are not discussing it, we are examining what the decisions were to see what our next approach should be in opposition to the rights being different from what they are in the Maritime provinces. So we are not discussing. What I am saying is that we are assessing the decision to see what our next step should be in opposition to the freight rates being different in the Maritime provinces.

MR. DECKER:

Right.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, I am glad to see that the hon. member agrees with me. In the Terms of Union, and confirmed later after Confederation, there was a decision which confirmed that the freight rate should be the same as the Maritime provinces. So what we are doing is assessing the decisions that were brought down on Monday and, as soon as we have them assessed and decide upon our next course of action, we will let the hon. member know.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Premier's information, the federal Cabinet has the authority to overrule the CTC. Can the Premier show this House that he has already gotten in touch with the Minister of Transportation to have the Cabinet overrule the decision? It is pointless in wasting any more time seeing what the decision is. The Cabinet has the authority to overrule it anyway, so why waste time fooling around with the CTC?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we will take whatever actions are necessary to have any decisions which are negative to Newfoundland on freight rates reversed, and that includes appealing to the federal Cabinet. We have already indicated in correspondence to Mr. Mazankowski and to other members of the Government of Canada, that any decision to discriminate against the freight rates in Newfoundland vis-a-vis those of the Maritime provinces is unacceptable to this Province and violates the Terms of Union, which were again confirmed in the decision by the CTC in 1950.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications. Last Friday I

asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications had he made any representation to ensure the consumers of this Province that they would be paying less electricity rates. I pointed out to him the fact that the price of oil had decreased by \$10 per barrel. He came back to me and said that he did not know anything about it, that he was not sure that those prices were correct. I would ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications if he has confirmed that they have decreased?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that at any time I did say that, I just believed what the hon. member for Port de Grave said in terms of his figures regarding the reduction in the price per barrel of oil. I am sure all hon. members are aware that the price of oil has decreased per barrel over the past number of weeks.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Well, since you now agree it has decreased by \$10 a barrel, you will also agree there will be a considerable amount of savings for Hydro. Yet, we are in the coldest time of the year and the consumer is still paying the penalty. I will give you an example: Just this morning I had a phone call from an individual who is receiving an income of \$576 a month unemployment insurance. It is not social assistance it is unemployment, he worked last year at the best job he could get, and

his heating bill for last month was \$250. Now, those people, along with many, many thousands of people in this Province need a break. Will the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications tell us now when they are going to get that break?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to this House that the electrical rates in this Province are high. It is certainly a burden for most people in this Province, particularly people on fixed incomes and senior citizens. There is no question about that. I wish I could stand here today and say I have the answer to that problem. I do not think there is any hon. member in this House, on either side, who has the answer to it. If the hon. member for Port de Grave or any hon. member opposite feels that he has the answer to reducing significantly the cost of electrical rates to the consumers of this Province, I think he would be remiss if he did not bring that proposal forward in this House so that we could talk about it and have a discussion on it.

Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has introduced the rate stabilization programme which will see them put monies in a special fund which, if not needed, the consumer will get the benefit -

MR. FLIGHT:

Needed for what, to maintain the debt?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RUSSELL:

If the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans would be quiet, I will try to answer the question. If not, I will just not answer it.

I am sure the hon. the member for Port de Grave is aware that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro has a rate stabilization programme which, in the good times, will see benefits go to the consumer and, in the bad times, these monies will be used to offset costs they have.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

The minister asked me if I had a proposal to put forth. The proposal is this and it is very simple. Obviously the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications does not know how to do his job. He is getting a big salary for doing nothing, so he does not have to worry about paying high electricity rates. I would suggest to him that if light bills go up when the cost of fuel goes up, then light bills should go down when the cost of fuel goes down. All the people in this Province are paying the burden. There are 80,000 people unemployed, another 40,000 or 50,000 people are receiving unemployment insurance, and they just do not have enough money to live.

Will the Minister of Consumer Affairs make a commitment now -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Perhaps the hon. member would pose his question.

MR. EFFORD:

I will, Mr. Speaker, but the minister asked me to put forth a proposal.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is Question Period.

MR. EFFORD:

Will the Minister of Consumer Affairs do the job that he is getting paid to do and assure the consumers of this Province that they are now going to see a reduction in electricity rates, instead of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro making these multi-millions of dollars profit?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Port de Grave referred to the big salary the minister was getting and thus indicated that if he were not getting that kind of salary it would significantly reduce the hydro rates in this Province when he, Mr. Speaker, and members opposite fully supported the Report of the Select Committee on Member Services, Accommodations, and Benefits which would have seen salaries and benefits cost the taxpayers of this Province some \$5 million or \$6 million. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that even if we were to take the salaries from ministers, that amount of money would not see a significant reduction in electrical rates in this Province.

I can assure the hon. member and this House that I shall do all I can to protect the consumers of this Province.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on that point.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The minister is saying that he is going to give to Newfoundland Hydro some \$60 million in windfall benefits which this time last year was not contemplated, when Hydro was not saying they were going to have to bring in a rate increase. Is the minister saying he is going to permit all of that decrease in the cost of oil to be put into that rate stabilization fund and no money go back to the consumer? If so, he should resign and resign now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, if there is a hon. member in this House who should resign, it is the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RUSSELL:

He scampered across the House, Mr. Speaker, for no apparent reason. Because he could not take the heat, he had to get out of the kitchen.

Mr. Speaker, I have more

confidence in Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and their ability to manage their business affairs and protect the consumers of this Province than I have in the Leader of the Opposition, certainly .

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is just time for a very quick question.

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, recently I brought to the minister's attention the variance in price between heating oil in Nova Scotia as opposed to the cost of heating oil in St. John's. The minister promised to write the companies involved. Can he tell the House if he has written the companies yet? Has he taken any action to correct that obvious inequity in prices?

MR. BARRY:

Any reply?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, yes, I have written the oil companies in this Province who are selling heating oil, and I have not received a reply from either of them. As soon as I get the replies, we will take a look at what they are saying, of course, and I will be pleased to pass along any information I get to the hon. member.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, heating oil is costing Newfoundlanders up to twenty-five cents a gallon more for the same oil.

MR. RUSSELL:

5.9 cents per litre..

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, 5.9 cents per litre. Now, that is over twenty-five cents a gallon. Now, these are the minister's figures, taken from the letter that he was supposed to have sent -

MR. RUSSELL:

It is not up to me (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:

It does not matter, there is a difference of 5.9 cents per litre. Now, how long does the minister intend to wait for an answer? This has been going on for quite sometime. The minister did not take the trouble to enquire as to why the differential between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland until I brought it to his attention in the House a week ago. This letter was dated the day after I brought it to his attention. Now, how long does he intend to wait to get a reply back from these companies, which are obviously gouging the Newfoundland consumer, before taking some action?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:

I can assure the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) that the minister took action before he brought it to the attention of the House.

MR. BARRY:

What action? What action?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, we in the Department of Consumer Affairs were getting telephone calls about the difference in the cost of heating fuel long before the hon. member brought it up in the Legislature.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, and you did nothing about it.

MR. RUSSELL:

If the hon. member for Twillingate says I did not do anything about it, that is his opinion. It is not my fault, Mr. Speaker, if he is wrong.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in answer

to questions from the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) I had indicated that it was my information that more than one project had been approved under the Jobs Strategy Programme in the Bay d'Espoir area. There was a difference of opinion between the hon. member and myself. I want to provide him with further information so that he will have it available as the member for the area. The Bay d'Espoir Development Association has a project approved worth \$74,000 for ten jobs. The Milltown/Head of Bay d'Espoir Recreation group at Milltown has a project worth \$60,000 for ten jobs. Survival One in St. Alban's has a project worth \$40,000 for eight jobs, and the Town of St. Alban's has a project worth \$160,000 for twenty-six jobs.

MR. GILBERT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

We have just heard the hon. the Premier talk about forty-eight jobs that had been approved through the Jobs Strategy Programme for the Bay d'Espoir area. He did not answer the question that I asked.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Let him finish.

MR. GILBERT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would ask the hon. member if he would come to his point of order.

MR. BARRY:

He is trying to.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Listen to that over there again.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is not in order at the present time.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

This is getting a little (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Throw him out, throw him out again.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is I asked the Premier a question yesterday about 120 jobs in Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

He came back and said there are ten jobs approved by the Department of Forest Resources and Lands with the development association. So there are only 10 jobs for the 120. Those other ones had nothing to do with it. They are jobs that were applied for under Jobs Strategy and are the same as last year and every other year under Canada Manpower.

There are only 10 jobs for 120 people. It looks like Aladdin's lamp in reverse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
To that point of order, Hansard of yesterday indicates my information to this point is that there has been one project approved creating ten jobs, full stop.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY:
What about the forestry agreement and the FESP programme?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I have heard enough on that point of order. It was obvious to the Chair right from the start that the hon. member was getting up to explain. He had a difference of opinion with the hon. the Premier and his statement.

MR. BARRY:
That is never an hon. member's (inaudible), Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
That is never the hon. member's (inaudible), Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! It was not a point of order.

MR. BAIRD:
You need a spanking 'Leo.'

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I rise once again. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) cannot be making shouting interjections to the Speaker when the Speaker is making a ruling. Mr. Speaker, if that is going to be allowed to continue in this particular House, the whole format and the whole purpose of the House is going to completely and absolutely disappear. If any member on the opposite side or on this side wishes to engage in debate and criticize the government or criticize the Opposition, that is one thing, but to make interjections of the type that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is making to Your Honour is completely and absolutely unprecedented. It should not be allowed. It cannot be allowed to stand. I would hope and I would suggest that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should get up and apologize to the Speaker now. I say to the hon. gentlemen there opposite, if their leader cannot control himself, if he has to be removed again, they would be doing a great favour by carrying him out of the House.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

We have just seen again, Mr. Speaker, the hatred and the bile of the member for St. John's East for the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island (Mr. Barry). What we are saying on this side, Mr. Speaker, is that when a member stands in his place to make a point of order, surely he has to be given the time to come to his point of order. We will not allow the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) to stand up and direct Your Honour, or try to direct Your Honour, as he is always trying to do, rather, we will be heard in this House because we stand here for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We are not here to be put down and put under the thumb and the hobnail boots of the member for St. John's East.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Am I allowed to finish a point of order Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member is not speaking to the point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, just further to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is one thing, as I say, for any member of this House to engage in debate with a member on the other side. But it is quite another thing altogether for an hon. member to be shouting and braying

to Your Honour when Your Honour is making a ruling, right in the midst of a sentence by Your Honour, when Your Honour is on his feet. The rules are clear. When Your Honour gets on his feet or he is speaking, no member may, not only stand, but no member may speak when Your Honour is speaking. That is the only basis for my point. The hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) can make all the allegations they want. It happens to be my job as Government House Leader in this House to assist in helping to maintain the order and decorum of the House, as well as ensure the protection of the Chair. That, Mr. Speaker, is what I am doing. There is a marked distinction to be made. The hon. gentlemen there opposite can engage in any kind of debate and hurl any kind of accusation or insult that they want at myself or any other member opposite but, that does not entail making comments to Your Honour when Your Honour is speaking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Let me say this to the hon. gentleman: we on this side saw in Question Period yesterday, for example, a perfect abuse by the Premier of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We are talking about a point of

privilege.

MR. TULK:

A point of privilege as to whether a member, Your Honour, has a right to be heard.

MR. SPEAKER:

We are not talking about yesterday. We are talking about the point of privilege that cropped up today.

MR. TULK:

Let me say that we on this side, Mr. Speaker, will be heard. Yesterday was a precedent and an example of what I am talking about. We will not be put down. We will not be cut off. We want the same rights for members on this side as there are for that side. Mr. Speaker, that is the point that the Leader of the Opposition was making.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The point of privilege raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) related to when I got up to speak. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should have been silent. That is the point of privilege. It is the one that I am considering at the moment. The point is well taken. When the Speaker does get up, he is to be heard in silence. That is in our rules and it is in Beauchesne. I think we have heard enough on that point.

