



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 86

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Thursday

20 February 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, arising out of the Ministerial Statement given by the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) yesterday in reference to the statement I made earlier concerning Hydro profits, hydro prices and the cost per barrel of oil, in which he said the statement I had given was inaccurate.

The statement I gave Mr. Speaker, was based on a telephone conversation I had had earlier with the public relations officer at Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, the figures I gave were very accurate; the price of oil was up to thirty-seven dollars a barrel sometime last year and, up to two weeks ago, it was down to twenty-seven dollars a barrel.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is not making a case for a breach of privilege.

MR. EFFORD:
The point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister's statement contradicts what I said. It says right here, and I will read from his statement -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I must rule that the hon. member is not coming to a point of privilege. It may be a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Consumer Affairs stood up and said that I made a statement which was incorrect and I am just trying to clarify the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
I am assuming there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage on a point of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I recall an occasion during this session when my good friend and cousin from Grand Falls took an extended period of time to make his point of privilege.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I rise because I think in the ruling that was just made, my privileges are affected, and the privileges of every member of this House, because that ruling connotes to me that we are not even going to be allowed to make our points of privilege. In private, this morning, I heard the concerns of the gentleman for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). In my view, and I am not the Speaker, he has the basis for a matter of privilege. In my view also, Mr. Speaker, he was not given ample opportunity to state what was the substance of that matter of privilege.

Sure I agree, Mr. Speaker, that in the introductory remarks he cited

some statements which represented a difference of opinion between him and another member of this House, but that was not the substance of the point of privilege he wanted to raise. I submit, Mr. Speaker, he ought to be given an opportunity to make that point of privilege or else there is no point in anybody, on this side certainly, rising on matters of privilege in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
That raises, Mr. Speaker, some very, very current, I am afraid, but very vital questions affecting the integrity of this House and particularly affecting the rights of Your Honour while he is in the Chair, and any of the Deputy Speakers. I will not quote again, because obviously it is well known to the Assembly, the quotation I gave some ten days ago when I gave a quotation as to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and his particular conduct in relation to the Speaker.

No, the fact of the matter is, the Speaker in this House is to be respected. Whoever the Speaker, in any House he is to be fully respected, his office as well as his person, and his ruling is final.

I quote to Your Honour in relation to what the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) has said. What has occurred here is the member for Port de Grave (Mr.

Efford) got up on and made introductory remarks as to a point of privilege he was making. Now, the accepted practice, and the rules of any parliamentary jurisdiction, is that the Speaker then determines whether or not there is a prime facie case. In other words, whether there is any possibility of a breach of privilege from the statements made by the hon. gentleman.

The hon. gentleman got up and he made the basis, the very kernel of what he was alleging was his breach of privilege. Your Honour ruled that it was not a breach of privilege and that should be the end of it. The hon. gentleman for Fortune - Hermitage knows the rules and for him to get up and make statements of the nature that he made, that the Opposition somehow is not being treated properly, is totally inappropriate. If people in this House want to get up on points of privilege, I suggest they quote the established rules that are before us.

I refer to Beauchesne Parliamentary Rules, the Fifth Edition, and on page 25 it says: 'Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made.' Now, that is a claim. I do not dispute the hon. gentleman's right to make a claim, but I will defend forever and a day the right of the Speaker to determine whether or not there has been a valid claim. And it goes on to say, 'Once the claim of a breach of privilege has been made, it is the duty of the Speaker to decide if a prima facie case can be established. The Speaker requires to be satisfied, both that privilege appears to be sufficiently involved to justify him in giving such precedence', over the other business of the

House and so on. It is set forth here on pages 25 and 26, and I do not need to read at length from it. Mr. Speaker, it is crystal clear, it represents the rules not just of this Assembly but every Assembly under British Parliamentary practice.

I regret the type of action and the conduct which ensued leading from the leadership of the Leader of the Opposition last week, and by the Opposition itself. The Leader of the Opposition, for instance, gets up yesterday and talks about the Minister of Finance attacking an officer of the House when, last Friday, in the most base way, he attacked the Speaker and had to be expelled. Mr. Speaker, that has to stop in this House. We have to have respect for the Speaker, understand his role, and all support it so that we can support the Rules of Parliamentary democracy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, we read Beauchesne very well and we understand it very well. And that was the point of my interjection, my point of privilege, that I submit, Mr. Speaker, that my privileges are breached if any member of this House is not given ample opportunity. I am not suggesting a half hour or something, but the gentleman for Port de Grave never really got beyond his second sentence before the Premier

started shouting that it was a difference of opinion and, very shortly after, Mr. Speaker rose and advised my friend for Port de Grave that he had no matter of privilege. I am submitting with respect, Mr. Speaker, that you, Sir, did not have ample opportunity to determine whether he had a matter of privilege or not. That is the issue that I raise, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

