



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 43

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Friday

30 May 1986

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me great pleasure today to announce the release of two documents developed by my department. The Task Force on Labrador Development has completed: A Decade of Development in Labrador: A Project Inventory; and Ten Years After: Progress Report on the Implementation of the Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Labrador.

A Project Inventory outlines the projects which have come about in Labrador since the mid-1970s as a result of federal/provincial cost-sharing arrangements and co-operation. A total of \$80 million has gone directly into the communities and regions of Labrador for community, economic, social and cultural development under these programmes.

This Project Inventory will help people of Newfoundland and Labrador better understand and appreciate this vast region of our Province.

Ten Years After systematically goes through every recommendation

of the 1974 Royal Commission on Labrador Chaired by the late Donald Snowden and assesses the degree of progress which this government has had in addressing the 287 recommendations.

In short, this report shows that a full 92 per cent of the recommendations have been addressed and over 70 per cent of them have been accomplished.

These two documents, plus the already released Conference Report of April, 1985, Development Conference and the Select Bibliography of over 200 sources on Labrador development demonstrate this department's commitment to research, analysis and programme development for Labrador.

This package of information is the part of the task force's larger undertaking of formulating a truly comprehensive Labrador development plan. The task force is presently involved in the complex task of assessing all the input they have received over the past two years and plans to release a draft to the public early in the Fall.

I am convinced that Labrador is a vital and vibrant region of this Province. These publications, and the continuing work of the task force will convince you.

Thank you.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK:
I thank the minister for his statement. It is quite true that

in the mid-seventies we saw many great developments take place as a result of 90/10 cost-sharing by the former federal Liberal Government. In actual fact, that money is now spent. It was supposed to last until '87, but it has all been spent, a full year earlier, which points out the needs that existed in Labrador, and the need for money, actually, for water and sewerage, roads and other things.

We still have communities in Labrador, like Norman Bay, that do not have electricity. We have communities that only have one phone. We have communities that do not have airstrips. Labrador is still waiting for the development of the Churchill Falls. We are still waiting for the aluminum plant. We are still waiting for the Northern Development Corporation. We are also waiting for the Northern NATO base.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously debating this statement. He is not commenting on the minister's statement, he is debating it.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the comments should be directly related to the statement.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that much has been done but much more needs to be done. After ten years we still do not have the Lower Churchill developed, we do not have the aluminum plant, and the \$50 million the Liberal Government promised for the Northern Development Corporation has not materialized. There are still places which do not have electricity, there are still places with poor schools, and despite all that was done with that \$80 million, we are seeing a decline in population in Labrador brought, about by the lack of long-term permanent jobs in the area.

So all I am saying to the minister is I congratulate him. The Liberal Government did give 90/10 of this \$80 million in the mid-seventies, plus other things, now all I am saying to him, since their friends are now in Ottawa, is we still need electricity for places like Norman Bay, we still need schools, we still need bridges, we still need long-term development in environment. I would also say, if the Conservative Government could get \$80 million out of the Liberal Government, then, surely, with PC Governments provincially and federally, we should be able to get \$160 million in the near future.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement.

I am very pleased to announce, Mr. Speaker, jointly with my colleague the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), that we have signed a tentative agreement with the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees for instructors employed in vocational schools, the College of Trades and Technology and the Bay St. George Community College. The tentative agreement covers some 600 employees for a four year period, from September 1, 1984 to August 31, 1988, and will be presented shortly to the membership for ratification, after which further details will be released.

I will just note, Mr. Speaker, that is nearly 70 per cent of all public employees who have signed agreements with this government over the past twelve months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I can inform the minister that, speaking for the Opposition, we are very pleased that an agreement has been reached with the vocational schools. The fact that the minister is announcing a four year contract, though, with a little over two years left to run, highlights, I think, the dilemma and highlights the price that the NAPE employees in this Province have paid for the wage freeze. I would like to say to the minister that we hope that the same good

will that was obviously necessary to reach this agreement, the minister will find that good will to try to resolve the NAPE strike before September.

MR. WINDSOR:

That is NAPE we signed with.

MR. FLIGHT:

I am aware we are talking about NAPE but it is a different unit of NAPE. The minister has been playing off one unit against the other, the MOS and the General Service. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the same good will that was obviously necessary to reach this agreement will be used to try to resolve the MOS and the General Service strike. The rhetoric and the public posturing is only hardening positions and demoralizing workers and it should stop. Maybe it would be a good idea to call in the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to help negotiate the MOS and General Service strike.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Oral Questions

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

The Premier is not in his place this morning so I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). Mr. Speaker, the Premier, indeed the government of this Province, have now admitted that they are willing to negotiate away a constitutionally guaranteed right, one of the Terms of Union and, of course, we are talking

about the railway, obviously.

Let me ask the Minister of Transportation in the absence of the Premier, Mr. Speaker, why is it that this government is consenting to auction off one of Newfoundland's few constitutional securities? Why is that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, it is nice to see that after a number of his colleagues had an opportunity to ask transportation questions yesterday, and in the absence of the Opposition House Leader and the Leader of the Opposition, he is able to ask a question today. I would just like to point out to him that a number of questions that have been asked similar to the one posed by the member for Bellevue always start off with a false premise and, as a matter of fact, bases the whole question on a very false assumption, perhaps based mostly on ignorance but perhaps also dealing somewhat with a malicious attitude.

I would just like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the answers to the relevant questions have been given adequately over the past two or three weeks and the situation has not changed from what it was yesterday, what it was last week or what it is this morning.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of

Transportation seems to be in a vile mood this morning. I do not know what is wrong with the man. I enjoyed my meal on board the Caribou last night and I thought he did. But in responding to the Opposition spokesman having a chance to ask a question, it is nice to see that the Minister of Transportation has an opportunity to answer for a change, too, instead of the Premier.

Let me ask the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Speaker: The minister talks about a false premise, but we have seen in the media over the weeks and months, and especially in the last twenty-four hours, Mr. Speaker, that the door is gradually opening wider with each day that passes with regard to giving away the railway. Let me ask the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Speaker, this: If this constitutionally guaranteed right is tampered with, does the minister not see that the Atlantic Accord, which will be enshrined in the constitution, would also be up for grabs and for changes in the future? Does the Minister of Transportation not see this as a very, very poor precedent to be setting in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, we realize members of the Opposition reply on the media in order to be able to ask their questions, but they should not sit around and daydream and imagine hypothetical situations, because the question posed is a hypothetical one and deals with 'what ifs', and this is no place to deal with that kind of a thing, Mr. Speaker. We are in the habit

of dealing with facts and those facts have already been given.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Transportation what has happened to this government? Six years ago, in 1980, we saw caravans rolling across this Province, we saw the Premier and his colleagues and the government that he leads ferociously defending the railway. Let me ask the Minister of Transportation, Mr. Speaker, where are the caravans now? Where are the full page ads now? Where is the cross-country tour that we should be seeing defend this lowly Province against bad old Canada? When will the Minister of Transportation and his colleagues come out, Mr. Speaker, swinging and defending this Province and its right to have its own railway as all the rest of Canada has?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, for the past five and a half years I as minister, and certainly before that the Premier and other members of former administrations have been fighting very, very effectively for the retention and improvement of the Newfoundland Railway. In the absence of support from members opposite, and in the absence of support from members who used to be opposite, I suspect we will continue to support Newfoundland's interest in the Newfoundland

Railway and in transportation in general, much to the chargin and disappointment of members opposite. But all of a sudden they are hoping there is a public issue that they can jump on at some point in their careers and perhaps cause some concern on this side of the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, as in the six years that I have been here, they are wrong again, and they will continue to be wrong. Because the people on this side of the House, this administration, myself as minister, the Department of Transportation and everyone else has been very consistent with its approach to the Newfoundland Railway. We have been very consistent. And once again for about the umpteen time in this sitting, I would like to point out to the hon. member one more time that the Province's position relative to the Newfoundland Railway is retention and upgrading so that the Newfoundland Railway can be part of a good intermodal transportation system in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, so that it will continue to provide for the consumers of the Province, for the shippers of the Province, for the carriers of goods, a very viable alternative to other forms of transportation. That has been and continues to be our consistent position last year, ten years ago, yesterday, today and, as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, well into the future.

MR. J. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER:

We thought that the railway was

guaranteed to us by the Terms of Union but apparently it was not. I wonder if the minister would comment on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

I would like to thank my colleague for the question.

Over the past number of weeks I think it has become evident that as the Terms of Union speak about the railway the only commitment that was given in the Terms of Union - and it is there very clear for anybody to read - as it relates to the Newfoundland Railway that by way of a property acquisition. It was agreed by the federal government at the time that the railway would be taken over - and that is the term used, 'taken over' - by the federal government as a property acquisition. As much as we would like to see further clarification as to the operation and continued viability of the Newfoundland Railway, unfortunately the Terms of Union are not explicit and did not provide us with that guaranteed continuous use aspect of the railway. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that the Terms of Union did was transfer ownership of a railway from the then country of Newfoundland to the Dominion of Canada and it relieved the Province, at the time, of responsibility of any funding associated with the railway. The only thing the Terms of Union did, and it is there very clear for anybody to see, was a property acquisition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Would the minister elaborate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I tell the Minister of Transportation why we sometimes have to go to the press for our questions is because the minister and the Premier are less than honest with this House, they do not give information here in this House and they do not answer questions.

Now I would like to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

The hon. gentleman said that the minister and the Premier are less than honest in this House. That is definitely, Mr. Speaker, outside the rules of this House and the hon. gentleman has to be asked to withdraw.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

There goes the hon. member for St. John's East again - my way or no way. He stood here yesterday and called my friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) a creep and all that kind of thing, but that was all right. It is not unparliamentary for my friend to say what is the truth, that the Premier and the minister have been less than honest. If it were parliamentary, he would also say they are telling lies but that is not parliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I do not think it was a point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of delay was all it was.

MR. SPEAKER:

I was trying to hear what question the hon. member was about to ask and I would ask him if he would continue with that.

MR. BAKER:

My question is this, Mr. Speaker, and I will pose the question to the Government House Leader. In the press we heard that the government has in fact made an offer of \$1 billion to do away with the railway. Now why is it that we have to trust to Mr. Mazankowski to give us answers to questions we ask in this House? Why is it that Mr. Mazankowski is more honest and forthright and open with the people of Newfoundland than the Premier of this Province is?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I hate to say this but I do have to say that there

are some times - they are very rare now, mind you - when you cannot believe everything you hear in the press.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Is the minister now saying that Mr. Mazankowski is not telling the truth and that, in fact, there is no offer from the provincial government of \$1 billion to sell the railway?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I have to say that Mr. Mazankowski, to my knowledge, always tells the truth. I do not know what Mr. Mazankowski said. I know he did not say what he was alleged to say. I would just repeat again that very seldom, but occasionally it occurs, that the press make errors too.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and it has to do with the Labour Relations Board hearing that is going on with regard to certification of the academic faculty of Memorial University. One of the defenses used by the university has been that the University's Act gives powers to the university that override the Labour Relations

Act. As the Minister responsible for the Labour Relations Act, I would like to have his opinion on whether or not the University's Act does indeed override the Labour Relations Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the hon. member should know that that is a matter of legal interpretation and if there is any question of interpretation as to where the University's Act rests with the Labour Relations Act, we will get the good advice of our Justice Department. The matter is before the Labour Relations Board. He ought to know that I could not comment on it at this time in any case since it is before the board. It is like a matter being before the court, it would prejudice the case.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My supplementary on this same issue is to the Minister responsible for administering the University's Act, whom I believe is the Minister of Advanced Studies and Career Development. Have I got it right this time?

MR. POWER:

Not quite. It is the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studied.

MR. FENWICK:

Whatever. Mr. Speaker, there should be a rule that no department should have more than three words in its title,

otherwise we get confused on it all the time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member pose his question?

MR. FENWICK:

My question to the minister is this: Since there seems to be some confusion on whether or not the University's Act is outside the gambit of the Labour Relations Act, is the minister willing to look at that piece of legislation that he is responsible for and see that it is made perfectly clear that certainly the employees of the university are covered by the Labour Relations Act and so is the entire university itself?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

The members opposite are setting an example for the students up in the gallery again today, are they? It is a good example you are setting, Mr. Peach.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Public Works (Mr.