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Order 22, Bill No. 59.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

The debate was adjourned by the hon. the Minister of Environment.

The hon. the Minister of Environemt.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I welcome the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) back into the House today. I note that he is very testy. The hon. gentlemen there opposite cannot keep him under control. This is an embarrassing time for the Liberals in this Province, Mr. Speaker, because we are debating the principles of Bill 59.

MR. LUSH:

You are not.

MR. BUTT:

Oh, yes.

MR. BARRY:

I hear you put everybody asleep while I was gone.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate yesterday I was speaking on the \$300 million Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Development Fund and what that \$300 million development fund is being used for. I was pointing out, particularly to hon. members there opposite, that we, even though we have gone through a very difficult election in 1985, did not use it for a slush fund like hon. members there opposite would do.

Just let me use the words of an old mariner when I refer to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) because the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, is a very

embarrassed individual in this House.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a momentous bill. I would like to have the bill discussed. It is not in order for members to get up and attack any other member of this House. There might be a place for that, Mr. Speaker, but let us discuss this bill and see are we selling Newfoundland out or are we making a good deal. Let us discuss the bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

There is no point of order. There is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. There is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Minister of Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We have been engaged in a broad-ranging debate on this Bill. Just let me refer to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), the member for Mount Scio, as an old mariner would in that his hull is rusted. You have come

to an end in Newfoundland politics. It is blistered and pitted. The hon. member is no longer seaworthy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I have to tell the member that I have heard so much tripe from members opposite that I have barnacles on my hull that are going to scrape the skin right of that member in the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

I must inform the hon. minister that his time has now elapsed.

MR. BUTT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the two minutes that I had remaining to me have been taken up in points of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. minister have leave?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave.

MR. BUTT:

The points of order involved the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry).

I do not want to be on the hook to the hon. gentlemen there opposite so I will conclude very quickly, Mr. Speaker. Just let me say this to a couple of the members there opposite. I remember very distinctly the member for Terra Nova at the time, who is now the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), talking about local preference. Local preference, Mr. Speaker, has a very large part to play in Bill 59. The hon. member for Terra Nova, at that time, and Bonavista North now, stood in his place and he made his usual long-winded speech, flailing his arms and saying "no man is an island unto himself," and, "What are you going to do? Is the Premier going to put up the great wall of China around the Province and not let other Canadians in?" Now, Mr. Speaker, they want to jump on the bandwagon. I have listened to three speakers up until my turn came and I have not heard one member opposite address local preference.

MR. LUSH:

I have not changed my view, not since that day.

MR. BUTT:

You have not changed your view?

MR. LUSH:

I have not changed my views.

MR. BUTT:

The hon member did not put it on the public record when he spoke, Mr. Speaker.

This is the most important piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that has even come before this House and I say to hon. members that they should stand in their place and clearly indicate where they stand with relation to Bill 59. Are they going to take a stand

like the Opposition spokesman on energy (Mr. Flight) there opposite, the gentleman who said he did not know whether he was going to support it or not? The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) does not know. The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) did say that he would support it. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) has a job to do now in getting his act together on the other side.

Will we speak as hon. members in this House and address the very important points in this Bill or will we be as kippers?

MR. PEACH:

What? What is a kipper?

MR. BUTT:

A spineless, gutless fish, Mr. Speaker.

I rest my case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

The minister in his concluding remarks might refer to the Bill at least once and perhaps clarify clauses 41 (a), (b), and (c).

AN HON. MEMBER:

Question! Question!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

In my brief remarks to this Bill I would like to deal in detail with a few sections of the Bill eventually. I cannot start though without first of all pointing out that we have just heard from the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) who gave a forty-five or fifty-minute speech on this particular bill and not once mention the environmental aspects of the Bill. I think this is absolutely scandalous and shocking. I expected the Minister of the Environment to deal with the environment.

MR. BARRY:

He must have done that yesterday.

MR. BAKER:

He did not deal with it yesterday. I expected the Minister of the Environment to deal with the environmental safeguards in that particular section of the bill, but not one single word. That is shameless!

MR. BARRY:

You are kidding. I was not here yesterday. There must have been something yesterday.

MR. BAKER:

No, there was nothing. The only thing that I heard from the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt)

MR. BARRY:

What about protection from oil spills?

MR. BAKER:

No protection from oil spills, not a word about that.

MR. BARRY:

What about the potential impact on fish stocks?

MR. BAKER:

Not a word about the impact on fish stocks, not a word about the accumulative effect of the 8 tons of mercury a year that is going into the water and not a word about any environmental concerns! Maybe he does not have any environmental concerns. Maybe he has not looked into it. Maybe he does not know about these environmental concerns as related to the offshore. And that, Mr. Speaker, shocked me and amazed me. I thought I was going to hear a semi-intelligent discourse on the effect of the offshore development on the environment and the safeguards that are built into this particular bill respecting the offshore and respecting the environment. I did not hear a word on those matters, Mr. Speaker. I think that is a shameful performance.

MR. FUREY:

Shameful! What a shame!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to use my time making personal attacks. I do not intend to do that. I intend to deal with aspects of this bill that need to be dealt with. I can see that right away the minister responsible for oil is leaving. That is an indication of his concern. We all know about his introduction of the bill a few days ago.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say right off the top that there are things in this bill that are good.

MR. SIMMS:

What?

MR. BAKER:

There are things in this bill that

are good.

I have heard a number of speakers on the other side and they have not gone into these aspects of the bill. They have not pointed out what is good. All they have done is ranted, raved and shouted "this is a marvellous document!" Then they go on and personally attack members opposite. I would like to say that there are things in this bill that are good. I would like to point out for the elucidation of members opposite what a couple of these good aspects are.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the establishment of the seven-member Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board, this idea of establishing a board with representation from the Province, is a good idea. They have been given responsibilities, Mr. Speaker, for, they said, 'all matters relating to the management of offshore oil and gas resources.' That is not quite true. They have been given the final responsibility for some of the decisions relating to the offshore matters. They can only suggest and relay their concerns to the appropriate ministers on other fundamental decisions. But I think the establishment of the board is good. We have representation on that board and that is good. I have not heard members opposite talk about that good aspect at all. I would like to point it out to them.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I think that another good aspect of this bill is the establishment of the equalization offset payments. That is good because it deals with a concern that people in the Province had that as soon as revenues start coming from the

offshore, that immediately our equalization payments would be cut and we would end up with no benefit. This particular aspect of the bill allows us to get back 90 per cent of regular equalization payments during the first five years and, thereafter, an amount reducing by 10 per cent annually. So for thirteen years we will get some benefit from the offshore money. So I think that this particular kind of scheme to ensure that we do not immediately lose all our money in a reduction of transfer payments is a good aspect of the bill.

So there are, Mr. Speaker, some good aspects to the bill. If you go through a bill that has 207 sections, I would suggest to you that you could probably find quite a few other sections that are, in fact, good and can be classed as good. I had hoped that members opposite would have pointed these out. Obviously, they could not find them.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duties -

MR. TULK:

When you said 207 sections the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) had to look and see, that is how closely he has read the bill.

MR. BAKER:

Well, I understand that members opposite, from the content of their speeches, really have not read the bill anyway. This is my point.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duties, if I did not point out some other aspects of the bill that I consider to be not so good. Before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline

the situation under which we are debating this bill, the mood in the Province and the mood for the last few years.

We have undergone a traumatic six or seven years in Newfoundland with regards to the offshore situation, absolutely traumatic. We wanted to make sure that we were going to benefit from this great development. We went through a period of time when there was an awful lot of shouting and screaming. As Newfoundlanders we wanted to own the offshore, we wanted to control the development and we wanted a number of other things. Newfoundlanders seemed to agree that "yes, that is what we should do. That should be the situation." However, we are in the precarious situation now where we lost ownership in a court battle and that is a story that has been dealt with by some of my colleagues already.

After we lost ownership, Mr. Speaker, what was left? Let us put this ownership aside. It has been lost in the courts and that is another story. What is left? Well, I would suggest that control over the development offshore is an important issue in this bill. I would suggest to you that the method of production is an important issue. I would suggest to you that jobs are an important issue, especially long term jobs and long term benefits to the Province. I would suggest that the development of refining and petro-chemical industries in the Province is an important issue in the minds of people. And I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the money, the taxes, the royalties and so on that we get from the offshore development is an important issue.

So I have outlined five things that we have left. After we have lost ownership, we still have these other five things. I would like to deal with them, Mr. Speaker, in terms of specific clauses, for the most part, in Bill 59.

Before I get to the specific clauses, Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to get a handle on specifically what we are talking about. We are talking about the development of all of the offshore resources. On the surface, that is what we are talking about. In reality, right now, in the next number of years in this Province, we are concerned about the development of Hibernia where we will have one concrete platform and, when it gets into production, Mr. Speaker, we will be producing from that concrete platform in the vicinity of 170,000 to 180,000 barrels of crude per day. I just want to put this into perspective. This is the immediate future that we are talking about and we should have a concrete platform and a production rate of 170,000 to 180,000, maximum 200,000, barrels per day, probably down as low as 150,000 barrels per day. I think this is really what we are talking about in the immediate future.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to my list of things that I consider to be important from the point of view of this bill. The people of the Province have been told, in various press releases and so on by the government, that we have the same control - I am talking about my first point, control over development - as if the resource were on land. As a matter of fact, the word 'Alberta' has been used. The same situation as

Alberta. Alberta has got their oil in the ground. We have got our oil offshore. We will have the same control as Alberta has.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if members opposite have even checked to find out if, in fact, that is so. I spent three days the week before last talking to officials of the Energy Department in Ottawa, talking to Mobil people and other people in the oil industry, to try to get some answers to these questions. I have taken the trouble to do that because I was interested in it. I wonder how many members opposite took that trouble or did they just sit there like trained seals and say how marvellous this is and really say nothing of substance?

Mr. Speaker, on control over development, I would like to refer to, first of all, Section 34, (1) (2) and (3). Section 34 (1) says that where "a determination is made that self-sufficiency and security of supply do not exist, the Federal Minister has authority in relation to any fundamental decision, other than the one referred to in sub-section (2), made during that period." I am talking about control over the development of the offshore resources. Specifically stated, the federal minister has authority in relation to any fundamental decision in respect to any period where a determination is made that self-sufficiency and security of supply do not exist. If, in fact, we have self-sufficiency and security of supply, then the provincial minister has the responsibility and has the power.

I will deal with the other one. The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) is seeing this for the first time. Section (2), Mr.

Speaker, he should refer to it. Section (2): "Subject to sub-section (3), the Provincial Minister has authority in relation to a fundamental decision referred to in Paragraph (a) of subsection (4) of section 134." Paragraph 139, (4) (a), Mr. Speaker, in case the Minister of Forestry does not recognize it, has to do with part one of the development plan. I know that is kind of shock to him.

However, let us go on to part three of Clause 34, Mr. Speaker, to see how that is dealt with even further. The minister is now closing his little booklet. "Where the approval or disapproval by the provincial minister of a fundamental decision referred to in" that paragraph - that is part one of the development plan - "would unreasonably delay the attainment of self-sufficiency or security of supply," if that does not exist, "the Federal Minister may substitute, therefore, approval or disapproval, as the case may be, of the Federal Minister, and where the Federal Minister does so, that minister shall, for the purposes of this act, be considered to have authority in relation to that fundamental decision." So there now is the development plan taken care of.

Whereas, on the surface we get comments like, "we have the same control as if it were on land," in reality situations exist in here where we do not have that control, Mr. Speaker.

Let us go on to Section 35 because Section 34 hinges on the fact of self-sufficiency and security of supply. Let us go on now and find out what that means. Maybe in this bill there is a section here which says that we can determine

what self-sufficiency and security of supply is. After all in Canada right now, Mr. Speaker, we are producing more oil than we are consuming. We are importing 380,000 barrels of oil per day but, we are exporting much more than that. You might think on the surface that means we are self-sufficient, but no, Mr. Speaker, no! That is not the situation. There are an awful lot of riders attached to that. It has to do with the kind of crude. The Alberta crude is a bit thick so there would be a bit of trouble getting it down here. So really now, that means we are not self-sufficient. There are all kinds of riders attached.