That is not the issue at all. The issue is the authority of the Speaker in this Chamber, it is the authority of the Speaker in the Parliamentary system. The hon. gentleman talks about his privileges. I am not talking about my privileges, I am talking about the privileges of this House and the people of the Province of Newfoundland to see that the established rules of parliamentary democracy are adhered to in this Chamber, and that it is absolutely essential to this that Your Honour's authority be respected and that when Your Honour makes a ruling, as he is perfectly entitled to do, other members do not get up on points of order on Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of privilege. I have already ruled on the first point of privilege. The second point of privilege, there is no prima facie case.

MR. EFFORD:

A new point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The point of privilege I was speaking to had to do with the

fact that the reference I made the other day-

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is out of order. That point of privilege has been dealt with and ruled on.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I did say a new point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
Is the hon. member dealing with the point of privilege which has been ruled on?

MR. EFFORD:
A new point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Now, Mr. Speaker, the point of privilege I want to express in very few words, has to do with the fact that the Minister of Consumer Affairs lied to this House in referring to the facts I gave concerning the price of oil and the decrease in the price.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is now dealing with a matter that has already been dealt with, and there was no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I want to rise now on a point of privilege.

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

MR. MARSHALL:
Mr. Speaker, I refer to Beauchesne again. If hon. members would refer to the authorities it says, on page 11, paragraph 17, 'A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament. It should be dealt with by a motion.' It is clearly the right of the Speaker to make decisions of this nature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you have made a ruling and the hon. gentleman has not accepted your ruling. And instead of sitting in the Chair, as all of us have to when Your Honour makes a ruling of the nature that Your Honour makes, he gets up and he persists in it. If that is going to occur, we are not going to have a House of Assembly, we are going to, in effect, have a beer garden here where nobody complies with any rules at all.

And I furthermore draw attention, in the same point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, to the statement made by the hon. gentleman, when he was just on his feet, when he said the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) had lied to this House. Now, I rise on the point of privilege that it is not allowed in the rules of British parliamentary procedure for any member to allege that another member lied, and I suggest that the hon. gentleman be invited to withdraw that allegation so that at least in the Province of Newfoundland, hopefully henceforth, we can comply with the rules of British parliamentary traditions that have been handed down to us for generations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the earlier matter, I believe the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) demonstrated exactly the point I was making in that he was permitted to go on ad nauseam about an unrelated matter yesterday involving the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), and when my colleague wants to make a matter of privilege, he is cut off in midstream. Now, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that he has raised a new matter of privilege, simply because his first matter of privilege never got beyond the first two statements which were ruled as a difference of opinion. His matter of privilege now -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I am speaking to the point -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

I am not allowed to speak now?

MR. SPEAKER:

Not when I stand up. I have already dealt with the second matter of privilege.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the matter of privilege raised by the hon. gentleman for St. John's East in which he points out that my colleague for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) had used the term 'lied'. That has not been ruled on. That has not been ruled on! I am speaking to the matter raised by the member for St. John's East, on his allegation that my friend for Port de Grave had used the term

'lied'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the substance of the second matter of privilege that my colleague from Port de Grave was going to raise. He was prepared to provide the Chair with a document which clearly shows that the gentleman from Lewisporte (Mr. Russell) lied, because the document has in it two statements which are mutually exclusive. Both of them cannot be true, so one of them has to be a lie because they directly contradict each other. That was the point my friend for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) was going to make and was not allowed to make it. I submit to you, Sir, that, if you had allowed him to exercise his privileges in this House, you would indeed see what he has seen and what I see, that the gentleman for Lewisporte has indeed lied, maybe unwittingly, but lied to the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, we have become used in this House, as were the people, when he was in the House of Commons, from St. John's to Vancouver, to the convoluted logic of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman is not getting away with the statements that he has made, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour is the Speaker in this House and is entitled to the respect that is due to a Speaker of this House. It is not within the province of any member of this House to get up and indicate that you are favouring one side over the other, and the hon. gentleman has given that indication. It is not for the hon. gentleman to get up and say that an hon. member of this House has lied. It is perfectly

acceptable for any hon. member of this House to get up and say that the hon. gentleman was mistaken or he said something that he should not have said, even though every word emitted from the hon. gentleman's mouth yesterday was completely correct, sufficient and adequate, and would bear the test of time. That is a different thing altogether than getting up in this House and attacking Your Honour. That is what the hon. gentlemen are doing, under the leadership of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and the twisted, convoluted logic of the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). Mr. Speaker, they are attacking the institutions of this Assembly, and as long as we are the government, we are not going to put up with that, whether it is under the guise of jealousy of the Leader of the Opposition, the convoluted logic of the member for Fortune-Hermitage, or the inanities of the member for Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. TOBIN:

Now we are going to hear it.