Young) with regard to the way in which tenders are called by his department. I would like to ask the minister is it the policy of the department when calling tenders for rental space to advertise in whatever paper serves that particular area?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, the policy is tenders are always called in accordance with the Tendering Act. I do not know what the hon. gentleman is asking. If he could be more specific probably I could answer his question. But we do call tenders publicly and we also call for proposals for a small amount of space.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works above the tender call, I think it was last August, for the Department of Health to rent space in Harbour Grace. Why was that tender not called by public advertising and so give everybody in the area an equal opportunity to bid?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, in such cases the officials usually go to a town council or something like that in the area. It was a small amount of space needed for the Department

of Health. We went into that area and we asked people if they were satisfied to offer us space. That was done, three people tendered for the space, and it was awarded to the lowest tender.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Public Works, that the amount of space should have nothing to do with it and everybody in the area should have had equal opportunity. I ask the minister point blank did the gentleman who got the space in Harbour Grace get it because he happened to be very high up in the minister's campaign in the last election?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure if you were to go down and find the documents, that gentleman bid for the space and he got the space open and aboveboard, as we do all over Newfoundland. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman who got the space was my campaign manager and during the last five years we have been very, very successful, much more than the hon gentleman opposite will be in the next election.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). I want to ask the minister about the long lingering and festering labour dispute in Stephenville. It is not a strike that has gotten the prominence of some of the strikes here in St. John's. The strike is with respect to the municipal workers in Stephenville represented by NAPE. I wonder if the minister can indicate to the House what is happening, what is the status of this particular labour dispute at this moment? Are there any negotiations going on? Can the minister give the House a briefing on what is happening in Stephenville?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I always enjoy a question from the hon. the member for Bonavista North. He always asks good sensible questions and I am pleased to provide some information for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, he makes a good point. It has been a very long and difficult dispute. We have changed faces in that dispute on a number of occasions, not because we thought one officer was not doing a good job and that another one could do a better job, but sometimes a change of face, a different person can make a difference. We have had our Director of Labour Relations out there. As a matter of fact, I might tell the hon. member that just yesterday I received a letter from the President of NAPE asking

that we conduct an investigation into the dispute. It is narrowed down to one point, Mr. Speaker, which is job security. I am going to take some initiatives in the next two or three days. I would not want to publicize what we intend to do, but I can assure the hon. member that I will be taking some initiatives with the view of trying to bring that difficult dispute to an end, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's answer. He has indicated that he is going to personally intervene or intercede in this particular situation. Can the minister indicate, though, whether there are now negotiations going on? Are both sides back to the table? What is the situation? Are they still in a confrontational situation and not at the table? And when the minister says he is going to intervene, will he get the two groups of people back to the bargaining table?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, specifically the union has asked for an investigation. Really what it is tantamount to, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, is an inquiry into the overall labour situation between the union in Stephenville and the council. There are no face-to-face negotiations taking place at the

moment. As a matter of fact, when I left to come here to the House this morning my deputy minister was with the conciliator who has been dealing with that dispute and he is determining every last detail about how it should be approached, what we might do to actually bring the conflict to an end. So we are really taking a look at it. If it is an investigation that is needed an investigation will be done. If it is a case of having separate negotiations at a very senior level to find out where the answer might lie, that is what will be done.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). In recent days we have seen developments, Mr. Speaker, that would certainly cast some doubts in the minds of some people as to the usefulness of the Canadian Salfish Corporation. My question to the minister, Mr. Speaker, has to do with that. We have seen evidence come to light that there is a \$2 million loss facing the Corporation because of poor business management. I wonder can the minister, Mr. Speaker, tell the House how does the price of salt fish paid to Newfoundland fishermen through the Salfish Corporation compare with the price that is now being paid or has been paid to, say, Nova Scotian fishermen for the same quality fish?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me comment on the preamble to the hon. gentleman's question. Whether you want to see the Canadian Salfish Corporation continue or be disbanded is one question, but I would suspect you would come down on that decision for the right reasons. To indicate that an account that had developed into a difficult account, but one that had dealt with the corporation for dozens of years, even when the hon. gentleman was a minister, to say that that is the reason why you should review the effectiveness or the lack thereof of the Canadian Salfish Corporation is certainly stretching one's imagination.

To answer the question directly, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the price is today but, by and large in the past, the price paid to Newfoundland and Quebec fishermen, because the corporation purchases on the North Shore of Quebec as the hon. gentleman knows, compares favourably with the rates paid by the industry in other sectors.

MR. W. CARTER:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:
I do not view the Salfish Corporation as a sacred cow that cannot be questioned or criticized when it is necessary and required.

Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind that the price paid to Newfoundland fishermen is contingent on the expenses incurred by the corporation and the amount of money received for their exports

in the foreign market, why is it that Nova Scotian fishermen have in the past, and I think still are, receiving anywhere from one third to 50 per cent more for their product than Newfoundland fishermen who produce salt fish?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I have indicated from time to time to the hon. gentleman, most recently when we were doing the estimates of the department, that we do not consider the Saltfish Corporation, or the advisory board or any other organization that are dealing with fishermen and the fishery in this Province to be sacred cows either, and there is nothing wrong with them being questioned and we are doing that on a continuous basis.

As to whether or not the difference in price between Newfoundland produced salt fish and Nova Scotia salt fish is as much as 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker, I would have to have that checked out. The hon. gentleman has been known to make some very wild and rash statements from day to day and time to time in the House, he continuously makes them and then, when the facts are provided, he is usually, 99.9 per cent of the time, found out to be wrong, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

That kind of comment from the minister is hardly worthy of comment.

Mr. Speaker, if the minister can get over his spite and discouragement because of the recent polls and the fact that his own seat is in jeopardy, federal and provincial, and if the minister can cool off long enough, would he undertake, Mr. Speaker, to find out and report to this House what the price of fish is in Nova Scotia? It is an important matter and it is not one to be treated lightly as the minister would do. Would he find out and report to this House what the price being paid Nova Scotian fishermen is compared to the price being paid to Newfoundland fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to spite and seats in jeopardy, I will put myself up against the hon. gentleman any time. He can come to the Baie Verte Peninsula at any time if he wants that and we will square off and see what happens and live with the results of it. That does not bother me at all, Mr. Speaker. I am as much concerned as the hon. gentleman is. He has no monopoly on concern.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman had an opportunity to show what he could do as Minister of Fisheries in this Province and he was a dismal failure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt). As the minister will know, last year there was a terrible dust problem in the town of Buchans, dust blowing off the tailings that came as a result of thirty or forty years mining, and there was a great concern that it was injurious to health. It was a terrible problem.

The minister undertook at the time and made a commitment to the people of Buchans and to the groups concerned that there would be reseeded and revegetation that would have the effect of stopping that dust in the future. I now understand that there are conditions as to whether or not -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is making a speech.

MR. FLIGHT:

- that reseeded and revegetation will take place.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

There has been too much cross talk here and we have not heard a single word of the very important question the member for Windsor - Buchans is raising.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. member and I will certainly give him an answer. Does the hon. member wish to have an answer now on reseeded in Buchans? I will

gladly give it to him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Well let the minister answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would ask hon. members to please keep quiet when questions are being answered.

MR. BUTT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind a little bit of noise while I am answering the hon. member. Let me say this, yes, I met with the Buchans Action Committee, an excellent group of people, I might add, headed up by the Mayor of the Town of Buchans, and he has a good, innovative group of people who want to do things in Buchans. One of the things they want to do in Buchans, Mr. Speaker, is to have a barite extraction operation there. Of course you know where that extraction would take place would obviously interfere with our initial plans to reseed the entire area.

Now we cannot reseed an area where they are going to have such an operation in the near future. They are planning on getting on with this this year, 1986. So I am waiting now on the Buchans Action Committee to come back and to lay out to me in the Department of the Environment their plans of how big an area this extraction programme is going to incorporate. In the meantime, another contentious area there that needs reseeded will be done according to plans. That is the area on back of the hospital where

there has been ongoing dust problems, and we will be taking care of that this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware of the terrible problem that the dust is creating in that town. If there is not a barite extraction programme this year, does that mean the minister will undertake to reseed that area? Is the minister saying that if there is going to be a barite extraction area which will only take in a very small part of the area that is causing the dust problem, does that mean if there is going to be a future barite industry in Buchans that the Town of Buchans is going to be subject forever to the dust problems that almost choked everybody last Summer?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no intention of subjecting the people of Buchans to a dust problem in perpetuity. In the meantime, the hon. member's question is really out of order in that it is a hypothetical question. We have had a good relationship with this very active Buchans Action Committee down there that wants to do some work, and I am going to be waiting, Mr. Speaker, for those people to come back to me and outline the good plans that they have for the people of Buchans whereby they are going to create

some jobs. To my mind and in my humble opinion, that Action Committee is doing a lot more than the hon. member to stimulate the economy of that depressed area of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

So I would suggest to the hon. member that he should get onboard with that committee and work hand in hand with them, put his shoulder to the wheel and try to create a few jobs in Buchans where there is a dire need for employment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the minister that the Action Committee is doing a lot more than he has ever done and understands the problem in Buchans a lot better than he ever understood them. We remember the comments he made last year that insulted every miner that ever worked in Buchans when a minister indicating that there was never a dust related problem in Buchans.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in his capacity as Minister of the Environment, who has ot a responsibility to protect the health and the peace of mind of people, see that the dust that is causing all kinds of problems for the people of Buchans, and will always cause those problems unless that dust is covered one way or the other, will the minister undertake to see that that is done so the people in

Buchans can live with some peace of mind about their health in the future?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the hon. member that the people of Buchans will get all the support they want from this minister. By the way, Mr. Speaker, that is a lot more than they are getting from their present member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

As a matter of fact, it has been so long since he has been to Buchans they were looking for picture of the hon. gentleman when I was there.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is just time for a very short question and answer.

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn) concerning the RRAP Programme. We have seen great things take place in Southern Labrador, but in Eastern Labrador, where the people live in one community in the Winter and move to Summer stations in the Summer - they maintain two houses - we have not seen much progress. We have only one person in terms of housing to look after that area.

he is located in Forteau and can only get down to Easter Labrador periodically. Will the minister provide a part-time person this Summer in order to alleviate and help the people of Eastern Labrador where the housing situation is deplorable? We have seen what it is like in Torngat Mountains. If we do not do anything with Eastern Labrador, we are going to have the same problem.

Has the minister's department looked at the possibility of putting a part-time person in to look after evaluating the situation with regard to RRAP? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. DINN:

The answer to the hon. member's question, Mr. Speaker, is, yes, we are certainly looking at that right now. We are anticipating signing the operating agreement with respect to RRAP very shortly. When that is done, then temporary staff will be put in place. We will have to put them in place at that point in time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave, no leave.

MR. W. CARTER:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

I want to raise a point of

privilege which, I think, if it is allowed to continue in this House, will have the effect of interfering with my privileges as a member and other members too. We have in recent days seen, when the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) stands up to ask a question, members on the other side, ministers and backbenchers, applauding and clapping and jeering and certainly -

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:
One second, it is not meant, Mr. Speaker, to be complimentary; it is not meant to be flattering; I think, to put it quite bluntly, it is meant, Mr. Speaker, to make a fool of the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER:
One second, this is important, Mr. Speaker. If the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is not prepared to listen, then he can step outside and sit down somewhere.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

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

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, were it not for the fact that the hon. member is a dedicated and committed man and member he would probably be half nervous about standing up for fear of this nonsense that members opposite are getting on with. I think they should show more respect. That gentleman represents 10,000 people in this Legislature. It is not the member standing up.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, can you tell that member to be quiet?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. HODDER:
I remember when you were over here and I was over there.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I had no intention -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! I do not think the hon. member is making any prime facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker, I am not being given a chance.

MR. SPEAKER:
I have heard the hon. member long enough to know that he is not making any point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I am going to control the conduct of the House, and nobody has more respect for the hon. member for Port de Grave than I have myself, and that goes for every other hon. member here.

MR. W. CARTER:
I rise on a point of order.

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

MR. W. CARTER:

This morning we saw a case here where members are asking perfect legitimate questions and the members opposite, because they could not give an honest answer, resorted to dragging personalities into it. We saw the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) this morning in reply to a perfectly good question, a very serious question from me on the price of salt fish, because he could not answer properly, he had to talk about my performance as a former minister.

We saw the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) this morning in reply to the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), because he was cornered and could not answer the question, started throwing slurs across the House.

For the House Leader (Mr. Marshall), of course, it is standard practice, when he is cornered, when he is not able to answer the question, to resort to this type of parliamentary procedure, which is certainly not becoming.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you, Sir, that the members opposite should put an end to that kind of behaviour. If they do not, then it is certainly going to interfere with my rights and the rights of all members on this side in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. CALLAN:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries thirty-five Grade VI students from Holy Cross Elementary School, Holyrood, with their teachers Gloria McDonald, Anne Marie Marrie, and Elaine Redmond.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Notices of Motion

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Registration Of Deeds Act."

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Revise The Law Respecting Insurance Adjusters, Agents And Brokers."

Petitions

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Stop me when I get to the end of the five minutes, will you, because I have got another bunch of petitions to present here, and also some letters with regard to the petitions as well.

The first one is from Baltimore Regional High School in Ferryland, and it was offered to the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) to present to the House itself. Since he is actually one of the ministers responsible for one of the education portfolios, it would be appropriate that he would, at least, speak to it. It would be nice for him to speak. Again, Mr. Speaker, it indicates the breadth of support for the particular initiative that we are talking about here, getting that encyclopedia completed.

Since the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is interested in it, I might as well present his at this point. The next one is from F.G. Bursey Memorial Collegiate, in Grand Falls, and it signed by -

MR. SIMMS:

That is in Exploits District.

MR. FENWICK:

It says Grand Falls but it is in Exploits, is it? In that case, either of the members could rise to speak to it.

It is signed by 154 students and staff members of F.G. Bursey Memorial Collegiate and is now the third petition that we have received from Grand Falls. This should now meet the criteria established by the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) that if there was significant

representation from his district, he would get up in his place and speak positively to the petitions.

The next one, Mr. Speaker, is from the Bonavista District Vocational School. This is the first petition that I have had to present from a vocational school itself. I am somewhat disappointed I have not been able to get in touch with the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) whose district the Bonavista District Vocational School is in. I have not had the opportunity to give him the chance to speak to the petition itself but I will inform him of it when he does return to the House at a later date.