You would think that because we are producing more oil than we are consuming we have security of supply. That is not so, Mr. Speaker. It was a shock to read Section 35 (2). The Minister of Forestry should pay attention to this. "For the purposes of section 34," which is the one, Mr. Speaker, I just read, "the first period shall commence January 1, 1986 and terminate December 31, 1990 and, in respect of that period" - now that is the five-year period about the self-sufficiency and security of supply - "a determination shall be deemed to have been made, for all purposes of this Act, that self-sufficiency and security of supply do not exist."

Mr. Speaker, the minute we put our signature on this bill it means that we are saying for that first five years the authority over the fundamental decisions rests with the federal government and not provincially.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the situation a few years ago if all

of a sudden the federal government said to Mr. Lougheed, when he was Premier of Alberta, 'Sorry, boy, we do not have security of supply in Canada, therefore we are taking over authority for all fundamental decisions relating to your oil on land?' Can you imagine what would have happened, Mr. Speaker? Yet, the government continually makes the statement, 'we are going to get control just as if it were on land like Alberta, like Mr. Lougheed.' How many times did I hear that?

Mr. Speaker, obviously Alberta would not put up with this and automatically hand over responsibility for all fundamental decisions to the federal government until we get a secure supply in Canada and then admit that we do not have a secure supply, therefore the federal government has control over all fundamental decisions.

I believe this is a very important aspect of this bill that members opposite have not dealt with, have not dared to go into, Mr. Speaker. To me, it is fundamental to judging whether this bill is proper or not and whether this bill is a good deal for Newfoundland or not. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in my point having to do with the control of development and the control of what goes on in the offshore, that we really do not have that control. We will not for the next five years.

The interesting thing about it, Mr. Speaker, is this: According to the present definition, we are short in Canada 380,000 barrels of oil a day, even though we are exporting oil from Alberta. We are short in Eastern Canada 380,000 barrels of oil a day.

What will Hibernia and this concrete platform that we are talking about produce? It will produce a maximum of 180,000 to 200,000 barrels a day, which means that that will not make us self-sufficient. So if we go to the 1990s, if we have accepted this definition of self-sufficiency now, in the 1990s we are going to have to accept the same definition, if that bunch are still in power. I hope they will not be in power. We are going to have to accept the same definition of security of supply and self-sufficiency. We are going to have to say for another five years, "Federal government, here is the control. You can have control over everything." We are going to have to say that, because Hibernia, producing at full capacity, will not satisfy the shortage of 380,000 barrels of oil a day we are experiencing in Eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I can see down through the years this government passing over control to the federal government of all fundamental decisions relating to the offshore. Granted, it is nice to have the joint management committee handling the nuts and bolts. I have already pointed out that this is a good aspect of the bill, but it is not good to hand over fundamental control to the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, the second point I mentioned was the method of production. It seems as if that is already settled. I think that Mobil has agreed to go ahead with one concrete platforms. But, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that Mobil agreed to it and Mobil made the decision to go with it. We did not make that decision. I would like to point out, Mr.

Speaker, that future methods of production are not the responsibility of the provincial government but the responsibility of the oil companies or the federal minister. They could quite easily go with other mechanisms other than concrete platforms.

I would like to deal with points three and four kind of together. One has to do with jobs and the other has to do with refining in petro-chemical industries. With regard to these points, the key section is 41 and I would like to deal with Section 41, Mr. Speaker.

I see the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is yawning. Now that we are getting into the technical details, he has difficulty following it and he is starting to yawn.

Section 41, "For the purpose of this section 'shortfall of petroleum deliveries in the Province' means" - so they tried to define what shortfall of petroleum products in the Province means. The purpose of defining what is meant by 'shortfall' in the Province, Mr. Speaker, is that there are certain declarations made in this document with regard to when in the Province there is a shortfall of petroleum supplies and that is absolutely crucial to us. If we are to get any use from the oil, then there is a mechanism set up whereby we declare that there is a shortfall of petroleum in this Province and, therefore, we kick in and get some of this petroleum to refine from the offshore.

Let us examine this in detail, because all that has been said in announcements made by the government so far is, "We have

100,000 barrels of oil a day from Hibernia." Mr. Speaker, that is giving a false impression. We have 100,000 barrels a day to refine from Hibernia if an awful lot of conditions are met.

The first thing that has to be done is to define what is meant by a shortfall. This is what is meant by a shortfall. I know that members opposite have difficulty following these complicated kinds of discussions, Mr. Speaker. One cannot blame them. It is not their fault. It relates to their capabilities.

Here is the definition. "For the purposes of this section, 'shortfall of petroleum deliveries in the Province' means the delivery of petroleum that are inadequate to supply, on commercial terms," the following: (a) "The end-use consumption and feedstock requirements of industrial facilities that are in place in the Province on the day of the coming into force of this Act."

Mr. Speaker, that is really interesting. In trying to get a handle on what this means, I called and talked to an individual who was one of, I believe, the six people responsible for actually doing the drafting of the act. I examined in some detail the meanings of a number of things here. The individual - and I will get to this a little later on in my speech - kept coming back to "But, you people are really protected." There is no protection later on, as I will point out. "You people are really protected because you can declare a shortfall if, in fact, you need it for your industrial facilities that are in place in the Province on the day of coming in force of

this Act." I asked that person, "What if I told you that we do not have the industrial facilities. They do not exist in the Province?" There was a silence for awhile, and then the person said, "Is that true?" I said, "Certainly! What great industrial facilities do you think we have in Newfoundland that are going to be in place on the day that this act comes into force?" The person said, "Well, I thought you had some petrochemical industries there." I said, "No. "Now," I said, "what is the effect of that?" "Well," she said, "that is not as good as it seems."

We could declare a shortfall of petroleum deliveries if (b) "the feedstock requirements of the refining facilities at Come-by-Chance on the day of coming into force of this Act or any refining facility constructed in the province to replace those facilities." Mr. Speaker, significant in this part of the definition is the fact that Come By Chance is singled out as having to be working on the day that this Act is proclaimed. This is the interpretation of the lawyers. It is specifically stated, but then they go on to say, "any refining facility constructed in the province to replace those facilities." But that is left wide open. It does not specify "the day of the coming into force of this Act" so, we will deal with that.

If Come By Chance is not operating, then there is no feedstock requirements. Therefore, after this Act is signed, we might as well write Come By Chance off. This is, in effect, what this does. I will point out in the next section how this is guaranteed. We can

declare a shortfall of deliveries if, as the next section states: "the feedstock requirements of any refining facility located in the province that was not in place on the coming into force of this Act, other than a facility referred to in paragraph (b)". In other words, now, they are moving on to other refining facilities, other than the one to replace Come By Chance. There is no mention of Come By Chance here. There is no mention that if Come By Chance still exists a year after the thing is signed that we can then declare a shortfall on the basis of that. There is no mention of that. Come By Chance is written off. This government will, when they sign this bill, write off Come By Chance.

I want to go on. "Required to satisfy the demand of industrial capacity, on the day of coming into force of this Act, in the province of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland." Mr. Speaker, let us go back and picture Mr. Lougheed when he was Premier of Alberta. The federal government would come to Mr. Lougheed and say, "Mr. Lougheed, you have a new facility coming on stream here but, I have to go and check with Montreal and Ontario to see if they need any oil before you can get any of your own oil to put in your own facility." Can you imagine what would happen? There would be absolute civil war in this country.

We do not have control or anything like it would be if this oil were on land. I would like to point that out in no uncertain terms. We do not have the control.

Let us assume that there is a mechanism whereby we can declare a

shortfall of petroleum resources in this Province. Let us assume that one of these mechanisms could kick in. What happens then? Mr. Speaker, I will go on to Section 41 (2) which deals with that problem.

"Where there is a shortfall of petroleum deliveries in the Province, the Provincial Minister may, after consulting with the Federal Minister, give notice to holders of production licenses in the offshore area that these facilities in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of subsection (1) that are specified in the notice have, during the term of the notice, the first option to acquire, on commercial terms, petroleum produced in the offshore area."

That is marvellous! If we can declare a shortfall, then we can simply demand the oil. We have first call on the oil. I pointed out the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, in declaring the shortfall. We have to go and check with the other provinces. We have to have refining facilities in the Province on the day that this comes into force or we have to build a new refinery. If we do not do those things, then we have to go and check with the rest of Eastern Canada.

In spite of this, let us suppose we could declare the shortfall, then all we have to do is lay claim to the oil. How marvellous, this is wonderful! Why did I not say this was a good part of this particular bill? Mr. Speaker, the reason is obvious. I am sure members opposite have not even looked at this part. I am sure the minister responsible for oil (Mr. Marshall) has read it but I do not know how much he is keeping his colleagues in the dark. Well,

maybe the minister does not have to make an effort to keep his colleagues in the dark because they do that well enough on their own. It goes on to say: "Unless a sales contract with respect to that petroleum has been entered into prior to the giving of the notice."

Mr. Speaker, that is an interesting "unless." Here we have 170 or 180,000 barrels of crude a day coming out of the ocean and here we have Mobil or some oil company, who has contracts for this particular oil.

MR. MARSHALL:

Does the hon. gentleman think oil comes out of the ocean?

MR. BAKER:

Well, under the ocean, oil floats, in case you did not know.

MR. BUTT:

Tell us your position on the local preference policy.

MR. BAKER:

I realize the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) has difficulty following my logic but, before I get to that I would like to finish this point.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

The hon. gentleman's time is up.

MR. BAKER:

I thought that I would be granted time to clue up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

I would like to know how much leave shall the hon. gentleman shall get? I do not mind giving him thirty seconds or so but, I think anything more than that is excessive.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, on that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the other side of the House would follow the same kind of thing that has been happening, that is unless there is some objection from the other side of the House that members be allowed to continue for practically as long as they want to conclude their remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is a point of order on the floor.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is making an excellent speech so I assume he would be allowed to go on as long as he keeps on at the level of excellence that he is at now because, unlike the crowd on the other side, Mr. Speaker, he is enlightening this House more than anybody on that side has done, including that great minister with oil on the brain, Mr. Marshall.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, further to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

It is my understanding of the agreement was that a reasonable amount of time, if a member ran out of his time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The minister had the floor.

MR. SIMMS:

If a member ran out of his time, Mr. Speaker, unless some member violently protested, there would be a reasonable amount of time given. I think the precedent has almost been set now because we gave the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) ten minutes and we gave the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) ten minutes, so I would think it another reasonable -

MR. BUTT:

No, no.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

No, no yesterday you did.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

I would suggest that that kind of amount of time might be a reasonable amount of time. You cannot go on ad infinitum.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander, to that point of order.

MR. BAKER:

I would remind Your Honour of the ruling that Your Honour made on Friday. I will just read it out. It says that, "My ruling would be therefore that as long as no objections are raised as it pertains to any other member of the House on either side, then the person would go on beyond the time allotted in the Standing Order. However, if an objection is raised by any member, then the Standing Order allowing a half an hour would apply." Mr. Speaker, that specifically was your ruling. It had nothing to do with ten minutes or anything else. It had to do with an objection being raised by the other side.

I would like to point out to Your Honour, with great respect, that there was no objection raised on the other side when I reached whatever time I was allowed. There was no objection raised, therefore, I assumed I could just continue on with my speech.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

I am going to make one further comment on the ruling on Friday. I have vivid memories of that ruling. My ruling was precisely as the hon. member has indicated. He has quoted it very accurately.