MR. PATTERSON:

Now, Leo McCarthy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to that matter of privilege. I think the example of the couple of quick comments since I rose on my feet may give some indication of who and which side of the House has

been engaging in personal attack, which side of the House has been subverting the rules, misusing the rules to enter into personal abuse, to carry on a debate, Mr. Speaker, under the guise of debating a very important piece of legislation, to launch out and attack the integrity of every member on this side of the House. That is, Mr. Speaker, what the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and his cohorts in crime have been leading this House into. That, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why things are not being done productively in this House, because the Government House Leader, aided and abetted by the Premier and his colleagues, have decided that they are going to set out to attack the integrity of anybody who dares to differ with them in the course of debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Anybody who has a concern to raise with respect to a piece of legislation affecting the interests of the people of this Province is a traitor, Mr. Speaker, if they do not act like slavish dogs to the partisan rhetoric that is spewed forth daily. The root cause of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that we have had the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell), for a number of days now, getting up and feeding to the people of this Province, through this House -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think the hon. member is getting away from the point of privilege at the present time.

MR. BARRY:

Okay, Mr. Speaker. If we have a minister who is supposed to be protecting the consumer launch, several days in a row, Mr. Speaker, into an explanation of why the consumer must continue to be shafted, and if the spokesperson for Consumer Affairs tries to get answers and is shouted down by the bully-boys opposite, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that in the heat of debate there would be things said? Is it any wonder, when members are sitting and listening to the poison spewn out from members opposite, that in the heat of debate, Mr. Speaker, particularly when the consumer is being betrayed by the minister supposed to protect them, things might be said that would not otherwise be said?

Now, let us get down to the business of this House before the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), and the Premier, 'picks up tail and runs' because they cannot stand the heat, having called the House back in special session. Let us get down to the business today. There are questions to be asked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would like to point out that no hon. member is allowed to call another person a liar or to say that he has lied. I did not hear that term. I will check in Hansard later this evening.

To the point of privilege, I will rule on that matter tomorrow.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:
I just want to rise, and I do not want to prolong this, to say, in relation to what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said on the point of privilege, you cannot attack what does not exist. What I am concerned about is the integrity of Your Honour, the integrity of all hon. members of this House, and their right to be able to speak on behalf of their constituents without being branded as being liars, and the right of Your Honour to be able to maintain order in this House in the same way as any Speaker in any British Parliament without being attacked in the partisan way the hon. gentleman did opposite, and indicated that Your Honour was partial. So I would ask Your Honour to take these comments into consideration when Your Honour makes the ruling.

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

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

MR. BARRY:
We once again, Mr. Speaker, see the statesmanlike Government House Leader get up and infer in a sneaky, low-down fashion that members on this side of the House do not have integrity.

That was the statement he made because we dare, Mr. Speaker, say that we should not slavishly follow the inflamed rhetoric of members opposite.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You are calling somebody a liar and that is unparliamentary.

MR. BARRY:

That is not what the Government House (Mr. Marshall) was talking about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder that there is a problem in keeping order in the House when the Government House Leader, after the matter has been dealt with by Your Honour, feels that he has to get up and once more make the point to attack the integrity of members on this side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader is in his declining political days, as are most members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

They are on their way out and make no wonder.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:

Did you have your needle today, 'Leo'?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

At this stage I would like to welcome to the Visitors' Gallery

100 students from St. George's High School, New Harbour, with their principal, Morely Reid, and teachers, Boyd Badcock, Bill Clarke, and Ann McDougall and Leon Cooper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, now that we have dealt with the immaturity of the other side, I would like to advise the hon. House and the consumers of this Province, if they are not already aware, that ESSO Resources have decreased by one cent per litre the price of gasoline, residential heating oil and stove oil, as of midnight last night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Again, Mr. Speaker, I could not hear. Could I ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs to repeat the amount of the decrease, because I could not hear him?

Mr. Speaker, I think the reference was to a decrease of one cent a litre in the price of gasoline and

home heating oil, which works out to about four and a half cents a gallon. Consideration the fact that the reduction in the price of oil is just less than \$15 a barrel now on the world market, we only gain one cent a litre.

If I were the Minister of Consumer Affairs, I would be ashamed to stand on my feet and announce that I am only going to pass on to consumers a saving of one cent a litre. This is the reason, Mr. Speaker, we have the problem we have here today, this is the reason the people of this Province are suffering, this is the reason I struck a sour note when I spoke about the hydro prices, and this is the reason they keep interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I would like to rule now on the point of privilege raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. It was raised in connection with the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in connection with the Report of the Auditor General. I must rule that there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege.