This is coming from a district vocational school and I think it is important to remember here that the previous ones have come primarily from libraries, regional library boards and from high schools which have a direct interest in using it. The district vocational schools are a different sort of organization but they themselves indicate a degree of support for it as well.

Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do at this point is to read some of the letters into the record which also support the encyclopedia and came with a number of the petitions.

The first one is from a Liberal district so I will allow the Liberal members to present that on their own.

The next one is from the Deer Lake Library, Mr. Speaker. This letter, by the way, is addressed to Bill Matthews because they have been sending the letters to the Minister who is responsible for

Culture, Recreation and Youth and whose department would, I would presume, do the assisting on this particular venture. It says, 'Dear Sir, On behalf of myself, a librarian technician, and the other staff members of our library, we would like to show you that we support the project that would complete the remaining volumes of the Newfoundland Encyclopedia by Mr. Smallwood. The two volumes here in our library now are used very much in research. In fact, we would be very lost without them sometimes. Some of our public have signed a petition saying this. We believe it is a very important project that should be finished.' Signed by Wynetta Cramm who is the librarian at the Deer Lake Library.

The next one is from Smallwood Academy. This one I apologize to the member for. I think he has the petition itself from it, Smallwood Academy in Dark Cove. I think we have actually presented it before. This is again addressed to Bill Matthews. It says, "Right Hon. Sir, I would like to see the provincial government provide funding for Mr. Smallwood's encyclopedia. The first two volumes which have been published are an invaluable tool to the students of our school who have used these books for research. They are particularly useful in some of the reorganized high school courses like the English course dealing with the research paper as well as Newfoundland culture. It would be a shame to see this resource unavailable in our schools because of a lack of funds. I urge the provincial government to reconsider their position on not funding Mr. Smallwood's project. Yours truly, Donald Tibbo, Librarian."

This, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to a petition that was introduced to the House yesterday. This is the supporting letter for it. It is from St. Gabriel's All-grade School in St. Brendans. I will read just the copy of the letter that went to Bill Matthews. It says, "I strongly urge you as Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth to use your influence on the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in an attempt to have them reverse their stand as it applies to The Newfoundland and Labrador Encyclopaedia. This project is of monumental importance not only to schools, but to Newfoundlanders in general. The price tag of \$1.5 million is minute when compared to the benefits that will be gained by the many people who will read and use it. Sincerely, John Croke, Principal."

Mr. Speaker, these are just a sample. I will continue on Monday to introduce additional copies of the encyclopedia petition and additional letters of endorsement from high schools, libraries and other private individuals across the Province. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we not allow this project to die on the vine, so to speak. It has gone from A to H. We need three more volumes in order to complete it. I even think that the \$1.5 million spread out over four or five years is probably an over statement of the amount because, I believe, that that could probably be trimmed down somewhat with sales and so on.

It is very important and I think it is time that we made a commitment as a government or as a Province to say that our history is much to important not to be recorded in such a way that all

the people of the Province would be able to read about it and find out about the rich cultural history that we have.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 7, Bill No. 42.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Implementation In The Province Of The Convention On The Recognition And Enforcement Of Foreign Arbitral Awards And The Model Law On International Commercial Arbitration," carried. (Bill No. 42).

On motion, Bill No. (42) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 8, Bill No. 48.

Motion, the hon. the President of the Council to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Leaseholds In St. John's Act", carried. (Bill No. 48).

On motion, Bill No. (48) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 9, Bill No. 47.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Matrimonial Property Act", carried. (Bill No. 47).

On motion, Bill No. (47) read a first time, ordered read a second

time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 10, Bill No. 46.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Portability Of Pensions Act", carried. (Bill No. 46).

On motion, Bill No. (46) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Motion 11, Bill No. 4.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's (Loan) Act, 1978," carried. (Bill No. 41).

On motion, Bill No. (41) read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:
Order 14, Bill No. 1.

MR. SPEAKER:
Bill No. (1). Debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Gander.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:
I am happy that the Minister Responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) is in his seat, because I would like to spend the first five or ten minutes or so dealing with him. I found that his introduction to the bill was distorted, insulting and petty. I

was very disappointed in the Minister Responsible for Energy introducing this hallmark piece of legislation. He spent so far, Mr. Speaker, about three and a half hours introducing the Atlantic Accord, and at least two and half hours of that time has not been spent on the Atlantic Accord. His remarks were distorted simply because I expected a more scholarly presentation from the Minister Responsible for Energy. I expected with his knowledge of the bill that he would go through the bill and point out areas of weakness, areas of strength and deal with the bill in a fair and reasonable manner. I really expected that kind of scholarly presentation from the Minister Responsible for Energy.

It was insulting to me, to other members of the House, to the press and to the people of Newfoundland because he did not do that, because he underestimates the intelligence of other members of the House, of the press and of the people of the Province. He underestimates their intelligence. He assumes they cannot read the legislation. He assumes either they are not going to because they are not interested enough, or they cannot read it and cannot understand it, and therefore he distorts the picture.

It was petty, Mr. Speaker, because three-quarters of the time was spent on a personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the height of pettiness and jealousy. One would expect that the Minister Responsible for Energy would know an awful lot more about this bill than he has shown so far. One would expect he would explain the bill and not waste most of his time on a

personal attack. And everybody knows why that is so. So, Mr. Speaker, I was very, very disappointed, the first point I would like to make, in the Minister Responsible for Energy. I thought he could do a better job, and perhaps he can do a better job. Perhaps what he has presented to us in this three and a half hours is not typical of the Minister Responsible for Energy. Perhaps he is capable of doing a better job, but he certainly did not show it.

I would also like to deal with the Minister responsible for Energy from the point of view of what he has said in the past. I want to deal specifically, first of all, with the promotion of refining and processing activities within the Province. We all remember, Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago, when the Minister Responsible for Energy had prepared and put his name to an analysis of the impact of a Nova Scotia type offshore agreement on Newfoundland. The minister's name was attached to this as well as Mr. Stephen Millan's, who was Executive Director of the Petroleum Directorate. They did this analysis of the Nova Scotia type offshore agreement on Newfoundland.

They would have to remember the circumstance, Mr. Speaker. The circumstance was that Nova Scotia had been offered a deal by the federal government and the Petroleum Directorate, under the direction of the Minister Responsible for Energy, took this agreement and analyzed it. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they did a half decent job, because at that time the concern of the Minister Responsible for Energy was that Newfoundland would not get ripped off. That was his

concern. So they analyzed the Nova Scotia type deal and they did what I consider to be, on most points, a reasonable job of analysis, not the kind of analysis that we are now seeing of the Atlantic Accord.

I would like to refer, Mr. Speaker, to parts of that document, particularly relating to the promotion of refining and processing activities within the Province. The Minister Responsible for Energy talks in terms of downstream industrial potential. Now, that is the industrial potential that would come from production in the offshore, particularly Hibernia. He analyzes the market factors and he says, "The general implication of the market factors is that the 'downstream' development in Newfoundland will be undertaken under highly competitive conditions" - that is a reasonable statement - "and that", and here is where we go now, Mr. Speaker, "control of the availability and price of feedstock from the offshore will be a critical tool" - the critical tool, Mr. Speaker - "in encouraging local development." The critical tool, 'The price of feedstock and the availability of feedstock from the offshore.' "This is certainly the case," he says, "in Alberta where provincial control of natural gas feedstock has been used to build a world-scale petrochemical industry", the implication being, Mr. Speaker, that if we could have the availability of feedstock for our Province and if we could have some control over the price of the feedstock, then we could develop a world-scale petrochemical industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us -

MR. J. CARTER:

Would the member permit a question?

MR. BAKER:

No, I am sorry. When I finish this section. I am just in the middle of this section, if the member would listen and try to understand where I am coming from.

The availability of feedstock from the offshore and control over the price of the feedstock, these are the two things the minister considered to be critical tools in encouraging local development and the implication was, and he stated it, 'that in the Nova Scotia type agreement that was not there, there was not availability of feedstock to the Province and there was no control over price.' As a matter of fact, he refers to this thing in the Nova Scotia agreement about feedstock being available on a commercial basis and he says 'that should not be, because there should be some control over that price on our part just like there is in Alberta.' He wanted the same control that Alberta had.

Now, I would put to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister Responsible for Energy was right in this case. Where is he coming from now, though, Mr. Speaker? This was done in 1982. Where is he coming from now? Do we hear from the minister? Did we hear in his three and a half hour discourse that because the feedstock was not made readily available to us that this was a problem, this would interfere with downstream development, it would interfere with the development of a petrochemical industry? Did we hear that from him? Did we hear anything from him about the fact that we now are suggested to sign an agreement which indicates that the oil will be sold on a

commercial basis? We heard this comment from him about the agreement with Nova Scotia, do we hear this same kind of rhetoric from the minister now about the fact that we have no control over the pricing of oil, that it has to be done on a commercial basis? We did not hear anything from the minister in his long discourse about that. I wonder why?

I could go on a little further in the 1982 analysis. "Under the Nova Scotia agreement, Nova Scotia-based buyers will have a first option to buy, on a commercial basis, hydrocarbons produced from the offshore area" - he has 'on a commercial basis' underlined. He does not like that - "but only to the extent that offshore production is required to meet end use consumption demand and feedstock needs of 'existing' industrial facilities in Nova Scotia." Clause (1) of the Nova Scotia agreement.

Now he comments on that: He says, "Ambiguity exists in determining whether the concept of 'existing' industrial facilities would include a mothballed refinery such as Come By Chance, and whether only industrial facilities existing as of the signing of the agreement, or such facilities as exist from time to time, be given preference under this clause." Do we hear that same comment now, Mr. Speaker? We are asked to sign exactly the same thing. Do we hear these comments now? Oh, no. I will get to what we hear about it in a few moments.

Then he went on to say, in 1982, "However, what is clear is that under the agreement, new Nova Scotia-based industrial buyers will not be given access to offshore production unless 'such

feedstock is excess to feedstock required to meet the demand of presently existing industrial capacity in Eastern Canada.'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, that was a tremendous fault in the Nova Scotia agreement, according to the Minister Responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) in 1982. We were told we could never accept that kind of an agreement, we could not accept the kind of agreement where new industrial facilities cannot get readily available feedstock from our own offshore. We were told that was impossible in 1982. Are we hearing the same thing now about the same clause that is in the Atlantic Accord? Are we hearing the same thing now?

The minister went on to say, in 1982, Mr. Speaker, "This means that unlike Alberta, which can use its oil and gas resources to start new industries which can compete with existing refineries in Ontario and Quebec, Nova Scotia can only hope that more oil and gas is found off its coast than Ontario and Quebec will need." Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Nova Scotia agreement committed feedstock to existing capacities in other provinces, this next sentence is the key sentence: He says, "This is hardly consistent with a commitment to using the resource to promote local economic development." Now I have to read that again for the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). "This is hardly consistent", the Minister Responsible for Energy says, in 1982, not very long ago, and what he is saying is hardly consistent is the fact that the feedstock has to go to existing refineries in other provinces. "This is hardly consistent with a commitment to using the resource

to promote local economic development." This was a tremendous flaw in the Nova Scotia agreement.

MR. J. CARTER:
(Inaudible),

MR. BAKER:
Well, the Minister Responsible for Energy did not know that back in 1982, did he? I am referring to the minister's own words, not my words, the minister's own words in 1982, that I would suggest to you were reasonable words in what, by and large, was a good analysis of the Nova Scotia type agreement.

Now, then, 'This is hardly consistent with a commitment to using the resource to promote local economic development.' The same thing, Mr. Speaker, can be said of the Atlantic Accord, and I will use the minister's own words. This Atlantic Accord is not consistent with a commitment to using the resource to promote local economic development, which is the only way we can get the very many permanent type jobs from the offshore.

We heard the Minister Responsible for Energy, Mr. Speaker, and I am spending more time than I had planned on the Minister, but I am hoping he will wander back in one of those minutes. We also heard the Minister Responsibility for Energy yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in his testimony to the House, when he finally got around to talking about the Atlantic Accord, in the last fifteen or twenty minutes of his discourse, talk about Alberta and that we were now - well, he probably said that we will have the same taxation regime as Alberta, we will be able to treat the oil as if it were on land. The Minister of Finance (Dr.

Collins) nods his head. It was a fine statement he made, however, it is not true. We cannot treat this resource as if it were on land. By the minister's own words in 1982 we cannot, the minister's own words on pages 25 and 26 of his analysis of the Nova Scotia type agreement. I would like to restate again, Mr. Speaker, that the same clauses that he was analyzing there are in the Atlantic Accord, and I will get to them a little later, the same clauses, therefore, the same analysis applies, exactly the same analysis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that bothers me. That really bothers me. This is an issue that is extremely important to this Province, the Atlantic Accord, Bill 1. It used to be called Bill 59. Here we have the Minister Responsible for Energy, in 1982, saying one thing about the clauses and now, in 1986, saying something totally different.

DR. COLLINS:
That is a very narrow point you are making.

MR. BAKER:
It is not a narrow point. I am talking about a narrow point maybe, the future development of this Province. If you want to consider that to be a narrow view and a narrow point, fine, the Minister of Finance can do that.

DR. COLLINS:
That is narrow, what someone said a couple of years ago. Broaden the subject out.