The ruling is, in fact, based on the fact that both sides of the House have gone beyond the allotted time and because there was some ambiguity with regards to an arrangement or an agreement. That matter has now been settled. I do not think we can look to what went on before as precedent. We have to go by the ruling on Friday, and the ruling on Friday simply is that a member, speaking in this debate and for as long as this debate lasts, may go on unless there is an objection. I interpret the fact that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) stood in his place, as any hon. member on either side may do, as an objection. Consequently, I would certainly rule that the hon. member be given a reasonable period of time to conclude his remarks. That is not thirty seconds or a minute, but a reasonable period of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The final word I want to say is this: We either do one of two things here for the purposes of this debate. We either establish, with the consent of the House, a particular and specified period of time of five minutes or ten minutes, whatever the case may be, or we are in the hands of the House when any hon. member makes an objection.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's North, to that point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

I have no objection if the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) speaks a little beyond his allotted time. But I think we should understand clearly how long he is going to speak for. So perhaps we will give him five minutes at a time and at the end of five minutes we will see how he is doing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

I am sure the hon. member is not serious. There can obviously be no arrangement of that sort. We must either agree to a specified period of time which will apply to all members on both sides or, the member speaking, the member who has the floor -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

It is either that or the member who has the floor and who is speaking will continue until there is an objection raised. That is the ruling based on what happened on Friday.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, just for a matter of clarification. I agree with Your Honour that until there is some objection on the other side, the hon. member should be allowed to continue. Your Honour is right

when he says that this House has its own rights and privileges in its own hands. Mr. Speaker, if I could correct some statement that was made by the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), in that we, on this side, had limited the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) just to ten minutes. That is not true. We just said "as long as you have something to say, go ahead and say it."

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West first, then the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to get it into perspective in regards to Your Honour's ruling and what was said by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). The fact of the matter is we are going to operate under the Standing Rules of the House and that is anyone who speaks in the debate has a half an hour to speak or thirty minutes. If somebody goes beyond that, it is by leave of the House.

MR. TULK:

You cannot tell the Speaker how to run the place.

MR. TOBIN:

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to operate under the Standing Orders of the House, which means thirty minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You are?

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

The President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) said it the other day, Mr. Speaker, that we will operate under the Standing Orders of the House and anyone who wants to speak can speak with leave of the House. Mr. Speaker, there may not be leave given if the member keeps it up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I will have to recognize the member for Twillingate first.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, by the Government House Leader's (Mr. Marshall) own admission, this is the most important piece of legislation to come before this House, possibly since Confederation. It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, and I think the record should show that the only objections that are being raised with respect to the duration of speeches are coming from the other side.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No. Not true.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is a matter of record, Mr. Speaker, that nobody on this side objected to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) when he spoke for, I believe, over an hour. We willingly gave the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) unlimited time even though he spent half of his time castigating the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and talking about everything except

the legislation. We did not object to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) going over his time, even though he did not utter one syllable concerning the environment. We have not objected to anybody on the other side. It appears that the government members are interested in muzzling the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. member will confine his remarks to the point of order raised and conclude his remarks.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the members on the other side do not want the members on this side to have enough time to speak to this very important bill. My colleague is making an excellent speech. In fact, it is probably a much more enlightening speech than the one made by the minister whose job it was to introduce the legislation. At least half of His speech, as I said a moment ago, was taken up criticizing the Leader of the Opposition. It was not at all relevant to the legislation being introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I have this to say, Sir, that this is a very important bill. It is probably the most important bill that will ever come before this House, both in the immediate and long-term. Surely, if a member on this side wants to go beyond the thirty minute time period that he should not be operating under the constraint of having an extra two minutes to wind up.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ten minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

Are we so busy, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot allow members on this side to express their views on this important legislation?

Let me say this in conclusion, Mr. Speaker: We have heard criticism by the members opposite about the so-called Churchill Falls legislation. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition of the day then, including the man who is now occupying the role of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), and maybe Your Honour, had been given time, or at least taken the time, Mr. Speaker, to properly debate that bill, maybe some of the inequities that they allege exist in it would not have gone through and would not have been passed. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not take time to discuss and to debate this bill, maybe fifteen or twenty years time the same can be said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I stepped over the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) in preference of the hon. member for Twillingate. The hon. member for Fogo is next, and the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) after that.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stay on this debate very long but, I want to point out the insulting attitude of the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) towards the Chair. The Chair has made a ruling, and that is that unless there is objection raised that members be allowed to continue to speak. As the Chair has made that ruling, unless the

House is going to withdraw it, that is the rule of the House.

Let me point out the way we have been operating on this side, Mr. Speaker. The member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) yesterday was speaking and he wanted some extra time. These are my remarks as I spoke for this side and said what we were willing to accept. "In spite of the fact that he was getting as low in the mud as he could get, if he had something else to say we did manage to get him back on the track, I want to put on 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 of the hon. gentleman saying what he wants to say." We, on this side, are not setting time limits on those people because, as the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) says, this is a very important issue. Maybe, if the debate is carried on as it should be carried on, Mr. Speaker, we will not have the kinds of mistakes that were made by another energy deal in this Province, namely Churchill Falls. I would ask that Your Honour tell the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) not to insult the Chair, to abide by the rulings of this Chair and the rulings of this House. If we want to change the Standing Orders for any particular occasion, we can.

MR. PEACH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The member for Carbonear and that is the last point I am going to hear on this matter.

MR. PEACH:

Some of the comments that the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) just made on that point of order are valid. If we remember, those of us who were here yesterday, when the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) was concluding, it was ruled that he would have leave of the House for ten minutes to clue up. The member is right that when my time limit was up at thirty minutes. It was agreed that I would continue as long as the member for Bonavista North. I would like, Mr. Speaker, just to draw your attention to Hansard of February 15, for just two comments before Your Honour will rule, I am sure, in the right way.

I refer to a comment that was there which said, "What has 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. I think that what the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has said is appropriate and that the hon. gentleman was proceeding on as if he had unlimited time. We would want him to draw his remarks to an end within ten minutes or otherwise we evoke the rule giving somebody else a chance." At the end of that Your Honour, who was in the Chair at the time has said, "I have heard enough to that point of order. The hon. the member for Bonavista North 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." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

Another aspect of the ruling on Friday has been raised. Let me

deal with it. Debate in this House is covered by Standing Orders and it is also controlled by precedent. Hon. members on both sides, from time to time, have called into question some rulings of the Chair because the Chair makes a ruling with regard to setting a precedent. The Chair has to take that into account. That is what the ruling was based on the other day, the dangers of precedent setting.

Hon. members, as I said, find fault and yet the same hon. members will rise and cite that very same precedent for going on with debate at another time and another place. It seems to me that the ruling on Friday can be interpreted in a number of ways, I suppose, if you want to just deal with part of that ruling. The hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) just cited one example. The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) cited another example.

It seems very clear that the Chair ruled on Friday because of the fact that a number of members had gone beyond the thirty minutes under the assumption there has been an agreement and because there has been no objection. An objection was raised, despite the fact that the Chair on two occasions asked what the time allotment was. Despite the fact that when asked, there was an indication of an arrangement or an agreement, and the Chair later found there was no such agreement, the Chair ruled that the hon. members speaking in this debate would be covered by the Standing Orders but could go on with leave of the House and would be allowed to go on in the debate unless a protest was made or a complaint was made by any hon. member. That was the ruling.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is so long ago and I was just in the middle of my speech, so I would like to very briefly point out what I said so far. I have dealt with Bill 59 itself, and specific clauses of the bill, some good ones and some bad ones. I was going through my list, Mr. Speaker. I was pointing out that we have lost, if we sign this bill, our control over what goes on in the offshore and over fundamental decisions offshore by the bill itself because we declare that we do not have self-sufficiency and security of supply. I have dealt with the fact that according to this, there cannot be any refining or petrochemical industries, and no new petro-chemical industries in this Province, because of the amount of oil and the availability.

I was just into and just trying to get around to this final part of Section 41 (2) which dealt with, "Unless the sales contract with respect to that petroleum has been entered into prior to the giving of the notice." That point, Mr. Speaker, has been brought up before. The response from the minister has been, "Oh well, we are only talking about thirty, sixty, and ninety-day contracts, short term contracts." Mr. Speaker, if that is the case, then nobody anywhere, provincial government, federal government, Mobil, nobody should have any objection to putting in here, "Unless a sales contract with respect to that petroleum has been entered into prior to the giving of the notice and that such a sales contract be not more than ninety days in duration." There

should be no objection if, in fact, that is so. We know though, Mr. Speaker, the way it goes. Mobil has got its own refineries to supply. Our crude is sweet crude, good crude, it flows easily and it is among the best crude you can get. They are going to sign contracts with their own refineries to supply this good quality crude and they are not going to sign thirty-day contracts, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Hydro has got a one-year contract.

MR. BAKER:

Hydro has got a one-year contract at Holyrood. That was not a thirty-day contract. So, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that that exclusion says that any contracts that Mobil would have or any developer would have, and would enter into before we get around to declaring a shortfall of supply in the Province, would have to be honoured. Whether they are one-year contracts, two-year contracts or whatever, they would have to be honoured first. Mr. Speaker, that is not giving us first call to our resources.

We cannot even get oil for any existing refineries under Bill 59. We cannot get any oil for any new industries in this Province unless we first, number one, honour all Mobil's existing contracts, and, number two, go and check with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to see if they want the oil first. Until we do that, we have no call for it.

Mr. Speaker, the next point was jobs. What does that mean in terms of jobs? It means that we are going to get a lot of short-term construction jobs on the platform and very few

long-term jobs. We are going to pump our oil out of the ground, up through this water, onto the concrete platform, and onto a ship to be taken away somewhere. That is all we are going to do. It is going to be taking another resource that we have and selling it in its raw state. That is precisely what is going to happen. There will be a lot of short-term jobs from a government who, a few years ago, wanted nothing to do with short-term jobs.

I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that when I put the concrete platform idea to one of the rather high officials in the Energy Department in Ottawa, his comment was, "Well, if you fellows want to go for the big boom and short-term jobs, not very many long-term jobs, that is your problem. I did not think you were as crazy as that."

Mr. Speaker, not my final point but, here is the final point in my list of five that I stated at the beginning. One would expect that we would get a good deal on royalties and taxes coming into the Province. We would expect to control the development. We would expect to have some say in the method of production. We would expect to get long-term jobs. We would expect to have refining and petrochemical industries and we would expect to get a good deal on the royalties and taxes. Mr. Speaker, what kind of a deal do we have on the royalties and taxes? How can we figure it out? How can I find out how much money is going to come into this Province if Hibernia is producing 170,000 barrels of oil a day? How can I find it out by reading this Bill 59? Nobody will tell me. I have asked a lot of people. I have

asked people in the oil industry. I have asked people in the Energy Department in Ottawa. Nobody can tell me. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that with this bill we are buying a pig in a poke, if we buy it. We do not know what royalties there are going to be.

As a matter of fact, there have been rumors and there have been several stories over the last two or three months in the mainland press that seem to indicate that there is a possibility that perhaps we may have to subsidize the development. Now, Mr. Speaker, what a situation! We have to subsidize the development. This development was suppose to provide us with all the riches. Mr. Speaker, I do not even like to mention it. I do not like to hear it, but in actual fact, we have not been given details of the royalty regime and of the taxes that we can expect and so on. I had hoped that the minister, in introducing this bill, would get down to brass tacks and say, "okay, if we can get \$25 a barrel in 1990 on the world market, then this is what it will mean to us. If we can get \$35 a barrel" - I wish that were the case - "here is what it will mean to us per year in the amount of money coming in, so we can then put the money into the fishery and into the forestry and the social network in this Province."

MR. BARRY:

They are trying to sell a pig in a poke.

MR. BAKER:

"If we could get \$50," - Mr. Speaker, some years ago I heard even mention of \$80 and \$90 a barrel - "if we get \$50 a barrel for oil, here is what it will mean

to this Province." Mr. Speaker, we have heard none of that.

I am sure that somebody in the industry knows. I am sure that somebody must know how much it is going to cost to get that barrel of oil out of the ground out there. Somebody must know. And somebody must somewhere have a grasp of how much money it is going to mean to this Province, if we can get \$25 a barrel for oil or some other price. It must be there somewhere. I was hoping that this would be touched on in the introduction to the bill and that we would be told those things. How can we sensibly vote on this pig in the poke without knowing these things, Mr. Speaker? I find it very difficult to say that this bill is the kind of thing that is going to result in prosperity for this Province. I sincerely wish that I could say that this bill is going to result in prosperity for this Province. I hope it does. I hope that we have ten wells producing a million barrels of crude a day, and that the world prices are \$40 or \$50 a barrel. That would be nice.