I would like to draw hon. members' attention to Page 114 of the Fifth Edition of Beauchesne on Protected Persons. That is paragraph 321, sub-section (3) and I would like to quote it: "The Speaker has traditionally protected from attack a group of individuals

commonly referred to as 'those of high official station'. The extent of this group has never been defined. Over the years it has covered senior public servants, ranking officers of the armed services, the United Kingdom High Commissioner in Canada, a Minister of the Crown who was not a member of the House, and the Prime Minister before he won a seat in the House." I would include the Auditor General in that group.

Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Finance would like to clarify that he was not attacking the Auditor General.

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad you have invited me to do that, because I did not attack the Auditor General. I would like to perhaps draw the Leader of the Opposition's mind to the following point, because I think the Leader of the Opposition was the first one who brought up the question of attack. We all know that people do wrong things, say, in civil law, and they are charged by the police. Now, the police are not attacking these people, they are bringing a charge. Yesterday, in my statement, I said, "I charge the Auditor General with putting into his report falsehoods." That is not an attack on the Auditor General any more than a policeman who will take someone to court is attacking someone because they charge him with breach of the law.

It is my duty as Minister of Finance, a portfolio I hold at the request of the Premier, to take care of the financial affairs of this Province on behalf of government, and to protect the

financial integrity of this Province. It is my duty to prevent any falsehoods said, written, reported, indicated about the financial integrity of the official statements of this Province. I will continue to do that until I am relieved of my post, and I would say that I will never be relieved of my post for doing that in this administration and under this Premier.

Anyone who purports to call into question the integrity of the official statements coming from this government in regard to its financial affairs, I will charge them with falsehoods unless they can prove their allegations. I charge that the Auditor General did not prove his allegations when he said that the public accounts contained falsehoods. I reject that allegation. I charge him that he made wrong statements. It is not an attack on the individual, on his office, I charge him as a policeman would charge anyone who broke the law, for doing something they should not have done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Finance, on the precedent that was clearly set, reconfirmed by the Government House Leader a few moments ago, that members on this side are not allowed to say that the Minister of Consumer Affairs

was engaging in falsehoods -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Lies. Lies.

MR. BARRY:

What is a falsehood?

MR. PATTERSON:

Splitting hairs.

MR. BARRY:

"The Minister of Consumer Affairs engages in falsehoods with respect to the consumer," says the member for Port de Grave and the Government House Leader stands up and says, "He must be forced to retract that." The Minister of Finance gets up and says that the Auditor General has engaged in falsehoods. Mr. Speaker, if there is to be fairness in treatment, if Your Honour has to protect officers of this House, they are afforded the same protection as members of this House, that is they are protected from being charged with the sorts of things that the Government House Leader says we are not allowed to charge the Minister of Consumer Affairs with.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you this, the allegation applies much more to the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) than it does to the Auditor General. I would ask Your Honour to have the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) instructed to withdraw those remarks.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

There is a marked difference between what the hon. gentleman did, calling the Minister of Consumer Affairs a liar, and what the hon. gentleman has done. He has merely said that in executing his functions, what the Auditor General did was false; he put a false statement; in the execution of his functions he was incorrect; he was false in his statements and what have you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has already said with respect to officers of the House. He has brought before this House the fact that the other officer of the House, the Comptroller General of this Province, says it is false and that the financial agents of the Province said it is false. The Minister of Finance, let there be no doubt, Mr. Speaker, speaks not just as the Minister of Finance, but the Government of this Province. We are delighted we have a Minister of Finance who will stand up and defend the financial integrity of this Province, and the people of Newfoundland, when a blatantly incorrect statement is made by the Auditor General. So I think we are very fortunate we have a Minister of Finance who will make those statements and draw it to attention.

Now, the fact of the matter is, what the hon. gentleman has said, with which we all agree, with which the Comptroller of the Treasury agrees, with which the financial experts, McLeod, Young, and Weir agree, is that the hon. gentleman made a false statement. It is regrettable. He is a servant of this House but, as a servant of this House, in making these false statements he affects the financial integrity of this

Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

And who should defend this but the Minister of Finance? I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, as we are in this administration, that we have a Minister of Finance who will defend the financial integrity of this Province, of the government and the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I am ready to rule on that point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Could I just refer Your Honour to Hansard for a moment, just briefly? I will not belabour it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Just a brief comment.