MR. BAKER:
Okay. Let us get back to what he said in 1982 then. Was this an example, I would rhetorically put the question to the Minister of

Finance, of the political posturing we have heard about? Was this purely political posturing? Was the minister correct in what he said in this analysis of the Nova Scotia agreement? Was he correct or was he not correct? Is he admitting now that the Minister Responsible for Energy made a mistake back then, or is he saying that the Minister Responsible for Energy, in fact, was doing it as a political posture and it was not to be taken seriously? We do not take political posturing seriously, but I am taking this issue very seriously. There is something wrong. Something smells, Mr. Speaker. There is something wrong when this kind of thing can happen.

As I said at the beginning, I expected a scholarly analysis of the Atlantic Accord from the Minister Responsible for Energy. Instead, all we got was nastiness and vituperation. That is what we got from him. A very small segment of his speech was about the Atlantic Accord. Either, Mr. Speaker, the Minister Responsible for Energy was right then and wrong now, or he was wrong then and right now. His comments today on the Atlantic Accord and his comments in 1982 on the Nova Scotia agreement, on clauses that are in the Atlantic Accord, they are mutually exclusive. Either he was right then or he is right now.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like the idea of the Minister Responsible for Energy of this Province, and the Premier has to be put in here, too, because the Premier has been up front on this, making all kinds of statements about the offshore oil, and I will get to that in a few minutes, I do not like the fact that the Premier and the

Minister Responsible for and Energy can go to the people and say one thing in 1982 about an issue and now come back and say something completely different. I cannot accept that, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that this matter be straightened out. Either these clauses were bad in 1982 and are bad now, either they are bad in the Nova Scotia agreement and bad in the Atlantic Accord, something we do not want, because we did not want the Nova Scotia type of agreement, or they were good in the Nova Scotia agreement because he is now saying these clauses are good.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that honour would dictate that this matter be straightened out. The people of Newfoundland have gone through an awful lot in the last few years waiting for this agreement. They have gone through an awful lot. There are some good things about this bill which I will get to. I will not only deal with the bad things.

The people of Newfoundland have gone through an awful lot, and in all this waiting and in all the hope that has been built up about the offshore we still have, as they have in the Nova Scotia type agreement, an impossibility to have any downstream development in this Province, any significant petroleum industry developed in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, this should be straightened out or, if the gentlemen have the honour I think they have, they should resign; one of the two, either straighten it out or resign. Because the Newfoundland people, one way or the other, have been fooled. Either they were fooled in 1982 by the Minister Responsible for

Energy and his comments on the Nova Scotian agreement, or they are being fooled now. I hope they are not being fooled now! And that is not an honourable thing for either the Premier of this Province or the Minister Responsible for Energy to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spend too much time on that particular aspect of what I wanted to say today. I intended to take five minutes or so, but I kind of got carried away. I think it is a scandalous kind of thing.

In my comments on the Atlantic Accord, Mr. Speaker, I am just getting around to them now, I would first of all like to go back a few years because I think the Atlantic Accord, Bill No. (1), has to be put in that kind of perspective. I would like to go back a few years to the impression that people had regarding Hibernia and regarding offshore development. Because of over-enthusiasm perhaps, that is a polite way of putting it, it might be simply political posturing and we have seen a lot of that in recent years, the people of this Province had the idea that as soon as we got around to production in Hibernia we would be rich. Somehow they got this idea that we would be rich and by, we would be rich, they were talking about themselves, the people in the Province, we would be rich, that we would have lots of money for schools, and highways, that we would have lots of jobs related to the offshore, that we would be rich. There is no doubt in my mind or in anybody's mind in this Province that five years ago that is what the people in this Province thought. They thought that have-not would be no more, that we could bring home the

people from Alberta who had had to go out there to look for jobs, the people who went to Toronto, the people who went to British Columbia and other provinces to find work. The impression that we had was that they could come back, that, when the offshore development got going, we would provide the work for these people who had had to leave the Province, and that we would provide work for the people already out of work in the Province. There is no doubt in my mind or in anybody's mind, Mr. Speaker, that that was the impression that people had in this Province.

We were told directly that the money from oil would be used to straighten out the fishery and the forestry; we would get into all kinds of forest management and all this kind of thing, and we would have money to make sure that we had forests in this Province operated and harvested properly; that the infrastructure of the Province could be built up, the municipal infrastructure and so on, water and sewer; that people in this Province would have decent water supplies, would have sewerage treatment systems and so on. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the Province believed that. 'The oil will eliminate unemployment in this Province', or at least all except the chronic 3 or 4 per cent, perhaps. But oil would, by and large, eliminate unemployment in this Province. The oil from Hibernia, this was a new Middle East and we were going to supply the world; the world would be coming to our doorstep to buy our oil. We were on our way to becoming the new Middle East of the world, the Middle East of the 1990s. That is the impression that people in this Province had

and because the people had this impression, Mr. Speaker, they supported very strongly the position taken by the Premier and the Minister Responsible for Energy on oil related matters. That is the impression they had.

The Premier and his Minister Responsible for Energy went through several stages of political posturing. First of all they said, 'We have to own the oil. It is ours, it is our right, it is on our land. That Continental Shelf is simply an extension of the Province and if the water were to lower a couple of hundred feet, that would be part of the Province. It is an extension of our Province, it is ours, we own it, that is it, case closed.' That was the first stage of political posturing. We know what happened to that, Mr. Speaker. We know that to get out of that position of political posturing the Premier put the case to the courts and the courts decided that we did not own it, it was not ours. We lost that one. Then the Premier put the blame on the courts: 'The courts took it away from us. The Supreme Court of Canada, people in Ottawa, took this away from us.'

AN HON. MEMBER:
That is lovely!

MR. BAKER:
That is very, very nice! Then, after going through the process of saying it is our oil, we own it, case closed, when that was shown by the courts to be not so, we got to the stage where, 'Well, at least we must be able to manage the resource as if we owned it, we must be able to control the mode of development, we must be able to control the rate of development, we must be able to control what

happens to the oil afterwards.' In other words, we must be able to use that oil as if we owned it. We went through quite a lot of that kind of political posturing, as well. And some of that, Mr. Speaker, is still around.

The implication in what the Minister Responsible for Energy said was that in fact he does not care about some problems, that really, really we can do what we want with the oil, we can manage it as if we did own it. He gave the impression that the Atlantic Accord gives us control over what happens out there plus gives us all the money. Now he said, 'What more could we want? What are we complaining about? We have got control. We have all the money. It does not matter if we own it.' Well, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that a statement like that is reasonable. If we control what is happening out there and if we are getting all the money from it, then I would not want anything else and I would, on that basis, gladly support the Minister Responsible for Energy.

The Minister Responsible for Energy also indicated, and the people of this Province believed - I do not know if they believe today, but I know a few months ago they did - that there was going to be construction of a whole lot of concrete platforms in the Province. One concrete platform now, right?

DR. COLLINS:
That is big enough.

MR. BAKER:
One concrete platform, that is enough now, is it? That is all we want, construction of one concrete platform. That is really what we want in this Province, short-term

construction jobs.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with these points. First of all, the reality. Let us look at the reality. I wish the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) would be a little more reasonable in his comments. I do not mind him making his comments, I might add, but be a little more reasonable. I would like to deal with the reality, then, of the Atlantic Accord.

First of all, we have Hibernia and we are told that when it starts producing it will be producing somewhere between 150,000 and 170,000 barrels of oil a day. That is a lot of oil. This will continue from ten to fifteen years, because the length of time it continues is dependent on how much we take out per day, obviously. So, 150,000 to 170,000, even up to 200,000 barrels of oil a day, what a tremendous amount of oil! The world is going to be rushing to our doorstep to get this oil.

To put this in perspective, Mr. Speaker - members opposite should listen to this - 150,000 barrels of oil a day is enough oil to supply one medium-size oil refinery and that is it. The world is going to be beating a path to our door to get our oil. What we have tied down now is enough oil to keep one oil refinery going, one medium size oil refinery. As a matter of fact, there is an oil refinery in New Brunswick, which is one of the provinces we have to provide oil to before we can develop our own petrochemical industry, that can handle 280,000 to 300,000 barrels a day, a big one. So, Hibernia -

MR. SIMMS:

What about the other fields?

MR. BAKER:

I will deal with that in a minute.

Hibernia has enough oil, what we know of out there now, what we are talking about getting into production with our concrete platform, to provide one medium-size oil refinery, Mr. Speaker, and that is it. There is not, in Hibernia, the oil to have the world coming to our door, there is not the oil in Hibernia to make us rich, there is not the oil in Hibernia to do away with unemployment, there is not the oil in Hibernia to cure the problems of the fishery and the forestry and the mining and everything else, there is not enough oil in Hibernia to ensure that have not will be no more and the people who had to go away from home can come home. There is not enough oil there. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reality and the minister knows it. The minister says that we are going to get all the money from the offshore. The minister said that yesterday, right? 'We are going to get all the money, we got control, what more do we want?' We are going to get all the money. The fiscal arrangements have not been worked out yet. I have not seen the minister presenting to this House details of the fiscal arrangements. We have to take his word for that now, that we are going to end up with all the money. We are going to have to take his word for that, because that has not yet been worked out. As a matter of fact, Mrs. Carney was saying there a couple of days ago that she was in the process of dealing with the developmental plan and, after that was done, then they would get around to talking about the

money. That brings up another point: We are supposed to have control over stage one of the development plan, not her. Anyway, that is another point I will get to in a few minutes.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please! Order, please!

I wonder if I could interrupt the hon. member for a minute, and maybe in about twenty minutes time, when our other visitors come?

I would like at this time to welcome to the visitor's gallery thirty-five Grade VI students from All-Hallows Elementary School, Corner Brook, with their teachers, Catherine Jordon and Marie Ryan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So, we do not have all this oil out there that people have envisioned, we do not have it ready for production -

MR. YOUNG:

Who said so?

MR. BAKER:

I will deal with that in a minute. Just hold on now.

- we do not have the fiscal regime in place, so we do not know that we are going to get all this money, anyway. The money is not there that people in the Province expect. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is only going to be one concrete platform built providing short-term jobs, not doing away with unemployment in

this Province. Mr. Speaker, there is even talk lately of having to subsidize the development of Hibernia, to put money in, and that is rather ironic, to subsidize the development of Hibernia when that was the development that was supposed to subsidize everything else in the Province. It is rather strange, Mr. Speaker.

Now, then, while I have been talking in the last few minutes, members opposite have been throwing across at me, 'But there is more oil out there, you are only talking about Hibernia.' Well, I would suggest to members opposite a couple of things: First of all, the people of this Province have been sold the bill of goods that Hibernia is what is going to solve our problems. Now they are admitting it is not. So there is some other oil out there somewhere. Fine! Fine! Fine!

MR. DAWE:

You have not been listening.

MR. BAKER:

The people of the Province I am talking about. The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) says I am not listening. I know about the weasel words that are used. I know about the words that are used with double meanings, created to give an impression to the people of this Province that there is untold wealth in Hibernia, and they got that impression, and the members opposite were happy because it got them re-elected. I know about those words, I know about the way the members created the impression, and I know that they could probably go back and point to cases where they said to people, "Look, really, you know, there may not be that much oil out there." I know that. I know

where they talked about afraid of overheating the economy and all this kind of thing. I know about that. But I am talking about the impression that people had in this Province and I am right in what I am saying.

Now, then, they throw back at me that there is other oil out there and I hope there is. I hope there is. But, in the meantime, look at what has happened. Hibernia was developed on one thing and one thing only. It was not that the oil companies all of a sudden said, "Well, boys, there is no more oil anywhere else so we are going to drill for oil on the Grand Banks. There is a good chance of there being oil there, and we will spend our money and drill for oil out there." The companies did not go there of their own free will, they went there simply because of the grant structure from the federal government, which allowed them to write off expenses; they went because of the PIP grants they got, the Petroleum Incentive Programme. That is why they went out and drilled at Hibernia, and that is why they drilled at Ben Nevis and the other wells. That is why 90 per cent of the exploratory holes have been drilled, they have been drilled because of the PIP grants.

Now, then, this year the PIP grants are being phased out. First of all the oil companies were told they were being cancelled altogether and there was tremendous reaction; there would be no drilling, they would not do any exploratory drilling. Then the federal government got a little more reasonable and came back and said, "All right, we will put in this grandfather clause, you know, we will PIP some wells,

we will provide PIP grants to some wells and so on. That is the way we are operating now. That is why drilling is down on the Grand Banks and will be for the next couple of years at least, that we know of, because the grants are not there. So if, in fact, there are huge, vast resources of oil on the Grand Banks, off the Coast of Labrador, off the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, wherever, if there are vast reserves of oil and natural gas out there, that is where they are going to stay simply because the federal government, totally insensitive to the exploration programme, has cancelled the grant system and, so far, has put nothing in its place.

Now, if the federal government comes back and replaces those PIP grants with something else so that the oil companies can go ahead and drill on federal government money, which is what they have been doing, then I would say sure there will be more drilling done and hopefully more oil will be discovered. But we have to deal not with the pie in the sky, because indications are that the Feds are not going to replace the PIP grants, not unless the government changes. Maybe if we get a Liberal Government back in Ottawa we will get back to the PIP grants. But right now there is no indication they are backtracking, therefore, there is no indication that we are going to experience the same kind of drilling activity on the Grand Banks and off Labrador, and so on, that we have in the last number of years, while the PIP grants were in effect.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is not this great vast wealth in Hibernia. People are beginning to realize that. It is not there. The other drilling that hopefully could

develop our offshore oil into a vast useable resource, that drilling has slowed down and will not go ahead unless there is some kind of subsidization for the drilling, and that has been removed. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the reality of the situation. The reality is we have Hibernia.