MR. BARRY:

Could you say a little bit about the environment?

MR. J. CARTER:

No, your time is up.

MR. BAKER:

I would need a lot of time to go into great length on the environmental concerns. I brought some of them up to the committee that was going around the Province dealing with environmental concerns. It would take hours to deal with them properly and the effect of a lot of the different kinds of pollutants that are going to be dumped into the ocean near

the platform or platforms or wellheads as the process goes on. Mercury, cadmium, and a lot of other things, Mr. Speaker, are going to be dumped in there and I wish I heard something about their possible affect on fish and the mention, in some cases, of a dead zone of five miles or whatever, the zone where sea life would be at risk and so on. There are an awful lot of those concerns I thought the minister would deal with.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would remind the hon. member he has about two minutes left to wind up.

MR. BAKER:
I would like to say from the point of view of all of those points that I brought up, they are all important. They specifically relate to the bill.

MR. BUTT:
Can you support the bill?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:
I quoted from the sections that I am concerned about. I am concerned about more sections than that, Mr. Speaker. Like I said, there are more good sections in here and there are more bad sections. I have been concerned about some and happy about some. It would take days to go into them all, especially if I got into the environmental aspects.

I would like to point out to members opposite that so far the communication to the people of this Province has been lacking. The people of this Province have

not really been told what is in this bill, Mr. Speaker. They have not been told. They have been given some pap put out by the propaganda system. They have not been told the details of Sections 41, 34 or 35. They have not been told about the kinds of control that we are now signing away. They have not been told about the long-term jobs versus short-term jobs and what this government has opted to do. They have not been told about any of those things and they have not been told about the possible environmental problems that could result from a number of these platforms offshore. They have not been told about the eight tons of mercury going into the Grand Banks, the most lucrative fishing ground in the world.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:
They have not been told about the five-mile zone around the platforms. Hopefully ten years down the road we will have platforms and not one platform.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:
We have not been told about that zone.

MR. BARRY:
There are no objections.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

We have already established the

rules.

MR. PEACH:

He has had the same time we had.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It has already been established what we were going to do with regards to the rules and we have already established the fact that a precedent was set yesterday with the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush). Ten minutes was allowed and I told the hon. gentleman that he had three minutes a little while ago. I was simply now reminding him that he should conclude his remarks.

MR. BAKER:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, my hearing aid was turned down.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Not just in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but in any debate in this House a member can speak on, and on, and on until there are objections raised. I have seen nobody stand up their seat, ask for recognition, address the Chair and express an objection. Anybody who has the guts of a kipper would do that in this debate. When we on this side of the House have permitted members to go on and exceed their time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. BARRY:

Every member that has gotten up has been permitted extra time to state this important Bill. We

have the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Speaker, asking the Opposition not to have second debate on this Bill when it is brought back into the House. Some chance, Mr. Speaker, like ducks!

Mr. Speaker, the point is that if there is a member of this House that has an objection, the way it should be done is for that member to stand in his place, ask for Your Honour's recognition, and then make the point.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, if I could address that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. It is point of incitement and excitement. The hon. gentleman can scream and bawl all he wants but the rules are there. They have been established by people who were here long before us. They are there in the Standing Orders and that is that.

I do not know what has gotten into the hon. gentleman. I do not know what it is but he seems to be like screaming Lord Such in this House in the last few days. His colleagues cannot control him and what we are going to have to do is use the same thing we use with other animals, we will have to use a tranquilizing gun.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair is not going to entertain any further debate on the matter of the ruling on Friday. It was already explained. A ruling was made and

an interpretation has been given today. Whether hon. members on either side agree with that ruling is academic. The fact remains that the precedent has been set, ten minutes to an hon. member, with leave of the House, after the Standing Orders were applied, which is half an hour. Now hon. members may not agree but that is very unfortunate. The Chair is not going to see the House turned into a free-for-all or a circus. That is my ruling, that is final and that is it. I do not want to hear anything else about it from either side.

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I did not see a note and I did not realize you were saying I had three minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) is correct. He was not given a note. He was given a note for his regular time. I am not faulting the hon. member for Gander at all. My remarks were not directed to him.

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks by saying that there is a section on environment and all this kind of thing that I could spend a couple of the hours of the House's time on. However, to conclude I would like to point out just one single thing, Mr. Speaker, about the environmental safeguards in this particular bill.

I would like to refer you, Mr. Speaker, to Section 154 which deals with waste. One would think that in dealing with waste we

would be talking about spills and things, well, spills are dealt with, but other kinds of things that are put out into the environment, the waste. If you read that section, Mr. Speaker, you will find that waste means -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. This is intolerable.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I will supply a formal objection. The hon. member has exceeded his time, exceeded our patience and should sit down forthwith.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already asked the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) to conclude his remarks and I was allowing him to do just that.

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Waste here, Mr. Speaker, refers to waste from the point of view of gas being burned off that could be sold, waste from the point of view of materials that are not processed properly and could be processed in a more valuable manner and so on. It seems to me that the stress, from the point of view of the environmental safeguards in here, is on economics and not on what could happen to the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence. I really regret that I do not have enough time to finish my remarks. I am probably about one quarter to one fifth of the way through the kinds of things that I would like to point

out on this floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I hope at some point in the Committee stage that I can deal with an awful lot of those concerns that I know that all members on this side have with regard to the fishery and with regard to the environment, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please! The hon. member should conclude his remarks now.

MR. BAKER:

- with regard to the amount of money and the benefit that is going to come to our Province to help in the forestry and the fishery and social services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it should not go unnoticed, and it should be established in the record of this House, Mr. Speaker, that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and other members opposite decided to cut the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) off from

his remarks when he was in the middle of pointing out the threat to the fishing industry of this Province, the threat to the environment, and the need for special environmental measures. That should not go unrecorded in the Hansard of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Let me deal with that matter and I do not want to hear any further comment on it. I have already informed the Leader of the Opposition, it was not any member of the House that cut off the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker), it was the Chair, in keeping with the rules. I had already indicated ten minutes and that was the ruling and that is fine. If the hon. the Leader of the Opposition does not want to accept the ruling, I am very sorry, that is very unfortunate, but the rules apply to all members of the House.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Perhaps the Speaker missed it, but is it the member for St. John's North's (Mr. J. Carter) fetch that is in the House that got up? Mr. Speaker, I sat here and listened to the member for St. John's North get up and stand in this House and

say he objected to the member continuing. Mr. Speaker, that is in Hansard and that cannot be removed from Hansard.

MR. SPEAKER:

I do not want to hear anything further on the matter with regards to why the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) discontinued his speech. I acknowledge the fact that the hon. the member for St. John's North rose in his place, which is his privilege to do. That is not the basis on which I made the ruling. The basis on which I made the ruling was that ten minutes had been allowed the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) yesterday by the Speaker, not by me, but by the Speaker. That had been established. Leave was granted by members to the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) and it is on that basis he continued. It had nothing at all to do with the fact that the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) rose in his place.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I would just like to clarify this for the record.

MR. BARRY:

Let the record show what happened.

MR. J. CARTER:

Let the record show that I got up and objected to the hon. member for Gander speaking ad nauseam. He had a full hour, in fact, he had an hour and two minutes and if that is not more than enough for him to vent his spite in this House, I do not know what is.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) might not have been aware or he might have been out of the House when his Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) managed to go to forty minutes, fifty minutes, whatever it was -

AN HON. MEMBER:

He had two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- talking about the development of the offshore without mentioning the threat to the fishing industry or the threat to the environment once! Did the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) overlook that?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

I recognize the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, they are finally giving me the opportunity to say a

few words in this debate. It is interesting to note my suspicion that the strategy now being pursued by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and members opposite is to somehow put in the minds of the people that we are muzzling them from speaking in this debate. In addition to that, my suspicion is that their strategy is to somehow give the appearance that they have given freedom to all members on this side to speak in the debate with unlimited time, so that when the Leader of the Opposition finally reaches his point in speaking in the debate, then he will argue, "we gave you unlimited time, then I should have unlimited time." If that is their strategy, Mr. Speaker, I suspect, now I will not say it, but I suspect that members on this side are certainly not going to agree with that. If that is their strategy, they should get it out of their minds.

Mr. Speaker, I want to, first of all, make a few comments on the speech given by the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker). I do not know if it was good but, I have to say one thing for him, he did everything that he could to try to bait us, to try to mix us up and try to confuse us, which I know you have suggested would be easy. He has tried to finagle us with legal terminology.

MR. PATTERSON:
Jargon.

MR. SIMMS:
Legal jargon, as the member for Placentia says. His argument has been so weak that that is what he has been trying to do for the last forty-five minutes or an hour. He has talked about refining capacity. He talked about refineries. I am surprised, Mr.

Speaker, that he did not tell us about fractionators and depropanizers and all the rest of it, which I know he is very familiar with. I would suggest the hon. the member for Gander does not know the difference between an oil refinery and a backwoods still. That is clear from what he had to say in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you another thing.

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

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

MR. BARRY:
I wonder if the Minister of Forestry is aware, from his experience with backyard stills, that there is very little difference in the principles of operation between a backyard still and an oil refinery? Is the minister aware of that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
No, Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with the operations of a backwoods still. Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition is a bit of an expert on it. That is fine.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Gander's argument has been so weak he has now tried to bring in all this technical language and

everything but he did not have his heart into it. It was obvious to anybody who watched the debate, he did not have his heart into it. What he had to say, of course, was very weak. I say to him, Mr. Speaker, the things that he mentioned in the debate will not work because there are greater minds and greater men than he who have looked at all of the points that he raised in the debate. I will cover some of those points and some of those observations by some other individuals as I go on through my speech.

Interestingly enough, he mentioned Mr. Lougheed in a negative sort of way on about three occasions throughout his speech. I wonder if the members of the House are aware of what the people in British Columbia had to say about the appointment of Mr. Lougheed by this government? I wonder if they are aware what they say in British Columbia? Here is what it says: "You have to hand it to the Newfoundland Premier Brian Peckford. He knows a good deal when he sees one. Peckford has hired Peter Lougheed. The canny Newfoundland Premier has not only acquired the services of one of the most knowledgeable people in the field of petroleum development but, he has closed the deal with a bargain basement price tag. The hiring of Lougheed is in pleasant contrast to the price tag of the MacDonald Royal Commission on the economy, which was launched by the federal Liberals in 1982 with a budget of \$22 million." That is what the people of British Columbia are saying about the appointment of Mr. Lougheed as an advisor to this government, Mr. Speaker. So the member for Gander can be as negative as he wishes and for as often as he wishes.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I just want to point out to the hon. minister, who is giving such a fascinating speech - it looks like it is going to be a string of quotations grabbed from here, there and everywhere - that your government also hired one Cabot Martin for \$150 an hour. On an average eight hour day, that is \$1,200, which is \$200 more than Brian Mulroney is paying Canada's chief negotiator at the U.S. - Canada Free Trade Talks.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is getting up and speaking in this debate, and this is really just a point of interruption.

MR. FUREY:

It was a point of information.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is the strategy of the hon. gentleman there opposite is to try to scuttle the debate and get up on spurious points. The hon. gentleman is out of order himself on getting up on a point of order like that, that is nothing but, purely and simply, an interruption of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

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

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for that ruling.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. mouthpiece for Brian Tobin will have his chance to participate in this debate and use all those kinds of excerpts.

MR. BUTT:

Watch your back 'Leo'!

MR. CALLAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) told us, at least, that he was reading from, I assume, a British Columbia newspaper. Now whether or not that is true, we do not know, but one way we can all find out and see who wrote the article is the minister has, Mr. Speaker, to table the document that he read from, so I ask that he would be asked to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it is customary to table a document that has been read from.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to get into the meat of my remarks. I am having a very difficult time. I do not know why. I have hardly ever interrupted any member over on that side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

There are one or two possible exceptions.