MR. BARRY:

Yesterday the Minister of Finance in his reference to the Auditor General said, 'This Province is not going to be besmirched by anyone. Servant of this House, non-servant of this House, member of this House, non-member of this House. This Province is not going to be besmirched with false facts as long as I have any responsibility.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Now today, Mr. Speaker, the minister, I submit, goes even further. He says that the Auditor General has engaged in falsehoods. Now, that is to say that the Auditor General is

lying. If there was any question, Mr. Speaker, of this being done innocently, we just have to refer back to the minister's comments yesterday where he talks about besmirching. One does not besmirch innocently, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

As the Government House Leader (Mr Marshall) has already pointed out, we are talking about the Auditor General in the execution of his work and responsibilities in the office of Auditor General of this Province. We are saying, and we are saying it loudly and clearly for all to hear, not only inside this House but outside this House, that we believe in the execution of his duties the statements he has made in his report to this House are inaccurate. That has been confirmed by the Comptroller General, by McLeod, Young, Weir, Dominion Ames, Merrill Lynch and other world-renowned fiscal experts on whom we depend, and many other governments depend. That is what we are saying, 'in the execution of his duties.' That is a lot different, Mr. Speaker, than the hon. member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) getting up and calling the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) a liar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

One final submission, the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

To the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition before you make a ruling, Mr. Speaker. The term in yesterday's Hansard is very telling, 'besmirch.' That has to connote some deliberateness, it has to carry with it the suggestion that someone set out to do something rather deliberately, and that is very different than submitting that something was innocently done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my second point is this: This House has a mechanism by which we scrutinize on a routine basis, on an ongoing basis under the rules of this House, the findings of the Auditor General. The mechanism is called the Public Accounts Committee. In that particular Committee, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), officials of his department and other agencies answering to him and, indeed, all other ministers of the ministry, have full opportunity to make their submissions after which a Committee appointed by this House, under the Chairmanship of my friend and seatmate for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), makes its determinations on the findings of the Auditor General and then reports to this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since that process is in place and the minister knows it is in place, the interesting question arises, why did he try and circumvent the process? If you couple that question with the term "besmirched" in yesterday's Hansard, you will get the answer. This had nothing to do with responding to the substance of the Auditor General's remarks, this had to do with besmirching the Auditor General, this had to do with undermining his responsibilities. I say to the

Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) if he lacks confidence in the Auditor General, he ought to have the courage to do by the front door what he is trying to do by the backdoor, and that is undermine the integrity of the Auditor General.

MR. MARSHALL:

I just want to say this government not for one month, not for one week, not for one day, not for one hour, not for one minute is going to allow statements like that to stand on the record. When we have to go and deal with the financial markets of this world, we are not going to wait for the Public Accounts Committee to deal with a statement that is so palpably against the interests of the people of this Province, as verified by the Comptroller General verified by our financial experts.

We will defend this Province against all attacks just as we will defend it, Mr. Speaker, against people who walk away from us and dig the knife into the people of Newfoundland when we are trying to negotiate an agreement on the offshore, and we will defend it against people who sat in a caucus up in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, and supported the people who tried to shove that agreement down our throats.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there seems to be confusion about falsehood and statements. If somebody makes a statement and somebody disagrees with it, somebody is obviously wrong. The point I brought up earlier, and that was referred to, was about

lying to the House. That is not a parliamentary term to use, and it is one I am looking into and will report on tomorrow.

There is no point of order.

Oral Questions

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to address a question to the Premier. We are well into the Atlantic Accord debate and I hope to have a chance later today or tomorrow to make a few comments on this. Mr. Speaker, every day we see the price of oil dropping and we know it is the price that will prevail in the 1990's that will determine the viability of Hibernia.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You have learned that much now, have you?

MR. BARRY:

As a matter of fact, I do believe I had a few comments to say on this before some members opposite were in the House.

I would like to ask the Premier, would he tell the people of this Province what is the base price at which the Hibernia development would be viable?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very

difficult question to put an exact number on. It will depend, in large measure, on the kind of development, industrial benefit opportunities or industrial benefits that are attached to the development itself, for example, where a lot of the platform is going to be built. So it is a difficult question to give a direct answer to. Under one scenario it might be twenty-one dollars a barrel, under another scenario it might be eighteen dollars a barrel, and under another scenario it might be fifteen dollars a barrel. It will depend upon the federal government's approach to the fiscal regime, it will depend upon our approach to the fiscal regime, it will depend upon the companies' approach to the fiscal regime.

You just cannot say a fish plant in one cove is going to be viable. It depends on how large that fish plant is, how much fish it has coming into it, and how many people they are going to have employed. There are many factors which go in to make up when an oil field becomes viable or non-viable, and it has to do with the fiscal regime and the industrial package, as well as other technical matters.