Now the expectation of jobs: As far as Hibernia is concerned, we will get a lot. Now I say a lot in quality of terms. If I am a businessman and I hire twenty or thirty people or something, then the jobs in the construction of the concrete platform are a lot. There are jobs constructing the concrete platform, but these are short-term jobs and, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to you that these jobs will not make a dent in our unemployment figures. For the past number of months, January, February, and March anyway, we have had 100,000 people in this Province, every month, registering on the U.I.C. rolls. They do not have work. A couple of thousand jobs is not going to solve that problem, and they are temporary jobs, short-term jobs, not permanent jobs. There will be permanent jobs once Hibernia goes into production, but again not nearly enough, not even enough to bring back home the people who have left, not even enough for that. It will not make a dent in our unemployment figures and it also will not bring any of these people back home. As a matter of fact, maybe more of the people who are away will get jobs than the people who are here now, because a lot of them went to work in the oil industry and have had some experience there. Anyway, we do not have the future from Hibernia that we were led to believe.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told

that we have control over what happens in the offshore. I would like to refer to the Atlantic Accord to point out that this really is not true. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to Section 33 of the Accord. Now Section 33, Mr. Speaker, is where there are definitions that apply to Sections 34 to 37. Before I come back to Section 33, I have to read Section 34 (1) to explain the significance of 33. Section 34 (1) says, "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 a fundamental decision referred to in sub-section (2), made during that period." Okay? Now then, "Where it has been determined that self-sufficiency and security of supply do not exist," right away in Section 35 (2), Mr. Speaker, if we sign this Accord we are saying, and I will read it out, it is plain English, understandable, Section 35 (2) says, "For the purposes of Section 34, the first period shall commence January 1, 1986 and shall terminate on December 31, 1990 and, in respect of that period" - that is the first five years - "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."

Now go back to what I read a moment ago, Section 34, 'where it does not exist, the federal minister has authority in relation to any fundamental decision.' I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who has control over what happens in the offshore on this basis? Is it the Provincial Minister Responsible for Energy?

MR. EFFORD:

No.

MR. BAKER:

Is it the Premier of this Province? Is it this House? We have signed away the control that the Minister Responsible for Energy talks and brags about, 'We have control. At least we have control of our offshore.' We signed that away for the first five years and goodness knows what happens at the end of the five years. Again, if I have time I will get to that.

MR. BAIRD:

Are you going to vote against it?

MR. BAKER:

So, Mr. Speaker, we have given away the control. Members opposite seem to be happy about this. They are shouting out, 'Are you going to vote against it? Are you going to vote for this?' I will ask hon. members, are you going to vote for it? Are you going to vote for giving away control? You are going to vote for this unamended, exactly the way it is. You are happy with giving away control, you are very happy about that.

MR. BAIRD:

The Liberals tried to give it all away.

MR. BAKER:

Is it that you consider you are not capable of doing anything if you had control? Is that the problem? Do you lack the self-confidence?

MR. BAIRD:

The Liberals gave it all away.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DAWE:

You are wrong.

MR. BAKER:

Well, you tell me when you get up where I am wrong in what I am saying. I am reading from the bill. And the people of this Province and the press of this Province can read and they can understand. We will look at the next five years and see who is right about this bill.

MR. EFFORD:

They will not be around here then.

MR. BAKER:

These words will come back to haunt the the Minister of Transportation, I can assure him.

MR. BAIRD:

You will not be here then, so you will not have to worry about it.

MR. EFFORD:

Who will not be here?

MR. BAIRD:

You will not be here.

MR. EFFORD:

Oh, yes, but over there.

MR. BAKER:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to another section of the bill which again deals with something that is very important to us, and that is the section on Regional security of supply. I am doing this, Mr. Speaker, to tie in with what I said at the beginning, and if the Minister of Transportation or any members opposite bothered to listen to what I said at the beginning, they will very quickly get the connection. I know the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) listened, because he is always very attentive and it is

good to see him there.

Regional Security of Supply:
Section (2) of Paragraph 41 says, "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 licences in the offshore area that the facilities that are specified" - in previous sections which I will get to in a moment - "during the term of the notice, have first option to acquire, on commercial terms" - now, remember that phrase 'on commercial terms', Mr. Speaker. We have first option to acquire on commercial terms. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is the point, that is the very phrase that the Minister Responsible for Energy did not like in the Nova Scotia agreement, 'on commercial terms'. We have no control over the price, in other words - "on commercial terms, petroleum produced in the offshore area." So this is what the minister is saying, we have rights to this 150,000 barrels of oil a day, we have rights to it. We can use it. But, Mr. Speaker, can we?

MR. DAWE:

Your ten minutes are up.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BAKER:

The last part of that paragraph says that we can get this oil, we can recall this oil if we have a shortfall unless, and this is the keyword here, Mr. Speaker, "Unless a sales contract with respect to that petroleum has been entered into prior to the giving of the notice."

Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker! We

are told that we can use our oil, our own oil, if and only if the oil companies do not have contracts for it. Now, we are talking about 150,000 barrels of oil a day, not very much oil.

MR. DAWE:

The contracts only last three months.

MR. BAKER:

The Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is getting into the act again saying, 'the contracts only last for thirty days, sixty days, or whatever.' If that is so, I would say to the Minister of Transportation that that means the Premier and the Minister Responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) would be willing to amend this particular thing to say, 'Unless a sales contract with respect to the petroleum has been entered into prior to giving notice and that such a sales contract be of no more than ninety days duration.' I would suggest that if what the Minister of Transportation is saying is true, that the Premier and the Minister Responsible for Energy would be willing to actually write that in there. It would be no problem. If, in fact, all those contracts we are talking about are thirty day and sixty day contracts, then surely they would be very amenable to an amendment in the Committee stage, as we go paragraph by paragraph, to an amendment which would specifically state this, that we are talking about short-term contracts, we are not talking about any long-term contract that Mobil might enter into with its own oil refinery somewhere for a longer period, that we are not talking about the kind of contracts I understand that the Holyrood oil refinery has.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I wonder if I could interrupt the hon. member? We will stop the clock and he can get back to where he was.

MR. BAKER:
Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:
This is a very pleasant ceremony for me. This is a unique occasion for our Newfoundland Legislature. I have the privilege of welcoming to our House on your behalf, Parliamentary Members from all over the world who are members of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
We have, first of all, the pleasure of welcoming our colleagues from Britain, where our parliamentary traditions date back well into the distant past. I might add that we, in Newfoundland, were among the six original founding members of our Association, in 1911. This parliamentary tradition has spread throughout the world so that today we can welcome from the Caribbean, from India, from Sri Lanka, Australia and New Zealand, from the African continent and Canada, Speakers, their spouses and representatives from all around the world. I know my friend, the hon. Gerald Ottenheimer who is your Chairman, is very pleased to join me as are all my colleagues in welcoming you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I do not think we have ever had a visiting Speaker say a few words to us before, but I am going to call on our Sergeant-at-Arms to escort Dr. the Hon. Bal Ram Jakhar MP Speaker of the Lok Sabha, in India, and Chairman of our Executive Committee to say a few words to you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. THE HON. BAL RAM JAKHAR:

Thank you. Hon. Mr. Speaker, hon. members of this august House, my colleagues of the Executive Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament Association, at the outset I must thank Mr. Speaker and all members of this august House for the privilege they have provided to me and to my colleagues to be present in this House and have the rare and unique opportunity to address you. It is very rarely done and this rare opportunity falls on the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I must thank you, Sir, on behalf of all my colleagues for this gesture.

We have enjoyed the hospitality, the affection, and the warmth of the people and the members here. We are very grateful and we feel right at home. It is a long tradition and you are one of the founding members of that unique tradition, which you began in 1911 when you founded that institution.

This institution that is called the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, in my opinion and the opinion of my colleagues, is a family gathering. A common bond binds us together. We stand for certain ideals: We stand for humanitarianism, we stand for

understanding for the freedom of all people. We want that man should enjoy the rights given to him by the Almighty, provided by Him, as members of a free society.

I remember the words of Winston Churchill who once said, "The worst form of government is Democracy but", he added, "this is the best system to be tried so far." We may improve, as time goes on, upon rules and procedures and whatever other laws there might be, but still I find it the best because it provides man the opportunity to express himself as he likes, to do as he likes and have the freedom of his conscience and his own bearing upon this Earth, and for that purpose I think the Commonwealth has shown us apart. It is a beacon of light for others to follow, this family, which once was not united by a common bond but by something otherwise, but we have replaced that and now there is a common bond of friendship and understanding which runs throughout this Commonwealth, more than one-third of the whole world today..

I compare this House here with the House in India. With a population of 750 million people, in our House there are 544 members. When I learned from Mr. Gerald Ottenheimer that there are fifty-two members here, I thought, 'There is not much of a difference, I will just add four at the end and it will make it more simple to deal with.'

Really there is no difference between big and small. It is a question of the inside of one's own heart and the impulses therein which count. Numbers do not mean much. If we have all the basic values which we cherish, thereby

there is no big and no small, we are all equal.

I should not go on speaking too long because your time is too precious for this, but I will say this: The other day someone asked me, "Mr. Speaker, when are you coming back again?" I told him an anecdote which I learned in my boyhood. A person was staying at somebody's house as a guest and they stayed on and on and on and rather overstayed their stay. The husband and wife conspired together to get rid of the person and in his presence they argued with each other; the wife said to her husband, "Well, will you not ask our honoured guest to visit us again pretty soon?" The husband said, "No, he will not come again." The wife was persistent, "Why not? He is our relation, he is our friend, why will he not come back again?" And the husband said, "My dear, only if he goes can he come again. How can he come otherwise?"

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. THE HON. BAL RAM JAKHAR:

So I told him, "My friend you have done so much for us, you have looked after us so well, only if we decide to go can we come back. I think we had better stay down here."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the members here and the populace of all Newfoundland who have been so great. This beautiful, calm, peaceful town reminds me of the serenity which I, as a farmer, enjoyed in my fields on my farm. I remember my days there as a farmer, and here I see that serenity, that calmness, that communion with the Almighty, a direct approach rather like a hot

line.

Thank you very much again for allowing me this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

I call on the hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was in the process, Mr. Speaker, of pointing out a number of things having to do with Section 41 of the Atlantic Accord, which is supposed to protect our regional security of supply of oil from Hibernia.

That regional security, according to Section (2), is that when there is a shortfall in this Province, the provincial minister can kind of recall oil from Hibernia, and he can do that by going to the producer and saying, "Look, you cannot sign any more contracts. You can service your contracts you have in place, but you cannot service any more contracts until we are satisfied that we have our security of supply."

Let us accept the fact, Mr. Speaker, that what we are talking about here are thirty day, sixty day and ninety day contracts. If members opposite are willing to stipulate that, then, fine. Let us suppose they are, and we are not talking about long-term contracts, then we can recall the oil. That is wonderful! A tremendous idea! But then, Mr.

Speaker, we have to go back to Section 1 to find out more about those conditions, more about how do we determine there is a shortfall. Again I will say it in simple language for members opposite. If there is a shortfall, we can recall the oil, and that is good. However, how do we determine there is a shortfall? That becomes the key now, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) understands that.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, we determine a shortfall in the following way: "For the purposes of this section 'shortfall of petroleum deliveries in the province' means, deliveries of petroleum that are inadequate to supply, on commercial terms" all of the following. So, if it is inadequate to supply all the following, then we have a shortfall in our Province. Now, the following is constituted by this - "(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."

So, we can supply our present great petroleum industry first. It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that we are rather devoid of petrochemical complexes in our Province, we are rather devoid of companies that can produce their products using our offshore oil. We do not have many of these in the Province, but the Minister Responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) did not comment on that.

So our present industrial complex that we have none of, we can supply. This was a bone of contention for the Minister Responsible for Energy in the Nova

Scotia deal, he did not like that. You did not like that in the Nova Scotia agreement, did you?

The Minister Responsible for Energy might come back and say, 'Well, we have another section here.' Well, let us go to the other section here. "(b) the feedstock requirements of the refining facilities existing at Come-by-Chance." Hooray! we are now guaranteeing that we can have oil for Come By Chance, Mr. Speaker, 100,000 barrels of oil a day. You go on to read, 'the feedstock requirements of Come-by-Chance on the day of coming into force of this Act.' The feedstock requirements of a mothballed refinery, Mr. Speaker, are zero.

Another problem that the minister had with the Nova Scotia agreement was precisely that, the ambiguity of the terms. Well, it is not ambiguous here, Mr. Speaker.

The minister can come back and say, Well, we have another safeguard in here, and here it is: "or any refining facility constructed in this province to replace those facilities at Come-by-Chance."

MR. CALLAN:

Where are they?

MR. BAKER:

Yes, where are they? The implication is that Come-by-Chance is going to be scrapped. Are we going to build another oil refinery in Come-By-Chance, then, or is that oil refinery going to go in the St. John's Harbour? Where is it going to go? Who is going to build this oil refinery now to replace Come-By-Chance?

MR. BAIRD:

You will be notified in due course.

MR. BAKER:

Anyway, we have that in there, Mr. Speaker, that we can go and build another oil refinery. Maybe the Minister Responsible for Energy is going to build his own refinery, or maybe there are companies which are going to.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I am tempted to say that the hon. the member is misleading the House but, in view of our distinguished visitors here, he is probably misleading the Commonwealth. I will not go on in that light.