We are debating what has been described as the most significant piece of legislation that has been brought into this Legislature since Confederation. We are debating legislation that for once in our lives will give us rights rather than take them away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

We will have rights to management and revenue even after the courts in this Province and elsewhere ruled against us. So this is a major and significant achievement. I suspect that even the most hardened Liberal in the Province would have to admit that this is a very positive piece of legislation and a positive bill that we are debating.

Mr. Speaker, the only member on that side who has made any comment at all in a positive light was the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) who did point out that there were some

positive features. He did not spend much time on it, in fact, he spent about two minutes at the beginning of his debate saying there are some positive features in this bill. But then, of course, he went on for the remaining forty-five minutes or so to criticize.

Let us just review briefly what the other members opposite who have spoken in this debate have said. First we had the Energy critic, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. FLIGHT).

MR. BUTT:

The little man from Buchans.

MR. SIMMS:

I do not like to say anything negative about the member for Windsor - Buchans, nor would I. But I can certainly say something negative about what he had to say in the debate and that is perfectly acceptable. What he had to say in the debate, of course, was quoted very accurately in the newspapers and it was almost to the effect that Graham Flight also spoke in the debate. I think they gave him a few extra sentences but, that is the extent of the contribution the member for Windsor - Buchans made, who is the official critic for the Opposition on this particular and vital matter.

Then we had the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert). I think my colleague the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) effectively pointed out what he had to say because he said he had kept notes on everything the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir had said, and he just passed the notes to me. There they are there, that is what the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir had to say in this debate

- absolutely nothing.

Then we come to the flamboyant member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), a very flamboyant speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Usually very entertaining.

MR. LUSH:

Absolutely.

MR. SIMMS:

Absolutely very entertaining, especially when he is speaking to an important resolution such as this that we have here today before us. I enjoyed him, I must say, but I have to admit and I think he almost admits to himself that he did not say anything of any consequence. He talks about the last three elections, and how we ran them on the issue of the offshore, and all that kind of old nonsense. But he flailed and threw his hands in the air and all those sorts of things which he usually does, and does well. He did it well. He practically frothed at the mouth. And then we had the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), and I just mentioned what the member for Gander had to say.

But, Mr. Speaker, one glowing factor has come out of this debate. From what has been said by members opposite, based on their comments and based on their debate, there is one glowing factor, I believe, which has come out, and that is that members opposite have not even taken the time to read the bill. I do not believe they have even read Bill 59, and it is very obvious from what they have had to say. Otherwise, why would they make the kinds of comments they made? Why

would they ask the kinds of silly questions they have been asking? The critic, himself, has said he has not decided whether he is going to support the legislation or not. They have criticized, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, solely for the sake of criticizing, contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition professed he would never allow to happen while he was leader. But that is exactly what they have been doing, criticizing for the sake of criticizing.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, even the staunchest Liberal in this Province would have to admit there are a lot of positive aspects to this bill. But they have chosen to be negative, as they always are, and that is fair ball, if that is the tack they want to take. But I think, Mr. Speaker, they found they cannot say anything bad about the legislation, they cannot find anything bad. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition has been reported as saying, 'I cannot find anything bad with this particular piece of legislation.' They cannot find anything wrong, Mr. Speaker, so they have decided to throw out a few red herring about Clause 54, and all that kind of thing. But all this criticism, Mr. Speaker, and all this lack of positive approach from members opposite really is unusual, because it comes from the very same crowd who, a couple of years ago, wanted us desperately to sign the Nova Scotia agreement which, by all accounts now, even by the most independent observers, is rated as probably the worst deal that could ever have been offered.

But the ultimate insult, Mr. Speaker, to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador right now, today, is that they do not

know where they stand on this particular issue, even after all these years they alluded to.

The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) says he does not know yet, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) says, 'I will probably vote for it', the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) says, 'I will vote against some clauses.'

MR. FLIGHT:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

I do not mind being quoted in this House but I like to be quoted correctly. I did not say I did not know where I stood, I said I was not going to tell the hon. the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), or the hon. minister, where I stood, yet.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is close enough for me. He will not tell us how he is going to vote. The reason he will not tell us how he is going to vote is because he does not know where he stands on the bill, and that is exactly what I just said.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is no point of order.

Anyway the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) says he does not know how he is going to vote yet, the member for

Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) says, 'I will probably vote for it', the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) says, 'I am going to vote against some clauses in this Bill', and the member for Gander (Mr. Baker), I think he said he could not vote for it. 'How can we vote for it, we do not know what it is all about?' - I think that is what he said. So that is a very clear and consistent stand I think, clear to anybody who might be watching and listening to the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is time for the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador, for once in their lives, to stand up and be counted. Let the people of Newfoundland and Labrador know how you feel about this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would further suggest -

MR. BAKER:

They are going ahead with Air Canada, eh 'Len'?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

My position on Air Canada is quite clear. The hon. member need not worry about that.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, just to carry on with that train of thought, if the Liberal Party had the intestinal fortitude to stand up and state precisely what their position is on this particular issue, I think that would be excellent strategy on their part. I think it would be good strategy on their part, if they find the intestinal fortitude to be able to do that. It would be the right thing to do naturally, and it

would be the right thing for them to do politically. But, for some strange reason, they cannot see that. But it will soon be time, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) says, 'We might just do that.' That is about the size of it, Mr. Speaker, they might just do that. They do not know what they are going to do and that, Mr. Speaker, is the bottom line.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to carry on without too much interruption. Hon. members have been at it for about fifteen minutes now, so maybe they could relax a little bit and sit back. If their problem is that they cannot find enough argument to support the legislation, let me see if I can offer some argument for them, some positive features of this particular legislation. Maybe I can convince them to update their strategy, and maybe I can convince them to support government on this particular piece of legislation, because I think it would be the right thing for them to do naturally and the right thing for them to do politically.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, this legislation which has been introduced in this House to implement the Atlantic Accord represents a solid foundation in our minds, I think, for a very prosperous era for years to come for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. This Atlantic Accord and the promise that it holds for our people, over the years, came about after a long period of worry, a long period of fighting between ourselves and the

former government in Ottawa, a government which, I think it is fair to say, tried its best to keep us from getting our rights. But, Mr. Speaker, we held out in the face of extreme pressure, pressure that was applied from every quarter, not the least of which was the quarter across the House, the Liberal Opposition, because that pressure came from within the Province and from outside the Province to sign an agreement, any agreement, but particularly an agreement like that weak and one-sided agreement that Nova Scotia was persuaded to accept and which that province has since repudiated.

Mr. Speaker, I think we would have been foolish to buckle under all that pressure. If we had given in to that pressure put forth by members opposite, this Province today would virtually have no prospects for obtaining any real share of the potential wealth that is represented by the oil deposits at Hibernia and other sites, both discovered and undiscovered. If we had, Mr. Speaker, given in, if we had wavered at all and bent before the pressure and the tactics exerted by members opposite, we would have found ourselves in a thoroughly subordinate position today on every front, including the task of managing this particular resource. So I think our determination to hold out for an equitable deal has put us in a situation today that is unique in many respects, so unique, Mr. Speaker, in fact, and so new that few people have really had an opportunity to fully realize the extent of the impact that the Atlantic Accord will have on our lives and the lives of our fellow Newfoundlanders and, indeed, the effect it will have on our

relationship with the rest of Canada in years to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in that regard it may be useful to have a look at the Atlantic Accord through the eyes of an outsider. I refer to Paul Eamon of the Osgoode Hall Law School who, I am sure, the Leader of the Opposition is very familiar with.

MR. BARRY:

A former student of mine. I flunked him a couple of times.

MR. SIMMS:

Did you really? That is not the way we heard it. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, let us have a look at it through the eyes of an outsider who wrote an article entitled, 'A critical evaluation of the Atlantic Accord.' For the benefit of members who might want to read the article in full, it was found in a newsletter of the Canadian Institute of Resource Law. Now, Mr. Speaker, this article by Paul Eamon claims that the Accord breaks new ground in federal/provincial relations, with the benefits to Newfoundland far outweighing any that would accrue to the rest of Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we may not necessarily agree with all aspects of that point of view, in that we have always maintained that income from the offshore should give us an opportunity to contribute to other Canadians, but it nevertheless illustrates the national importance that has been attached to the Accord by certain constitutional and legal experts, notwithstanding the expert advice of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) provided to Mr. Eamon in years gone by. The article points out how the ownership and management provisions of the

Accord, Mr. Speaker, stand in sharp contrast to the rulings of the Supreme Court and, of course, the Newfoundland Court of Appeal. And everybody remembers how both courts ruled against the Province. But the Accord undercuts those particular rulings, Mr. Speaker, by giving major aspects of legislative rights to our Province, as we all know and, for the first time, I suppose, helping us to become equal partners in Canada.

But, Mr. Speaker, one of the big fears throughout early negotiations for an offshore agreement with Ottawa concerned the possible too rapid loss of equalization payments, which the member for Gander alluded to. That fear has been put to rest in the Atlantic Accord under Clause 39, which also receives very close scrutiny in Mr. Eamon's article. The article points out emphatically that the equalization offset payments that we negotiated as part of this Accord, give Newfoundland an advantage never before enjoyed by any other province. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the offset plan provides a cushion to protect this Province from any future legislative changes to equalization arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, just to conclude, from the Eamon article, this article, which is intended to critically examine the Atlantic Accord, by the way, from a national perspective rather than a Newfoundland perspective, generally disapproves of major provisions of the Accord which, when you turn the coin around, Mr. Speaker, over on the other side, as it were, it is the same as saying that it sees the Accord as being a major benefit to this

Province. So we could go on, Mr. Speaker, to say that this article, and others like it, of course, essentially are saying without a doubt that the Atlantic Accord is excellent for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and that, Mr. Speaker, is a pretty nice change after so many years of us putting up with situations not nearly as good as that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we move on throughout this debate, there have been, as we have heard from members opposite in particular, many points raised about the prospects for future oil prices and how these prices may affect the development of the offshore. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that when a number of very important points have been taken into consideration, it will be seen clearly that today's fall in prices and the threat of more price reductions tomorrow will, in the end, have very little to do, in fact, with the timing of development. For one thing, the development is going to be aimed at the markets of the 1990s and beyond that, not the markets of today, and for another, Mr. Speaker, today's falling prices will eventually be checked by the normal law of supply and demand wherein falling prices will increase demand and, in turn, the growth of demand will start pushing the prices upwards again. That is clear and obvious, Mr. Speaker, to any reasonable -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

That is reasonable and rational.

But there is more than prices to be considered, Mr. Speaker, there is the security of supply, as the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) mentioned. And I do not think anybody in the Western world will ever again be naive enough to trust the OPEC countries, especially those located in the Middle East that we all hear about so much these days, a part of the world that at any day or any minute, I suppose, could erupt into war, if it is not war now.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we can look at other types of volatile situations that we are all familiar with, as well. We see them on T.V. every day.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
I have to warn the hon. gentleman that the Government House Leader over there is not looking too pleased. First of all, he has not done a couple of things: He has not praised the Government House Leader to the hilt as the greatest thing since sliced bread and, secondly, he has not attacked the Leader of the Opposition. I would ask him not to break his party's strategy, otherwise, there is going to be a rift over there that you will not be able to heal, even if he should become the leader of his party. So I would ask him to stick to the strategy of his party, to praise the Government House Leader to the hilt and to please take on the Leader of the Opposition and cut him up in little smithereens, because he is

soon not going to be able to stand much more of it.

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

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, virtually every industrialized country in the world nowadays is forced to depend on the Middle East for vital fuel supplies, and even those who may have hoped for an alternative in the North Sea are preparing for a letdown, as we all know.

Mr. Speaker, the demand for a secure supply of oil is already an important factor, and that will increase as time goes on. This country is looked upon around the world as being a very stable country, both politically and socially. It is also recognized as having a lot of vast natural resources all throughout the country, and some of those natural resources are known by names like Ben Nevis and Hibernia. That is something that we should not lose sight of nor feel sad about in any way at all.