We are presently engaged in negotiations on all three of those areas, on the fiscal regime, on the industrial benefits package and on the technical operation of the development. Therefore, I cannot give a direct answer to the Leader of the Opposition on that question because there are numerous variables which will go into the whole formula which will help determine at what price that is a viable operation for Newfoundland and Labrador. The Leader of the Opposition knows

that. He knows you just cannot say it is twenty-five dollars or twenty dollars or fifteen dollars, because there are a range of variables in there, fiscal regime/federal government, fiscal regime/Province; industrial benefits, where are they more expensive, least expensive, to build this or to build that part of the platform, because some of those components in the platform are \$300 or \$400 million and that would materially affect, therefore, at what point the price of oil becomes operative.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:
This one will come back to haunt the Premier. I have never heard such utter garbage in my life. Mr. Speaker, I just sent him the little one-page, quick calculation I did today before coming up to the House. I would like to ask the Premier whether he would confirm that if we assume 150,000 barrels a day, which would amount to 54,750,000 barrels a year, and if we accept that Mobil's capital costs for a floating platform, as stated in the Environment Impact Statement, is \$4,770 billion for a fixed platform, amortize that over ten years, which is all the field will be if it is producing at 54 million a year - if the recoverable reserves are 600 million, it would be just over ten years - amortize that and without counting anything for interest during construction, interest on debt during the project-

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:

Mr. Speaker, I hate to interfere with the happiness of the hon. gentleman, or the obvious smile of deep satisfaction on his face when he constructs the scenario that Hibernia will not come about, nor North Ben Nevis. I hate to interfere with his great delight that he obviously feels but, he is on a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to you that he get to his supplementary question instead of getting on the way he is. As I say, I hate to interfere with his great feeling of enjoyment over the situation he is trying to construct.

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

The Hibernia development will go ahead. It will go ahead when we form the government, after the next election.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If you can dream and not make dreams your master, / If you can think and not make thoughts your aim, / the Leader of the Opposition might get somewhere in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, in response to his question-

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have not finished my question, Mr. Speaker. If Your Honour would deal with the point of order and then give me the opportunity to finish my question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition was making a fairly long statement, so maybe he would ask his question.

MR. BARRY:

I was just getting along to that. It is hard, Mr. Speaker, when you are dealing with numbers. But, Mr. Speaker, I have distributed a copy of this calculation which I will be happy to show Your Honour. My question to the Premier is, if Mobil has to recover a minimum of \$477 billion a year before interest to pay off a fixed platform, and if their operating costs annually is-

PREMIER PECKFORD:

If!

MR. BARRY:

Well, that is what they say in their Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Speaker, if their annual operating cost is \$465 million, and if Mobil is not engaging in falsehoods, Mr. Speaker, if, in other words, the total capital and operating cost before interest, before taxes, before royalties, before profits is \$942 million a year and you divide that by 54 million barrels, approximately, of oil a year, will the Premier not agree that at least seventeen dollars a barrel oil will be needed before profit,

before taxes, before royalties, before interest, and totally regarding all that irrelevant nonsense that the Premier went on about a minute ago?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that the great expert over there, the traitor who had to leave, in 1981 -

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
I ask the Premier to withdraw that. I will say to the Premier that my contribution to this Province is going to stand the test of time a lot better than his.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the word "traitor", I will just call him a person who ran away from the pressure.

In 1981, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT:
You are hurting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I want to answer the Leader of the Opposition's question.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
- he was asked the question as Minister of Energy, before he ran away, how much will it cost to develop Hibernia? What price would you need for the price of oil? "Well, Mr. Speaker, unlike previous Liberal Administrations which were able, such as in the case of the old slogans, 'One mil power for Newfoundland at one mil, unlimited supplies of power at one mil,' unlike these slogans which were drawn out of the air by some form of sorcery, because it is so difficult to predict, this government believes, Mr. Speaker, in establishing prices when all the information is in and then there will be a development plan, and an approval process, Mr. Speaker, whereby the public of this Province, and the people of Newfoundland will have an input into the type of development. Once it is known how the development will take place it will then be possible to put a trace on it, or a cost on the development."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are in negotiations.

MR. BARRY:
Exactly! Exactly!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
May I finish? Just one second.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
I am used to your temper tantrums. I saw a lot of them in Cabinet, and I do not want to see

them anymore, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am not interested in temper tantrums. I am interested in giving the Leader of the Opposition the answer and this is the answer, Mr. Speaker: When we know how the whole development is going to be carried out, therefore we will know the cost. When we know exactly how much the federal government is going to exact in taxes from the development, then we will know the cost. I only quote the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Minister of Energy, to show just exactly the kinds of ways that he wishes to flip flop on this matter. 'If', 'if', 'if', Mr. Speaker, you know, 'if'. If we had ten oil fields going today we would be more prosperous than we are now - 'if'. And I am not interested in dealing with ifs, besides which, of course, hypothetical questions are not supposed to be posed in the Question Period, anyway.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Premier might indicate how it is that Mr. Hopper of Petro-Canada seems to know what the base price is, and how is it that, having received the development plan, Mr. Speaker, and having stated that we are going to get fixed platforms, the

Premier is now saying he does not know how the development is going to proceed, having promised thousands of jobs.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. the member please pose his question.