Surely the member knows that oil can be bought on the open market, and that the oil from Hibernia and the oil from any producing wells will be sold on the open market. It does not matter if we cannot get that particular oil for our refinery, we can buy oil anywhere, any time. It is just foolishness.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has learned a new word today, Commonwealth. Now, if somebody would explain to him what it is, he would be well ahead.

Mr. Speaker, he knows very well that my colleague is making a very, very valid point. He can squirm all he wants, he is now boxed into the position of voting for a bill that will have the refining done in Ontario. We cannot accept that, my colleague cannot accept it, and stop obstructing him. We do not accept it. You can be skewered all you want, but as long as you support the refining in Ontario of Newfoundland oil, we are 'agin' it and we are 'agin' you.

MR. SIMMS:

Stop showing off now.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I knew there was no point of order.

Now, then, let us go on to the third section, because Mr. Speaker reminds me I only have five minutes left, unfortunately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. BAKER:

By leave I could go on to the good points of the bill, after my time is up.

Now, then, Section (c) of Paragraph 41, Mr. Speaker, says that after this is taken care of, "the feedstock requirements of any refining facility located in the Province that was not in place on the coming into force of this act." In other words, certainly we can build new oil refineries, or not just oil refineries but a petrochemical complex, because we

have allowances made here for feedstock requirements for facilities that are constructed after the act comes in. Well, that is fine, Mr. Speaker.

We go on to the rest of the paragraph, Mr. Speaker, and it cancels out everything that went before: "to the extent that such feedstock requirements exceed the feedstock requirements required to satisfy the demand of industrial capacity, on the day of the coming into force of this Act, in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Hibernia we have 150,000 barrels of oil a day. We have refineries in New Brunswick that can handle close to 300,000 barrels of oil a day. We have to make sure that the other Atlantic Provinces have all their requirements satisfied before we can even declare a shortfall for any new facilities. This indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have given away the right to build any kind of petrochemical industry in this Province.

And I would go back again to the statements made by the Minister Responsible for Energy in 1982. I do not know if he heard those before, but these are his own statements. What he says is that in the Nova Scotia agreement, where there was the same kind of clause, except 'Eastern Canada' was there - that was in our original one, too, and it was also in the federal one to start but I think it has been changed. Anyway, in the Nova Scotia deal, where Nova Scotia could not build any new refining facilities until the demand of Eastern Canada was satisfied, this is what the Minister Responsible for Energy

had to say on that occasion: "What is clear is that under the agreement, new Nova Scotia-based industrial buyers will not be given access to offshore production unless such feedstock is excess to those required to meet the demand in the other provinces. This means that unlike Alberta", Mr. Speaker, "which can use its oil and gas resources to start new industries, Nova Scotia can only hope that more oil and gas will be found off its coast than the other provinces will need."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if that was a problem in the Nova Scotia deal, then, obviously, it is a problem in the Newfoundland deal. The minister has since changed his tune, and we wonder why? It was a problem in the Nova Scotia deal for a number of reasons: Number one, because of political posturing on the part of the minister and the Premier, and, number two, because of the stripe of government in Ottawa which has since changed. Those are reasons why the Minister Responsible for Energy, Mr. Speaker, has now changed his tune. Now, something that was horrible in 1982 has suddenly become the best thing since the safety pin, in 1986. Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong here, as I pointed out before, and I was hoping that the Minister Responsible for Energy could hear it. There is something wrong here, something smells. The Minister Responsible for Energy is expected, in this Province, to be believed and to be believable when he has such a position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out, before I conclude, some of the better points of the bill. It will not take very long, I will just summarize them. I would

suggest, Mr. Speaker, to you and to members opposite that there are some good points to this bill. The Canada/Newfoundland benefits plan, that is good; the Canadian ownership for the production licences, the percentage of Canadian ownership, the 50 per cent and so on for the production licences, that is a good move. We do not want the multinationals taking over everything. The establishment of the seven member board, the equal membership on the board, I think that is a good move as well. The equalization offset payments, even though they are not dealt with in this bill, the minister mentioned them and I would like to refer to them as well, the equalization offset payments that are going to result from Hibernia - I presume the minister has checked. That is in the federal bill. I am taking your word for this now - the equalization offset payments, Mr. Speaker, will ensure that we do not automatically get cut off from our grants from Ottawa. I think that is a good section as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, to conclude, I would like to point out to members opposite and to the press and to anybody who might be listening that what we have done here in this Atlantic Accord, if it is passed, is give up any hope of having refining and processing activities, particularly, processing activities, within this Province for a long, long time. And unless somebody over there gets off their butts and makes sure that there is a new programme to replace the PIP programme that they were so savage against and that developed Hibernia, unless they insist on a new programme to replace the PIP grants, we are going to end up having nothing out of this.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak very long on this bill because I am sure that many members will want to have their name in the records as having been present when this historic bill was passed. So I am going to speak briefly for that reason.

But I also want to speak because of the main thrust of the remarks made by the hon. member who just took his seat. He has gotten a thing in his mind that is so far away from reality that one has to comment on it. Now, what is he asking for essentially when he goes on about, 'we must use the oil offshore for our purposes' and all that sort of thing? I will not go into the convoluted arguments that he put up because it would be pointless. One would only waste one's time on them. But what he is, in essence, saying is that we should legislate here in regard to Hibernia so that a millenium comes to Newfoundland, that we should take what is out there and disregard the realities in the rest of the world, disregard the realities in the market aspects of world commerce and just take all the benefits for ourselves.

Well, unfortunately we do not live intellectually on an island and commercially we do not live on an island. Physically we may live on an island but, in actual fact, we must relate to the rest of the world.

Now the hon. member was saying that somehow or other this bill -

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

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

MR. FENWICK:
My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the speaker is saying that we live on an island. Mr. Speaker, we do not. We live in a Province that has an island portion and a large mainland portion. We would appreciate the member keeping his Province correct.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. member has provided some information.

DR. COLLINS:
Very, very sparce information, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member was implying that this bill should ensure that some of the Hibernia oil comes to Newfoundland and therefore, we would then have a viable oil refining industry in this Province. He also mentioned the refinery in Saint John. Now, if you take the essence of the hon. member's arguments, you have to say to yourself, why is the refinery in Saint John, which is now working at 25 per cent capacity, not working at 100 per cent capacity? Is it because of a lack of oil? Of course not. The refinery in Saint John is working at 25 per cent capacity in a world where there is oil coming out of everyones ears, where the world is awash in oil because the availability of crude is not the big point.

So the hon. gentleman opposite is

totally out to lunch if he thinks that what will hold up a refining industry in this Province is we did not write into this act that Hibernia oil has to come to the Province. There is more oil, as the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) pointed out, in the world than the world can possibly refine. It is not the availability of oil that is going to make a refinery go. It is many things. It is the markets. It is the level of technology. It is the competitive capacity of that particular enterprise.

For the hon. member to say there is a huge gap in this bill because we somehow or other did not enforce, did not legislatively compel - which would be a ridiculous situation in this day and age to do anyway - the companies to put oil into this Province, disregarding everything else, for the hon. member to get on with that is so ridiculous and so far out to lunch and is so naive and is so divorced from what, in actual fact, goes on in the world, it is almost laughable.

Now I do not think the hon. member is that sort of person. I do not think that is the level of his intellectual capacity. The only reason why he is saying that is that this bill is such a good bill, they cannot find anything substantive to attack in it, so they have to go on to ridiculous aspects. Because if there was something really good to get at, if there was a real defect in this bill, would the hon. member go after what are called in the local parlance the rabbit tracks. Surely they would go after the moose tracks; they would not go after this foolish little argument you brought up. But, of course, he cannot because there are no

major defects in this bill.

This bill is a historic bill. It is an excellent bill. It is a bill that brings to fruition a situation of great difficulty. To bring off the development of the Newfoundland offshore was a very difficult task. I am sure we can all think of when oil was discovered in the Southern United States or when the oil was discovered in the sands of Saudi Arabia that there was an immediate flow of wealth to those areas. Those were in the halcyon days of the early 40s, and so on and so forth. That is not the situation we are living in today in the world.

The oil industry in the world today is a very tough, difficult, competitive business and you have to know what you are doing to be able to get into it at all. Now, that was the one difficulty.

The second difficulty is, they say if you try to dig a water well in Alberta you had difficulties because you were bound to strike oil or if not in Alberta, in Oklahoma or whatever. We did not have that situation, unfortunately, on our Grand Banks. We had to explore. We had to take on tremendous problems. When I say 'we' I am putting ourselves in the context of being partners with the oil industry because this is what we are as a result of this bill, we had to go out there and scratch and scrape and discover, under great difficulty, the oil reserves. So that is the second difficulty.

The third difficulty is that we live in a very difficult climate in terms of offshore exploration and offshore oil development. That is the third difficulty.

With all those tremendous difficulties, it is an absolute wonder that we could put together an arrangement to develop our offshore. It was a Herculean task. It required unending effort to do and the fact that we have been able to do it is something that I think future generations of Newfoundlanders will look back at and wonder. This was not like falling off a log; this was a plum falling off a tree. This had to be worked at, it had to be scraped at, it had to be fought over, it had to be argued about to bring it together at all and it is a wonder we managed to do that.

Now, with all those three difficulties that I have mentioned, that was bad enough, it was an almost impossible task with those three difficulties but there was a fourth difficulty, as everyone in this House knows. We live in a Confederation and to bring this off in the face of a Confederation was an extremely difficult task because we were dealing in an area here of unclear jurisdiction. This was not a resource that was on the land mass of any province. This was not a resource that was in a wilderness area to which there was no claim, such as if you found oil in Baffin Island or whatever.

This was in an area that was not on a land mass but it was in an area where a Province had legitimate, historic and moral rights to the values of that resource. So we were in an extremely difficult jurisdictional area. We felt, in the beginning, that the easiest and cleanest way of doing this, the right way, the moral way would be for all other claims to it to be rescinded and the only claim that would stand will be the Province of

Newfoundland's claim. We still feel that would have been the cleanest, easiest way. Unfortunately, we do not live in a perfect world so we have to go when that was clearly not going to come off and, especially with the intransigence of the federal government at that time, there was no possibility that they would even look at it.

When that best solution would not come about, we had to move to a second best and this second best is an extremely good situation. In actual fact, given the circumstances of life and given the fact of the image and the arrangement of Confederation, it is the best arrangement. The other one just was too far off to one side to be countenanced by the other players in the whole issue.

So, we have now got the best solution here to that very difficult area of jurisdictional dispute and that is that we can manage this resource as though it were on land with certain provisos that relate to the national interest that we, ourselves, fully support. We have no wish to, in any way, have powers that we could exercise that would impair the national interest.

There are powers in, say, the hands of the Government of Norway that they can control their resource, irrespective of the national interest of Canada. We do not want powers over our resource out there such as Norway has over its resource in relation to Canada. The only powers we want in regard to our resource are within the confines that we fully support, those that are in the national interest of Canada, the country to which we belong, but

having given that, we have then full jurisdictional powers. When that point is accepted, as we fully do, other than that, all the powers that we want evolve onto this government. We felt that it was absolutely necessary to have those so that the maximum benefits for the people of this Province could be derived and that is what this bill does.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is essentially all I wanted to say. I just wanted to be associated with this document, this document which was brought forward with great sweat and toil and tears but is culminated in a document that we can be proud of. It covers every issue that we wish to be covered. It embodies the necessary compromises and the compromises we fully support, that had to be put in there so that the nation also gets the proper and appropriate benefit from our resource.

The final word I would like to say is that the present Minister in charge of Energy (Mr. Marshall) deserves - not only the commendation - but deserves the everlasting thanks of the people of this Province, on both sides, in all walks of life, whether they live on the East Coast or the West Coast or in Labrador; whether they are urban dwellers or they are rural dwellers, because they will all get appropriate benefit on this; all these people deserve to give, and I am sure they do, their heart felt thanks to the Minister responsible for Energy that he persisted and worked and laboured so long and so strong to bring forward this act which will do us all so much good in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:
That was really wild applause.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, following on that thunderous applause, I note the gentleman for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) says 'not a very big fan club', no, but it has quality. I can say that for it.

Mr. Speaker, that may well be the last pleasant note I will be able to utter during the next few minutes because the subject at hand is not one that lends itself to very many pleasantries, unfortunately. I wish that the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) were here because I did want to respond to some of the matters that he raised in the debate. It is the kind of response though that would almost dictate his physical presence because I wanted to say somethings that I must prefer to say in his presence than in his absence, one because I would like to do it that way, and secondly because, if I said it in his absence, it might be construed that I would not want to say it in his presence and that is not the case. He raised some issues yesterday, Mr. Speaker, which need to be responded to. Some of them were fairly low personal issues, but we will leave those.

Let us talk for a few minutes about the bill and perhaps, during the course of my remarks, the Minister responsible for Energy might tare himself away from the law office and come back in and

hear what we have to say on this particular issue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister responsible for Energy yesterday, in introducing the debate on second reading, talked about the role of the former federal Liberal government. Everytime I hear that chant again, that litany again, the word that keeps coming to mind is 'newspeak', Orwell's 1984, everybody had to learn what to say, how to say it, and how often to say it. Every time I hear the minister talk, I keep thinking the word 'newspeak'. He says it often enough, it has no historical basis in fact, but he says it anyway, and he operates on the principle, if he says it long enough, enough people will believe it. Mr. Speaker, I am talking in particular about his ranting and roaring once again on how the former federal Liberal government brutalized this Province and almost brought this Province to its knees. Remember all that, Mr. Speaker, remember that litany.