Mr. Speaker, when looked at from an international point of view, to address the point that the member for Gander mentioned, there is no doubt at all in my mind, and I can speak for myself, and there is certainly no doubt in the minds of my colleagues on this side of the House, and I think I can speak for them, and I do not believe there is any doubt in the minds of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that our offshore gas and oil deposits will be developed, contrary to what the member for

Gander may feel.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while the Atlantic Accord will ensure that we will continue to receive a lot of major benefits for many years to come, it also opens up an opportunity for a major boost, I think, to our economy in the form of jobs, especially in connection with the fixed production system we are all familiar with now, that will be used by Mobil.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:

I will get to that, if the hon. member will relax. Let us also keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that without this particular agreement between the Province and Ottawa, there would be no movement towards any development at all and, therefore, there would not be any immediate prospects for jobs at all. So let us keep that in mind, as well. That is a point the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir was trying to make.

MR. SIMMONS:

I doubt it.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, it may be in his mind.

Mr. Speaker, hon. members give the impression they have done some research. Well, if they have, they have read in that Environmental Impact Document, which was put out during that environmental assessment process, a number of figures, various numbers that have been thrown around. I took my information from that document. They show you the jobs that will be available in the construction placement of a fixed production system. It might be useful to take note of these

numbers once again and, also, to take note of the categories of employment.

Are you all ready now? At the peak of the development phase, in 1989, that total is forecast to reach about 6,000 jobs. This, Mr. Speaker, by the way, includes 500 labourers, which may be considered somewhat significant in some respects, since most people are inclined to think that most of the jobs will be technical jobs and will involve high technology. A lot of people do not think that common labour work is going to be available, but there will be 500 labourers jobs and they will have the opportunity, of course, to earn some wages and learn some new skills.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, it appears that, by and large, the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will be, or has already trained virtually every kind of tradesman, technician or professional person who will be required for this development. Again at the peak of development, for instance, in the years between 1988 and 1991, the project is going to require up to 700 or more welders, more than 500 pipefitters, as many as 520 ironworkers, 235 boilermakers, 167 draftsmen, 162 engineering technicians and 220 carpenters. Of course, there are going to be hundreds of other jobs, ranging from telephone operators to aircraft pilots, train operators, truck drivers and the like.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addition to those direct jobs which are going to be created, there are going to be many other jobs created as a result of the spin-off and as a result of the increase of cash flow through the economy. I

think, even understating the spin-off impact by using a multiplier factor of two and a half to one, that rate alone on the Hibernia project would result in the creation of another 14,000 jobs. That is the spin-off factor. Everybody is using them. And that is perhaps even understating the situation.

Now, as much as members opposite might not want to hear this, Mr. Speaker, that is generally accepted by most economists. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the employment generated by the Hibernia project during peak years of development could reach somewhere between 19,000 and 20,000 jobs. I mean, that is straight logic, straight economics. Now, they can argue that and probably will. But that is fact, and that information has been taken from documents presented through the environmental assessment process.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time has elapsed.

MR. SIMMS:
I would just like to have a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, to conclude?

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Yes, yes.

MR. SPEAKER:
A couple of minutes.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), perhaps, or the member for Burgeo

- Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert), wondered what will happen afterwards? Well, I suggest that a lot of these jobs which are going to be created, Mr. Speaker, can be expected to be maintained, even after the peak of the Hibernia development has been met, for several reasons, including, of course, the development of other offshore oil - we cannot forget about that. That is something that is sort of being lost in the debate - and, of course, because of the general upswing in the economy created overall by offshore and other activity throughout the years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, none of these jobs would be possible without this agreement, without this Atlantic Accord. Without having this agreement enshrined in legislation, we would not have these benefits or prospects. Royalties and the taxes, then, that would flow into the provincial treasury as a result of signing this Accord, Mr. Speaker, will give us a new start in bringing our standard of living up to and beyond that enjoyed by many other parts of North America and, for the first time in our history, Mr. Speaker, we will have enough economic power, hopefully, to provide the kind of support for our way of life that our people in this Province deserve.

Mr. Speaker, one final note about the Accord itself. I want to make the point and emphasize the point that in order to assure that this can never be amended, except by mutual consent of both the provincial and the federal governments, there is that requirement that mutual consent has to be given in order to make changes in this. So I think that provides good protection for this

Province in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the Canada - Newfoundland Atlantic Accord Implementation Act now before hon. members in this House should be regarded by all sides of the House in a non-partisan way as a vital key to the economic well-being and future of the people of this Province. And I, for one, as a member of government, am very proud to be able to stand here and speak, and have a part to play in passing this particular legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to have something to say on this. As my cousin has so well said to the House, this is a significant piece of legislation. It goes without saying, that significant of itself does not connote any suggestion of positive versus negative. The gas explosion in India was significant, but I would not suggest to anybody that it was a very positive development.

It is significant, it is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this House. That is not to say, of course, that everything in it should be embraced without proper scrutiny.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe that our offshore oil and gas resources will come to the production stage. It is worth noting that

that development was set in motion, not by any initiative of this administration, or the Moores administration, or, indeed, the Smallwood administration, under which administration the drilling began back in 1966. This whole development was set in motion by some initiatives taken by the former Trudeau Administration in Ottawa through the super depletion taxation regime and, subsequently, the Petroleum Incentive Programme - PIP. Without those two programmes, we would not be here today talking about any impending development. We would not be even at the exploration stage yet.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland offshore will proceed as an economic enterprise. And, it will do so, not because of any initiatives of this provincial administration, but, Mr. Speaker, in spite of that administration's incompetent, highhanded, highly partisan, obstructionist, self-serving and naive approach. That incompetence, that obstructionism, that bull-headedness have caused a crucial, and a completely unnecessary three to five-year delay in the development of the offshore.

That undue partisanship, Mr. Speaker, that unprecedented naivety and, again, that monumental incompetence have resulted in an agreement that gives away the shop to the federal government and to Central Canada.

Despite that incompetence, and naivety, despite that bull-headedness and that cheap partisanship, the offshore will one day succeed. The only possible fly in the ointment is declining oil prices.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), or whatever it is, is a very experienced parliamentarian. There is no need for him to read a speech. I tremble when I look at the thickness of his speech, if we are going to have to listen to all of it. But it is quite out of order to read a speech in this House, and he should be directed to sit down.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I did not notice the hon. member reading his speech.

The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The only possible fly in the ointment, I say to my good friend from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), is declining oil prices. It stands to reason that, as the price of world oil goes down, continues to tumble, Hibernia and the other fields becomes less of a sure thing, and there has to come a point where it is no longer economically viable. Now, we all hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that possibility does not become the reality. As a Newfoundlander, I dearly want the offshore to be developed.

As a Newfoundlander also, Mr. Speaker, I want the offshore to be developed to the ultimate benefit of the Newfoundland people, our way of life. And, it is on this point, Mr. Speaker, that I have

the gravest fears and the deepest, most profound misgivings.

The bungling, the incompetence, the childish partisanship, the unparalleled naivety of the provincial government have already, Mr. Speaker, very severely circumscribed and delimited the potential benefits for Newfoundland and our people.

The government was clearly on the right track, Mr. Speaker, when it demanded control of the offshore development. It was a position, Mr. Speaker, I was proud to support in a speech in the House of Commons in the Fall of 1982.

The government, Mr. Speaker, was clearly on the right track when it demanded a forty per cent back-in provision.

What then, Mr. Speaker, happened to that control? What happened to that 40 per cent back-in provision? Government spokesmen will tell you nothing has changed. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the so-called Atlantic Accord itself which puts the lie to the government's contention.

Gone is provincial control. It is the federal government which is now effectively in the driver's seat. It is now the federal government which will control the rate of production. Mr. Speaker, you need only refer to the press release put out on February 7 by the two governments. Page two of the back-up document says in part, "Responsibility for fundamental decisions will rest with the federal government when Canada has attained or lost self-sufficiency and security of supply". Now relate that statement, Mr. Speaker, to a provision in the legislation.

I say to my friend and cousin from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) that we have read the legislation. We have read it with some shame, as a matter of fact, but we have read it, and coupled this statement here to a provision, to a waiver, to a sellout by the provincial government that for the next five years it would be deemed we do not have security of supply.

So what this document says, Mr. Speaker, not my document, a document bearing the name of the two governments, this document says that for a minimum of five years, if you read it in concert with the legislation, for a minimum of five years "responsibility for fundamental decisions will rest with the federal government". It is the federal government, Mr. Speaker, which will control the rate of production.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Now, Mr. Speaker, remember how the Premier fought so valiantly for that sacred principle of control. Remember also, Mr. Speaker, how meekly he signed it away last February.

Gone is the back-in provision, the 40 per cent back-in, with its tremendous potential for benefitting the Newfoundland people.

Here is a document put out by the Government of Newfoundland in January, January 25, 1982, a proposal for a settlement. On page 43 it talks about the old Newfoundland and Labrador petroleum regulations, 1977. It says, "The NLPC was given the right to participate in any development for up to 40 per

cent." Later in that paragraph, I quote, "Under the Province's regulation, more than half of the income to government from Hibernia will come through participation, through that 40 per cent." So I now ask you, Mr. Speaker, if that 40 per cent has been wiped out, do we assume that more than half the revenue is also wiped out? That was their trump card back there in 1982, Mr. Speaker.

Gone, I say to you, is the back-in provision, with its benefits. It is now the multi-national oil companies which will reap the benefit. The Premier made sure of that when he signed the infamous Atlantic Accord last February.

How then, Mr. Speaker, did the Premier get snookered into such a shameful about-face? And snookered is the right word here. His unforgiveable error, his Achille's heel, his abysmal mistake was in signing the letter of intent with Mr. Mulroney just prior to the 1984 federal election.

It must have seemed a smart political move at the time, and there can be no doubt that it certainly enhanced the Tory cause at that time.

But, it was more than smart, Mr. Speaker, it was something else, it was something far more pernicious and enduring. It was the stick with which Mr. Mulroney would beat the Premier into submission.

The Premier's fatal error, Mr. Speaker, lay in stating unequivocally that a federal Tory administration would give Newfoundland a better deal than a federal Liberal Administration. That was his fatal error. Having droned that into the public consciousness, he had effectively

and surely set a trap for himself and, unfortunately, for Newfoundland as well.

It remained only for Mr. Mulroney to spring the trap. And spring it he did, just as soon as the 1984 federal election was safely out of the way, just as soon as he had his thumping electoral majority whose foundation, Mr. Speaker, was not based in Newfoundland, not in Atlantic Canada, but in Quebec and in the West. In short, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mulroney needed the Premier before the election, but he did not need him after the election.

What was the exact nature then of the trap? It was simply that the Premier, because of his early rhetoric that any Tory federal deal would be better, had to accept just that, any federal Tory deal offered to him, however badly it compromised Newfoundland's best interests. To have done otherwise, to have refused any deal offered by the federal Tories, the Premier would have given credence to that well-founded view that he lacks the ability to negotiate in good faith, that he is above all else a confrontationalist. Even more to the point, Mr. Speaker, it would have completely undercut the entire premise of his earlier stance. How could he go around after the fact saying, 'I was wrong. What I said the Tories would do in Ottawa they have reneged on?'

Mr. Mulroney very quickly recognized Mr. Peckford's dilemma - the Premier's dilemma I should be saying - and he saw very early the completeness of the box the Premier was constructing around himself. And he, Mr. Mulroney, was glad to oblige, delighted to

help the Premier box himself in. Politically, Mr. Mulroney had nothing whatsoever to lose, because he knew that, however shamefacedly detrimental to Newfoundland's best interests, the Premier would have no choice but to laud the agreement as the best thing since sliced bread.

In that context, Mr. Speaker, the infamous Clause 54 comes as no surprise. Mr. Mulroney was simply protecting his flank in Ontario and Quebec, just as he has continued to protect that flank with the completely cosmetic amendment to Clause 54 which has recently supplanted the original wording.

Mr. Speaker, the provincial government's and, in particular, the Premier's contortions on Clause 54 are worth noting. Remember how stoutly the Premier defended Clause 54 at first, until he realized that such a defence was ludicrous, and seen to be ludicrous by the public of Newfoundland, that nobody was believing him anymore on that issue?