MR. BARRY:

Having received, Mr. Speaker, the cost information contained in the Mobil report, will the Premier indicate to us why is it he is so abysmally informed when compared to other people who have the same information that the Premier has but who apparently are able to read so much better and understand so much better than the Premier? Give the base price. Stop hedging.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I mean, the man can go on all Question Period just to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, what I have asked the Premier to say is before royalties, before profits, before taxes, what is the base price needed to cover the cost of the fixed platform and the annual operating costs. Answer it!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You cannot answer the question, Mr. Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition knows you cannot until you know how much is going to be extracted from royalties under the federal system, how much is going to be extracted from royalties under the provincial system, and

how and where the development of the platform is going to take place.

You see, the Leader of the Opposition is being like somebody in Junior Red Cross. Of the total development, all we know now is that the concrete legs are going to be built in Newfoundland. Now we have to decide what the cost of the topside is going to be, or the cellar deck. What is the cost of the cellar deck? Estimate, \$500 - \$600 million, \$700 - \$800 million, \$900 million - \$1 billion? That has got to go on top of the legs. That is factor number one.

Variable number two is, what is going to be the taxation regime under federal jurisdiction that is going to apply? Variable number three, what is the taxation system under the provincial jurisdiction that is going to apply? These are the three factors which are still unknown, which are being developed to be a part of the development plan. And until that whole development plan is known, not one part of it but all parts of it, then it is impossible to determine at what price the development will be viable or non-viable. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the students here in the galleries can understand that. Do they give an answer to a mathematical problem when there are four parts to it and they only know one? Can they give a full answer based on one quarter of the problem? Of course not. You need to have all the factors that go in to make up the development plan. We only know part of them. The rest are now being negotiated. When they are finished being negotiated, then we can tell the Leader of the Opposition, who ran away, just what he ran away from, which will be a development while this

government is in power. I know the Leader of the Opposition is embarrassed every day to realize that he made a fatal mistake in his career.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) but, in his absence, I will ask it of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). It pertains to the FPI plant in South Dildo. That plant, as I indicated to Captain Morrissey Johnson in a Telex of three weeks ago, has operated for two and three weeks for the past five years, when it was owned by the Nickerson's. Then, of course, it was taken over by FPI.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that some additional Northern cod has been obtained for fish plants in Harbour Grace and other areas, and the minister is quite familiar with this, because he and I and representatives from that area of the Province met in the Collective Bargaining Room last Spring, along with the provincial Minister of Fisheries, and we talked about the possibility of bringing some Northern cod into this plant so that it will not just be open for two or three weeks to process caplin, let me ask the Minister of Finance what is the intention of FPI toward this plant? Is it their intention to just leave it open for a couple of weeks again this year, to make some quick bucks for FPI processing caplin?

Or is the intent to keep it open for longer periods of time, year-around if possible, so that the people in that area do not have to trust to make-work programmes, UIC and the like, but will get some productive employment? Would the minister answer that?

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member brings up an issue of great importance to the people in that area. The people in that area are having tremendous difficulties in earning their livelihood. They are hard-working people, they have been depend on the fishery for many, many years, and they have a real problem on their hands. The resource has disappeared from their inshore area, and they are presented with a tremendous problem.

Now, at one time they had some relief from the seal fishery. Unfortunately, certain kooks in our world have taken the bread out of their mouths by convincing gullible people that the seal fishery should go down the tube. I mean, it is a tremendous shame, and the people who do that sort of thing do great harm to people. They only look at the causes they espouse, they do not look at the consequences, the consequences that flow from their actions.

So I am just saying that these people out there have a real problem. FPI are aware of their problem. They, themselves, have to work within restrictions of the allocations given to them by the

federal government, and they have to make sure that their operations are financially viable. Otherwise, the company, itself, will not survive and there will be tremendous problems for the work force of this Province if FPI does not survive.

So they are aware of the problem. They have certain constraints within which they have to operate. But I can assure the hon. member that we will once again, as we have done before, and the hon. member knows this, bring to FPI and all those involved - and I am sure the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) will be able to expound on this in greater detail when he comes back - the plight of those worthy people in that area, and try to get as much done as possible.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In view of the fact that the last provincial election was called to give the Premier a mandate to create jobs and that mandate was given, the people are now waiting for the beef. In view of these undeniable and incontestable facts, would the Premier tell the people of this Province what is the specific rate of unemployment to which he and his government are committed? Because the Premier must know that if there are no goals, if there are no objectives, there is going to be no progress and no action.