Let us suppose for a half a second, Mr. Speaker, that he is right. Suppose that what he is reporting to the House for the umpteenth time is correct. Suppose that the former Liberal government did, in his words, brutalize this Province. Suppose, in his words, that the former Liberal government did 'bring this Province to its knees'. Suppose that is right.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if that is right, the following is also right. It is also right that the Minister responsible for Energy was a partner in the crime, unwitting, maybe, but I will recall for you, Mr. Speaker, an event that is not hearsay on my part; it does not require any

trust of the House in my words; it just requires a fairly short memory on the part of people in this Chamber. All they have to do, Mr. Speaker, is recall that the gentleman for St. John's East and Mr. Chretien, after some discussions in Montreal, I believe it was, or Ottawa, but I believe Montreal, I stand to be corrected, but they made an announcement to the press as together they stood shoulder to shoulder late one evening. I remember seeing the clip on television, as millions of Canadians had the opportunity to do likewise, with our man from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and the federal Minister of Energy of the day, Mr. Chretien, announcing to the press they had reached the basis for a deal. That was the lead story on the national newscast, radio and television, all that evening.

Then, next morning there was another story. If I may paraphrase rather roughly to make the point, the story next morning had a clip from the Premier of Newfoundland in which he was basically saying, in not very subtle terms, 'Not so fast Billy boy'. The Premier in that moment had done exactly to the Minister responsible for Energy what he had done on another occasion to the now member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), the then Minister of Fisheries when he went in and signed the fisheries deal on a couple of occasions and the Premier stepped in after the fact.

It raises a very important question. It raises a germane question in terms of the issue raised yesterday by the member for St. John's East relating to the resignation of the Leader of the Opposition from the Tory caucus. We have heard the excuses or the

explanation given by the member for St. John's East but, if he reads all of the Leader of the Opposition's letter of resignation very carefully, he will find the reason and he will find that the reason relates to an incident which parallels exactly the incident I just quoted where the Minister responsible for Energy one night announces to the public he has got the basis for a deal; the incident where the then Minister of Fisheries announces to the public he has got a deal with the federal government and signs his name on the line; those two incidents, the third incident relates and parallels.

The third incident, which took place before these other two in time, was when the then Minister of Energy, the now member for Mount Scio, had come back from Ottawa with the basis for a deal, wanted, in his capacity, expected, in his capacity as a minister, to be able to report to Cabinet but was prevented from doing so because the managers of the fiction that said it was impossible to get a deal with Ottawa wanted to cosmetically wrap the package, wanted to analyze it, wanted to pick it apart, in short, wanted to run interference on it. That, Mr. Speaker, more than anything else was the issue in triggering that resignation.

It was the case of a Premier, again, refusing to allow a minister to carry out his mandate, be it the mandate of the former Minister of Energy, the now Leader of the Opposition; be it the mandate of the now Minister responsible for Energy when he has the basis of a deal with Mr. Chretien; be it the then Minister of Fisheries when he had a deal on fisheries. It has always been the

same, the old one man show, but more than that. I would be simplistic to talk about it in terms of a one man show for the sake of a one man show. It was for a diabolical purpose. It was to manage public opinion about the big, bad guys in Ottawa.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as an observer of the Newfoundland scene, quite apart from my partisan position in this House, of which I am very proud, I find it amusing - in other terms I find it very sad - but as an observer of the political scene, I find it amusing that the people who manage so well - and let us give credit where diabolical credit is due, let us give the devil his dues, I chose all my words well - they managed well the myth that Ottawa was big, bad and out to get poor old Newfoundland.

In the process, they got racist. You saw the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) mimicking a Francophone accent. God, if he would only learn the Queen's English, he would have it knocked. We saw the almost racist, the bigoted approach, no holds barred, no principles taken into account.

Here is my point, Mr. Speaker, when I talked about something being amusing: What I find amusing and intriguing as an observer, terribly sad as a taxpayer and a political participant, but as an observer of the scene what I find amusing is the crowd who manipulated so well the public perception then are having a heck of a job doing it now when they are trying to pretend they are defenders of Newfoundland and they are going to fight Ottawa.

Look how they fought on FFTs. Boy, what a fight! What a drag them out fight that was, Mr. Speaker. Was that not a classic? Does that not make Armageddon look like an anticlimax, what they did on FFTs? What a fight! Can you not stand up, Mr. Speaker, and laud them for that marvellous fight they put up on FFT? Yes, Sir. Those people do they fight.

Look at the railway issue now, Mr. Speaker. They are not even going to sell it, they are going to give it away, if you listen to Mr. Mazankowski. I am with the Premier on this, I believe Mazankowski, I know him fairly well and I know him well enough to know that his disclosure to the press yesterday was not accidental. I know him that well. He is a very astute politician and a man of great integrity and what he did yesterday was part of a scheme that was going on over the past few days. Lower the ante. Let us have Mazankowski go out and drop \$1 billion in the press and, in the same mouthful, say that is a bit rich. Lower the ante out there in the public. Lower the expectation.

Then we hear the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) with a planted question from the member of St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) get up and try and point out to the House that we have no constitutional case. When, Mr. Speaker, be it a Liberal Government in Ottawa and Tory down here, or vice versa, or governments of the same stripe in both jurisdictions, when did we ever have a case where a spokesman for one jurisdiction got up and made the case for the other jurisdiction?

Mr. Speaker, as you will know, I have been federal and I have been provincial and the perspective is different. When you put on another hat, the perspective is different because you have a different mandate if you are a federal politician as compared to being a provincial politician. Your constituency in one case is Canada, in the other case it is Newfoundland and certain things that are in the best interest of Canada as a whole may not be the case if you are looking at it totally from the Newfoundland perspective. So I can understand politicians in the separate jurisdictions have separate and quite distinct points of view on particular issues. I can understand Mr. Crosbie, for example, in the present circumstance, seeing the railway from a different perspective than you would see it if you were a minister in this Chamber right now because he sits at a Cabinet table in Ottawa where the poker game, the trade offs in terms of total dollars available to the Province relate in a whole different environment than they would if he were sitting around the Cabinet table here. So I do not scorn those who, by virtue of their elected responsibilities, have different perspectives.

What I do scorn, Mr. Speaker, is the charade that we are seeing on the railway and the charade we are seeing on this so-called Atlantic Accord. Let nobody ever forget that this term, Atlantic Accord, is another bit of Tory packaging. An accord suggests agreement. It does not suggest acquiescence. So when you hear me talk about it I talk about it as the so-called Atlantic Accord so people will know what I am talking about. I am just calling to mind the Tory

label, accord. First, it is an acquiescence, not an accord. Secondly, it is not Atlantic as we know Canada, Atlantic, the term that we use to connote the Atlantic provinces. It has nothing to do with the other Atlantic provinces. Then, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it does. Perhaps, unwittingly, the people who crafted this term put the right name on it, the right adjective on it at least, because this Atlantic Accord provides more for the economic well-being of other parts of Atlantic Canada than it does for Newfoundland. It looks after their refineries before it looks after ours.

I scorn, Mr. Speaker, the charade that is going on with the railway, the ruthless manipulation or orchestration where the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) gets up and puts the Ottawa case in this Chamber. I mean, what utter gall! What a sell out! Even if he believes that case in his heart, which I doubt he does, even if he believed it with everything in him, his mandated responsibilities require that he get up and put the best face on our case and this does not happen because one of us asks a question. This happens because he went to his own friend and said, 'By the way, make sure we raise the question of the constitution so we can drone it into the public mind again that there is not much of a case there. Drone it into the public mind, Mazankowski, that a \$1 billion is rich, too much'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in one respect I say to my colleagues on this side of the House, we have been wrong in this railway issue. We have been saying all along that this crowd wanted to trade it off. We are wrong. They want to give it

away.

DR. COLLINS:

This the wrong bill.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker. I say to the comatose member for St. John's South, it is not the wrong bill. It is the wrong bill, I agree with him on that. It should be a bill that looks after our interests and our refining, our jobs. But I know what he means. I am talking railway and he wants me to talk Atlantic Accord. I am drawing for him a very direct parallel. I am saying it is equally scornful and shameful, whether you look at his administration's handling of the railway issue or his administration's handling of the so-called Atlantic Accord.

I was making the point earlier, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister responsible for Energy had talked about Trudeau and Lalonde and Chretien brutalizing Newfoundland. Well, I put it to him and to his colleagues, if they were brutalizing Newfoundland at that time, if they were bringing Newfoundland to its knees, as he says at that time, why was he out publicly agreeing with them? Why was he saying a couple of years ago they had the basis for a deal?

And I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that had the Premier not intervened at that time, we would have had the deal, Mr. Chretien and the half-time Minister for St. John's East would have signed that deal, if you can take him at his word. Again, I say to you, I am not conveying to the House some private conversation. I am recalling for the House an event that happened on national television, which almost everybody

in this Chamber would have seen, I see by the nods.

But, Mr. Speaker, the minister was instructed by a spiteful confrontationist Premier, a man would rather have a confrontation than have his breakfast, he was instructed, Mr. Speaker, to go back on the deal that he had made with Mr. Chretien, a deal that you would have to assume was acceptable.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chretien (inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, there he is, there he is. Mr. Speaker, you know, the amazing thing is that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) not only heard what I was saying, but he understood it. What he does not understand is that I am responding to comments that his colleague made yesterday about Mr. Chretien, but I am just using the term in -

DR. COLLINS:

Is Mr. Chretien looked upon as the worst Finance Minister that Canada ever had?

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) is looked upon as the worst Finance Minister we ever had anywhere in Canada. That is for sure. Not only that, I can go further than that. He is a bungling and incompetent minister, as he has demonstrated on a number of occasions. But that is another subject.

Mr. Speaker, the member for St. John's East, I thought he would be in by now, but I only have a few more minutes. I would like to say what is on my mind, even in his absence. I wish he were here and

I bided my time for ten or fifteen minutes to get him back in. It is his bill. Another insult to the House, Mr. Speaker. A minister is suppose to be shepherding a bill through the House. He is not here and he is clearly not within hearing range. So, Mr. Speaker, I may be criticized for saying this in his absence, but I shall say it anyway.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, with full vile in control, he challenged the Leader of the Opposition to get up and explain his letter of resignation in which he, the Leader of the Opposition, had said that the Premier's approach would not give Newfoundland enough control.

Now I ask, first of all, where is the sin in saying that? Well, the gentleman for St. John's East, Mr. Speaker, suggest the sin is in that things have turned out differently. Well, that is where he is wrong. That is where he is dead wrong, Mr. Speaker. Again, I do not ask you to believe my words, I have a document here that the member for St. John's East is a party to. This is a press release put out on February 7, 1986 and in that press release, put out jointly by the two governments of Newfoundland and Canada, there is a key sentence in that press release, which I will quote in a minute, which puts the lie completely to what the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is saying. He is alleging that in the letter of resignation the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) had said we would not get enough control.

The fact is the Leader of the Opposition was right and here is what tells him he was right. This press release is over the name of

the member for St. John's East and Ms Carney. The press release says, in part, on page 2 of the press release, "Responsibility for fundamental decisions will rest with the federal government."

Now, if they are making the fundamental decisions, who has control? The federal government, the document says so, not I. The press release from the two governments says that the government in Ottawa is going to make all the decisions. Mr. Speaker, you can have your office where you want, and he made much of the fact that the office would be in St. John's. It goes on to say for the five years but you have already conceded that you have sold out for those five years. You are assuming there is not security of supply. I have taken this statement in context.

The full statement, if the minister wants it, is this, "Responsibility for fundamental decisions will rest with the federal government when Canada has not attained or has lost self-sufficiency or security of supply." That is the full sentence. I left of the last part of the sentence because it balances out with another sell-out in this so-called Atlantic Accord. The sell-out that says for the next five years, we throw up our hands and even if you have security of supply, we are going to ignore it. We are going to assume you do not have security of supply. So for the next five years, Ottawa is going to make all the fundamental decisions. Not if, maybe, perhaps, they are going to make the fundamental decisions, that document says so. The so-called Atlantic Accord says so as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not have a crystal ball and perhaps in six years time we will find three more Hibernias, Ben Nevises and whatever, but is it not reasonable to assume that all the fundamental decisions about Hibernia and about two or three other downstream projects will have been made by then? Is it not fair to assume that all the effective decisions about a gravity base system versus a floating system; all the decisions relating to marketing, to refining; all those fundamental decisions on rates of production, prices; is it not fair to assume that all the effective decisions on those projects will be made, or most of them will be made in the next five years?

So, in effect, Mr. Speaker, the minister for St. John's East in a most despicable fashion - and I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have sat in the Parliament of Ottawa, I have sat here and I have observed, as members did from around the world today, I have observed a few other parliaments in various places and I have never in my life witnessed anything as despicable as that performance yesterday by the member for St. John's East. It was low, it was personal.

I thought the minister would get up, Mr. Speaker, and address himself on the issue but he spent most of his time attacking the Leader of the Opposition, one who was absent, but more to the point, attacking him.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I notice that the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr Tobin) is not here but I

notice that he was thoughtful enough to leave part of his anatomy here. If he is going to speak, Mr. Speaker, he should do it from his own seat.