Then, Mr. Speaker, eureka! The light came on! In no time at all, he and his bosom pals - as in FFT - his bosom FFT pals in Ottawa, came up with some new wording.

MR. LUSH:

New wording, but that is all.

MR. SIMMONS:

New, yes, but just as weasel, just as vague, as the old wording. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, it was just as vague and just as weasel for intentional purposes, for good intention or bad intention, as you will see.

Because you see, Mr. Speaker, I

submit that if the intent of the federal government was to permit refining in Newfoundland it would not be at all difficult to find the proper words to say it. It would not be at all difficult to put that intention into clear, unequivocal language. But, that is not the intent. Mr. Mulroney knows that. Mrs. Carney knows that. And what is most shameful and most despicable of all, the Premier also knows it. But, he cannot admit it. That is the price you pay for boxing yourself in.

Is there anything good, then, Mr. Speaker, that can be said about this offshore agreement? Yes, I think, in relative terms only, some good can be said about it. In April 1967, the now Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer) and my good friend, the gentleman for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey), voted to ratify the Churchill Falls agreement because, in relative terms, it was a good thing. It was better to have the thousands of short-term construction jobs and the continuing revenue than to let the Churchill River continue to flow unharnessed to the ocean. In the same sense a badly flawed offshore agreement, I suppose, is probably better than no agreement at all.

Today, as we all know, the Churchill Falls construction jobs have long since gone. The revenues from Churchill Falls are measly, when compared to Quebec's windfall profits. And, we lament as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, day in and day out, that these profits could be ours if only things had been done differently back there in 1967.

Oil, Mr. Speaker, is a depletable

resource. It is finite. And one day, it will be no more. The construction boom and the construction jobs will be behind us. The production phase will be regulated by the legislation we craft here today, a bill which, as it now reads, ensures that the multinational oil companies get first crack at the offshore largess, a bill that ensures that Central Canada and the Maritime Provinces get second crack at that largess, a bill that ensures we get whatever crumbs are left over after that.

As that production proceeds, Mr. Speaker, we, as we have done and are doing on Churchill Falls, will lament daily, day in and day out, that more of the benefits of offshore could be ours if only, if only things had been done differently back there in the 1980's.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that generations of Newfoundlanders yet to come will grow agitated and angry and frustrated that our oil is being shipped to refineries in Central Canada and the Maritime Provinces, as provided for in Clause 54. And they will not only be angry and frustrated, but they will ask why it has to be like that, those generations yet to come. And they will have it patiently explained to them, over and over again, that way back there in the 1980's a fellow by the name of Peckford built a box around himself and then pulled Newfoundland in with him. And they will be told about a fellow named Mulroney who was good at snooker, especially when playing with a rank amateur.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Absolutely.

MR. SIMMONS:

In fairness to that fellow Peckford, Mr. Speaker, they, those future generations, will be told that he meant well, his heart was in the right place. They will also be told, those future generations, that like most public figures and certainly all would-be statesmen, he, the Premier of today, of the 1980's, eventually faced the ultimate test, the test of whether to be a two-bit partisan politician or to be a champion of the people's best interests.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

They will be told that, not only did he face that ultimate test, he failed it miserably and that, as a result, those future generations are the poor, those future generations continue still to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water despite all the rhetoric to the contrary from this particular administration we face across the chamber today.

You see, Mr. Speaker, if you say something often enough, however ridiculous, you begin to believe it. And that is the Premier's dilemma. He is employing that particular tactic now and he has instructed his minions, the members of his caucus, to use that tactic on a very specific point, and I give you the example which comes to mind: Have you noticed, Mr. Speaker, that apart from the abuse that we have had to take, the name calling, the personalities, the refusal by the government spokesman to deal with the offshore issue, with some exceptions, and I say to my friend and cousin for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) he dwelt essentially on the

point, apart from his little sermonette on stills and so on, and I must get him aside and get some more information. But apart from that I, thought he stayed with the issue. We do not necessarily agree with all he said, but at least he had the courage to get up and say it. I predict grave things for him, because he broke with the strategy of obfuscate, obfuscate and obfuscate some more.

But apart from all those issues, Mr. Speaker, they have been doing one other thing almost consistently, every person who has spoken, they have launched a vindictive personal attack on my good friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). Once you hear one do it or two do it you say, well, that fellow just got a fetish. He does not like the member for Mount Scio-Bell Island. Fair ball! That is all right. Let him go, he is only self-destroying so, what difference? But, then, when you see every member doing it religiously you say, well, this is a strategy. So you say to yourself, why that particular strategy? Why are they taking so much time on what they tell us is an important piece of legislation to cast personal aspersions on the character and the record and contribution of a member of this Chamber, in this case the Leader of the Opposition?

To get my answer, Mr. Speaker, I went to a person I regard as an authority. I went to a man who has the confidence of this administration, Dr. Doug House, who has been designated to head up the Employment and Unemployment Commission, a man who has written a very thorough dissertation, book, on the subject of the

offshore, The Challenge of Oil, and in that book - surely the government now will not disown what this man has had to say about the offshore - in that book he gives me the reason for the concerted attack on the Leader of the Opposition these past few days. He tells me, among other things, that "Barry was a chief architect of the Newfoundland and Labrador petroleum regulations, regulations which embody a tough stance towards the oil industry." He tells me that "Barry wanted to insist upon the recognition of offshore jurisdiction before signing the Accord and the constitution." He tells me that "Barry had remained unshaken in his firm position and left office expressing the fear that 'if there is a settlement it will be another Upper Churchill contract.'"

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Now, Mr. Speaker, do you see the pattern? You see, Mr. Speaker, as I have said in my opening remarks, there is a very good possibility, for which I pray and hope, that this offshore will come to reality. And so already the preoccupation is not with doing something of substance for the Newfoundland people but, who will get credit? Who will get the bouquets for that particular development? That is the concern, Mr. Speaker, and that is what I meant by 'childish partisanship' at the beginning of my remarks.

Here we have, Mr. Speaker, in our caucus we are proud to say, not because he did any running, Mr. Speaker, unless it was to run away from the kind of treachery that I have been alluding to, and that would be to his credit, Mr.

Speaker, but here we have, with pride, in our caucus a man who is recognized by an authority on the offshore, an authority on the Newfoundland lifestyle, Dr. Doug House, recognized as one of the chief architects. And he goes on to describe that indeed the fear of Steve Millan and the others in the department was that with Barry gone there was a concern that this new fellow Peckford might not be as steadfast in protecting Newfoundland's interests.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

That is what it is all about, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker when the day comes that some credit has to be assigned, they live in fear, they have nightmares that perhaps the truth will get out. And, so what is the tactic? Say something often enough, however ridiculous. Talk about how this fellow Barry scurried and ran, and so on, and could not take the heat, etc. Say it often enough and maybe, just maybe, the press will be gullible enough to report that kind of stuff.

Did it not occur to those people, who must themselves be considerably gullible, that perhaps the press read these documents too, that perhaps the press know other views than that which is spouted here day in and day out in this particular Chamber? Does not the government spokesman recognize that perhaps there is another reality, there is another version of truth other than what they propagate day in and day out? That is what is behind this childish and ill-fated attack from day to day on the Leader of the Opposition.

So I say to him publicly something I have not said to him privately, for which there is no need, he is a man whose mental health is in good state, but I say to him publicly, not particularly for his benefit but for the benefit of others, take heart and in your own personal terms pray to God that every person who gets up attacks you, because that is further vindication, further proof that Doug House has committed an awful error - if wants to stay on the good side of the government he had better put out a revised version pretty soon - he has committed a terrible error in terms of the newsspeak approach of this particular government.

In conclusion I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Newfoundland's -

DR. COLLINS:

Tell us what you said about the Leader of the Opposition privately.

MR. SIMMONS:

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have to admit, though, I really have to admit that apart from my admiration for the Minister of Finance's ability with figures, his wit is the next thing that really comes home, his deep, profound, unchallengeable wit.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted, during the past few minutes, to put on the record my particular views on the issue. I can understand, with some disgust, the penchant on the other side for refusing to hear what they pretend they want to hear. They want us to give some comments. Now, if they think I am going to get up and agree with everything they are doing, I am on the wrong side of the House. But I have given them some comments. And I have been a little disturbed throughout my few

comments that some members, I suppose pursuing their assignment from caucus, have been intent on trying to inject the red-herring approach. Mr. Speaker, I say to them they can abuse to their heart's desire. They can employ every diversionary tactic, every distraction in the book, they will not succeed in dissuading me and dissuading us on this side from our dual objective in this particular matter, first to enter into the public record my observations on this vital subject in the firm belief that posterity will one day judge me to be correct in what I have said.

MR. POWER:

Quit slopping (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

'Charlie', that is cheap even for you. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I have done so, and we are doing so, to flag some of the concerns we have in the less firm belief, I have to admit, that a government, however drunk with its own desperation, will take heed while time still permits.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I submit that Newfoundland's offshore oil and gas discoveries have been made possible by the former Liberal Government, in Ottawa, through the super-depletion taxation regime and the PIP programme.

I submit that the offshore will proceed to production unless world oil prices continue to tumble way out of sight.

I submit that the Newfoundland offshore will proceed despite the incompetence and the highly-partisan approach of this administration.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the

people of Newfoundland will not reap anything near the full benefit of the offshore development because this administration backed down on two key issues: They backed down on offshore control, and the document that I quoted from, from the federal and provincial governments, acknowledges barefacedly that all the fundamental decisions will be made by the federal government for at least the next five years.

The people of Newfoundland will not enjoy the full benefit because this administration has backed down on what was the very cornerstone of its whole approach in refusing to sign earlier. They backed down on offshore control and they have backed down on the 40 per cent back-in provision. The Newfoundland people and the Newfoundland economy is the poorer and will be the poorer for it.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier badly compromised his earlier stance, badly compromised the people of Newfoundland by signing the so-called Atlantic Accord last February.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the principal benefactors of the offshore will be the multinational oil companies, Central Canada and the Maritime Provinces, and if there is any largess, any crumbs left over apart from short term construction jobs, then, perhaps, we will get some of them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is no abstention on this side, that is for sure.

MR. SIMMONS:

I had assumed as much from the man whose grace is mainly remembered for refusing a former Premier one

photo opportunity on his last day in this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, it does not in any way bother me that he continues to make those interjections. What bothers me is that other reputable people still agree to sit on the same side with him.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the main offshore benefits to Newfoundland will be short-term construction jobs and some additional revenues to the public treasury, which revenues will be quite minimal if current world prices hold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is an issue that the government would like to have some far-ranging debate on. It is a significant piece of legislation and I understand, judging from the precedent that was set when, not the Minister of the Offshore -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

It is now 6:00 p.m. Would the hon. member care to adjourn the debate?

MR. SIMMONS:

I would like to move the adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

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

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

Index

**Answers to Questions
tabled.**

February 18, 1986

Burgoe - Bay d'Espoir

Reviewed by the Hon. the
Premier, 15 Feb, '86

PROJECT NO	SOURCE	LOCATION	APPROVED JOBS	WORK WEEKS	TOTAL TURBINE	FEDERAL FUNDING	PROV. FUNDING
2202RA6	Fenguin Area Dev. Assoc.	Burgoe	10	200	60,000.00	0.00	0.00
3014RA7	Bay d'Espoir Dev. Association	Conne Ford	10	160	74,057.00	0.00	10.00
2211RA0	Fenguin Area Development Assoc.	Francois	6	160	40,000.00	0.00	0.00
2230RA7	Fenguin Area Development Assoc.	Grey River	10	160	55,000.00	0.00	0.00
1505RA6	Milltown-Head of Bay d'Espoir Fed.	Milltown	10	160	60,000.00	0.00	0.00
1406RA3	Survival I	St. Alban's	8	128	40,000.00	0.00	0.00
1441RA4	The Town of St. Alban's	St. Alban's	24	416	160,000.00	0.00	1.00
TOTALS			82	1384	\$489,057.00		

26
10
10
8

54