Mr. Speaker, the minister yesterday made much of the fact that the Yukon and British Columbia and the three parties in Ottawa had all voted for this and where was the Opposition. What was the Opposition going to do? Surely they were not going to vote against the principle of this bill. But what hog wash, Mr. Speaker, does that minister not listen at all? Where was he on February 21 when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), in leading off for the Opposition in this debate, said a couple of very important things relating to what the minister raised yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition said on February 21, "The principle of the Atlantic Accord legislation is that Newfoundland negotiate an offshore petroleum deal with the Government of Canada in order to be able to participate in the management of the offshore resource and to share in the benefits of offshore development. The official Opposition supports that principle and will be voting in favour of it at second reading."

So the minister yesterday was blatantly dishonest, Mr. Speaker, when he wanted to give the impression that somehow we are against having a mechanism to get on with offshore development. That is not what we are against, Mr. Speaker.

We are against the shameful flaws in this documents. We are against the sell out to Mulroney in Ottawa in this document. We have identified a number of specific examples and others of my

colleagues will be enumerating them because I see that my time has nearly run out but I did want to get back for a moment to what the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) was saying yesterday. He was talking about the Leader of the Opposition and would he take him on in debate. I say to him, through Hansard because he is not here, he is out doing his other job I suppose, I say to him, through Hansard and through his members here, that the Leader of the Opposition will be glad any time to take this minister on in a debate about offshore or anything else. Indeed, if he wants to talk to somebody who has been through it, the minister should talk to the Premier who had a debate with the leader during the last provincial election with mixed results from the Premier's standpoint, to put it kindly, mixed results. So if he wants a debate, he can have a debate on this issue anywhere, name the time and the place and the Leader of the Opposition will be there.

What I would like to say to the member for St. John's East, if he were in the Chamber, is be a man, be a man, boy. You blew it on the Atlantic Accord. You blew it because you over played your hand just before the Tories took over and the Federal Tories knew when they took over they had you exactly where they wanted you. They knew that any deal they gave you, however sloppy, however inadequate, you would have to rush out and say it was the best thing since sliced bread, because to do otherwise was to admit that all your procrastination had contributed to your failure. That was the Catch 22 I say to the gentleman from St. John's East that you boxed yourself into, that

was the Catch 22.

You had no choice but swallow hard like you are swallowing hard now on the railway, like you swallowed hard on FFTs, like you will swallow for the three years that Mr. Mulroney has left in Ottawa, if you judge by the latest polls. What was it? Thirty-seven per cent for the great Tory Party, 21 per cent for the NDP Party which is where it has always been and where it always will be until it fades off the map altogether, and 41 per cent for those big bad Liberals that the member for St. John's East keeps talking about, 41 to 37. So in the next three years -

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

The hon. member has about two minutes.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I say to the member for St. John's East face it, be a man about it, you blew it, you botched the chance by over playing your hand to get a good agreement for Newfoundland. We have an agreement. We are delighted about that. We can at least proceed but we should have done it about three or four years ago. The sad truth is that we are proceeding with one hand behind our back because all the fundamental decisions are going to be made in Ottawa.

One final point, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) says, 'The only hon. thing to do is for the Leader of the Opposition to resign'. These words, I say, were music to my ears yesterday. Not because he was asking the leader to resign, but because he acknowledged the

principle of resignation in certain circumstances. He finally knows about that parliamentary tradition which is practiced by men of integrity like Sinclair Stevens, practiced by the minister in B.C. who resigned even though there was no wrongdoing but because of the cloud surrounding his circumstances.

MR. YOUNG:

We all know about your resignation.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in my case, different from the gentleman for Harbour Grace who is not in his place now, I had the courage to resign in certain circumstances. That is why I am asking the gentleman for St. John's East to stop lecturing the member for Mount Scio.

MR. YOUNG:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I had much choice and some day, if you want to talk about that, we will talk about that.

MR. YOUNG:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, boy, here she goes again.

MR. YOUNG:

Here she goes again. Well, I notice (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member will have an opportunity to conclude his remarks.

MR. SIMMONS:

I am just cluing up, I have one more sentence. If the gentleman for St. John's East wants to see parliamentary tradition honoured, he can stop abusing that tradition himself. No man, Mr. Speaker, has his hand in the public till, no man is lining his pockets more at the expense of the public and he stands there and lectures the Leader of the Opposition about resigning on principle! What would he know about principle, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. BAIRD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:

I just heard the hon. member say that the President of the Council was lining his pockets from the public till. I do not think that is acceptable in this House of Assembly. I would ask the member to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I did not catch his exact words. If that is accurate, then I would ask the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage to withdraw the remark.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I was expressing a

well-founded opinion. If it is unparliamentary, I withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:

Well, if you are going to speak, I will speak after you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Normally we go from side to side.

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. PEACH:

No problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAKER:

Were you asleep?

MR. PEACH:

No, Mr. Speaker, I remind the hon. member for Gander that I was not asleep. I was here sitting listening to some of the remarks made by my friend here from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) in his unfounded, incorrect allegations that he made against my good friend, the Minister responsible for this Atlantic Accord. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that history will indicate, as we proceed down the road to economic prosperity, that the member for St. John's East will be probably heralded as one of the great, if not the greatest, ministers that this Province has ever had.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

The Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Speaker, I am sure as all people in this Province know full well, has done an admirable job in the years past and will do in the years ahead in seeing that we, as Newfoundlanders, get our due place in Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, we can always listen to members opposite make some comments on what they would like to have had done two or three years prior to this but I am sure that all of the people of this Province know full well that if we had signed the agreement that the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) just referred to, we would have signed what would have amounted to a Nova Scotia deal. I am sure that is not what the people of this Province wanted.

The members opposite can get up in this House and spiel off every other day that this government has gone to the electorate of the Province on two occasions on an offshore oil agreement or on the development of our offshore and that it has been successful. They are there sitting in their seats today hoping and praying that we will not bring prosperity to this Province. They are hoping that they will have the opportunity to go out into this Province in other elections and say that the Atlantic Accord and this government has been a failure. I am sure, Mr. Speaker that is from their personal, conceited and own ill-conceived ideas that they have. I am sure that they now are being led by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), who was on

this side of the House and could not get an agreement, who left the party - and who left in a manner feeling that he was leaving a sinking ship - but he found out very quickly that that was not so because we went to the people of this Province in April of 1985 and got a mandate, Mr. Speaker, to come back and proceed with the Atlantic Accord in the way that the people of this Province wanted us to.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that in the number of weeks ahead, as has already been indicated by our Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate, that when some good news come forth, as the Premier has indicated, with regard to the Atlantic Accord, I am not sure what will happen to the Leader of the Opposition then. There is not many other places for him to go. I doubt if the member for Menihok (Mr. Fenwick) will take him into his party, it is very unlikely. According to some comments that came out of a meeting with the Fishermen's Union last week in Bay de Verde, according to the comments that was passed along to me by some fishermen from that part of Trinity and Conception Bay, that Mr. Cashin does not have too much time for the Leader of the Opposition or his party either. So I am not sure then, Mr. Speaker, what is going to happen to the now Leader of the Opposition, probably we will find that Mr. Neary will come back to lead the party or I am sure there is some other scenarios around that would cause a great deal of confusion in the party.

MR. SIMMS:

Bring Don back.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PEACH:

Well, we could bring Don back I suppose but -

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to interrupt the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach) and his speech, but I have a question. Mr. Speaker, is this the Atlantic Accord debate or is this a personalities debate by the members opposite? Obviously, the member for Carbonear has to be instructed on what he is suppose to be speaking on.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I hate to get into a family quarrel, you know, the member for Port de Grave quarrelling with his neighbour for Carbonear. I mean, this is a family quarrel and I hate to get into it. But I would like to point out that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) spoke at length on the railway, of all things, rather than on the Atlantic Accord when he was on his feet.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order. Hon. members on both sides of the House have had all kinds of leeway and certainly that

is going to apply throughout this debate.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your usual, well-advised ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I was speaking on the topic that is here, the Atlantic Accord, Bill 59. It is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bill 1.

MR. PEACH:

- to myself as one individual member sitting here, and as well, I am sure very, obvious to the media and to the people of the Province that the type of thoughts and the type of actions that is evident by the party opposite is very noticeable by the absence of the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! We might as well get it on the record again that the Chair made the ruling yesterday in terms of this debate. Hon. members will be heard in silence. That applies to both sides.

MR. PEACH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying, it is very noticeable, Mr. Speaker, that since my good friend and colleague, the member for St. John's East introduced or reintroduced second reading of this bill a day or so ago, the Leader of the Opposition has been absent.

It is probably because of the grueling attack that he had to put up with several days ago by my friend for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). He probably has not

gotten over it since.

However, Mr. Speaker, as it is one o'clock. I have no problem adjourning the debate.

MR. CALLAN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. DOYLE:

He cannot make a point of order from somebody else's seat.

MR. PEACH:

I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker. He is in the wrong seat.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

The Liberal Party (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue stood on a point of order, but he was not in his own place.

MR. MARSHALL:

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, Monday at 3:00 p.m.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday, June 2, at 3:00 p.m.

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Second Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C.	Premier
Hon. Robert J. Aylward	Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development
Hon. Harold Barrett	Development and Tourism
Hon. Ted A. Blanchard	Labour
Hon. Charlie Brett	Social Services
Hon. John Butt	Environment
Dr. The Hon. John F. Collins	Finance
Hon. Ron Dawe	Transportation
Hon. Jerome W. Dinn	Mines and Energy
Hon. Norman E. Doyle	Municipal Affairs
Hon. William Marshall	President of the Council/ Government House Leader/ Minister responsible for Energy, Petroleum Directorate/Nfld. and Labrador Hydro

THE MINISTRY - LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Second Session - Fortieth General Assembly

-2-

Hon. William Matthews	Culture, Recreation and Youth
Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer	Intergovernmental Affairs
Hon. Charlie Power	Career Development and Advanced Studies
Hon. Thomas G. Rideout	Fisheries
Hon. Maxwell J. Russell	Consumer Affairs and Communications
Hon. Len Simms	Forest Resources and Lands
Dr. The Hon. Hugh M. Twomey	Health
Hon. Lynn Verge	Justice
Hon. H. Neil Windsor	President of Treasury Board
Hon. Haig Young	Public Works and Services

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

Second Session - Fortieth General Assembly

Hon. A. Brian Peckford, P.C., Premier

Hon. P.J.McNicholas, Speaker

Leo Barry, Leader of the Opposition

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Aylward, Kevin (Lib)	Stephenville
Aylward, Hon. Robert J. (PC)	Kilbride
Baird, Raymond J. (PC)	Humber West
Baker, Winston (Lib)	Gander
Barrett, Hon. Harold (PC)	St. John's West
Barry, Leo (Lib)	Mount Scio - Bell Island
Blanchard, Hon. Ted. A. (PC)	Bay of Islands
Brett, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Trinity North
Butt, Hon. John (PC)	Conception Bay South
Callan, Wilson (Lib)	Bellevue
Carter, John A. (PC)	St. John's North
Carter, Walter C. (Lib)	Twillingate
Collins, Hon. John F. (PC)	St. John's South
Dawe, Hon. Ron (PC)	St. George's
Decker, Chris (Lib)	Strait of Belle Isle
Dinn, Jerome W. (PC)	Pleasantville
Doyle, Norman E. (PC)	Harbour Main
Efford, John (Lib)	Port de Grave
Fenwick, Peter (NDP)	Menihek
Flight, Graham (Lib)	Windsor-Buchans
Furey, Chuck (Lib)	St. Barbe
Gilbert, Dave (Lib)	Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir
Greening, Glenn C. (PC)	Terra Nova
Hearn, Hon. Loyola (PC)	St. Mary's-The Capes
Hickey, Thomas V. (PC)	St. John's East Extern
Hiscock, R. Eugene (Lib)	Eagle River
Hodder, James E. (PC)	Port au Port
Kelland, Jim (Lib)	Naskaupi
Lush, Tom (Lib)	Bonavista North

MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR
Second Session - Fortieth General Assembly

...2...

<u>Member</u>	<u>District</u>
Marshall, Hon. William (PC)	St. John's East
Matthews, Hon. William (PC)	Grand Bank
McNicholas, Hon. Dr. P.J. (PC)	St. John's Centre
Mitchell, Calvin (PC)	LaPoile
Morgan, James (PC)	Bonavista South
Ottenheimer, Hon. Gerald R. (PC)	Waterford - Kenmount
Patterson, William G. (PC)	Placentia
Peach, Milton (PC)	Carbonear
Peckford, A. Brian, P.C. (PC) (Premier)	Green Bay
Power, Hon. Charlie (PC)	Ferryland
Reid, James G. (PC)	Trinity - Bay de Verde
Rideout, Hon. Thomas G. (PC) ,	Baie Verte - White Bay
Russell, Hon. Maxwell James (PC)	Lewisporte
Simms, Hon. Len (PC)	Grand Falls
Simmons, Hon. Roger P.C. (Lib)	Fortune-Hermitage
Tobin, Glenn (PC)	Burin - Placentia West
Tulk, R. Beaton (Lib)	Fogo
Twomey, Hon. Dr. Hugh Matthew (PC)	Exploits
Verge, Hon. Lynn (PC)	Humber East
Warren, Garfield E. (PC)	Torngat Mountains
Windsor, Hon. H. Neil (PC)	Mount Pearl
Woodford, Rick (PC)	Humber Valley
Young, Hon. Haig (PC)	Harbour Grace