So could the Premier tell this House and, by so doing, tell the

people of this Province, then, what is the specific rate of unemployment to which he and his government are committed, and what is the time frame that they have set out to establish this specific rate of unemployment for the people of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I thank the hon. member for his question, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, as I informed the House just the other day, the unemployment rate in January, 1986 is down almost 5 per cent from where it was in January, 1985, and unemployment amongst the youth, from eighteen to twenty-four, is down 6.4 per cent from January 1985 to January 1986.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So the unemployment rate is now, even in the middle of Winter, when we have most unemployment in the Province, going down. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, those two statistics are the best for any province in Canada in January, 1986. No other province had a reduction of 5 per cent in unemployment from January to January.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No other province in Canada had a reduction in youth unemployment by over 6 per cent from January to January, Mr. Speaker, just to look at the immediate. Obviously, as the member for Bonavista North knows, just about all governments in the world, both those in the

Western industrialized countries as well as those, I guess, in the Socialist or Communist countries, have as their goal zero unemployment. Our goal is to work on behalf of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador until every single citizen has a job. That is our goal, Mr. Speaker. Now we are trying to work towards that.

We have taken an offshore fishery which saw Fishery Products Limited bankrupt, the Lake Company bankrupt, Nickerson's in Newfoundland bankrupt and Penny's, as well, and put them into a structure, Mr. Speaker, which everybody said two years ago would never work, and this year we will see that new company making a profit. So we have already, in the fishery, taken significant moves to turn that industry around. There are still as many people working, or more, in the Burin Plant today. Where they said there could be no secondary-processing, we now have them working two shifts, supplying fish to the marketplace. So, in the offshore fishery, we have taken that kind of action.

MR. FLIGHT:

Order, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am giving an answer to the hon. member's question. Now, how are we going to reach that? In the inshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, we announced, just the other day, a mid-water fleet to help catch the fish we have not been catching so that we can therefore give more jobs to the land-based fish plant workers, and catch the quotas we have not caught so that Quebec and the Maritime Provinces do not get the fish that we do not catch. We have to catch it. So we are doing

that.

We have turned around Corner Brook, Mr. Speaker. We are turning around St. Lawrence. We have kept Baie Verte going. We will, quite likely, this year be opening a new gold mine on the Southwest Coast. And we will, Mr. Speaker, besides all that, with a tourism agreement, and an Ocean Industries agreement, and a rural development agreement, be getting the offshore going and providing construction jobs to the people of this Province. That is the way we are going to do it.

We will not sell it away like the Liberals did and like the Leader of the Opposition said the Liberals did. We will not sell it away, we will develop it for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. And if you want a symbol for that, Mr. Speaker, look at St. Lawrence and you will see what happened in the mine there. When the Liberals developed St. Lawrence, they let the ore go to Quebec to be processed. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a mine in St. Lawrence and the ore will be milled in Newfoundland. That is what we are going to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, a very short point of order. I wonder if the Premier is aware that he is driving the young people out of the gallery the same way he is driving young people out of Newfoundland?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

In the last election we got more votes from the young people of this Province than any other political party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order, the hon. member for Bonavista-North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, in view of all the prattling done by the Premier, I am sure people would not believe that our unemployment rate was somewhere around 19 per cent. In view of the statements made by the Premier and his plan to create all the jobs he is talking about, jobs for the 80,000 people unemployed in this Province, I wonder how does the Premier reconcile his own position, his stated position with creating jobs, with that made by the Conference Board of Canada today, I think, when they predicted a pretty dismal and abysmal economic growth in this Province over the year 1986, and points out that the Hibernia development, itself, will do practically nothing with respect to making a dent in the economic and employment growth of this Province? How does the Premier reconcile his position with that statement made by the Conference Board of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I rationalize it this way, Mr. Speaker: Very simply, the Conference Board of Canada, like a lot of other National Boards of Canada which have predicted doom and gloom for Newfoundland and for the rest of Canada, have been wrong before and they will be wrong again this time. This past year we have had a growth of 3 per cent in our economy, which was not predicted by a lot of national institutions who were doing research on Newfoundland. We do not take our marching orders from the Conference Board of Canada, the Economic Council of Canada, or anybody else.

Also, in their report they did go on to indicate that there would be gradual improvement in the economy of Newfoundland. Even they, who have been wrong so often, had to admit that. We will not take our marching orders from the Conference Board of Canada, we will take our marching orders from our own policies and programmes. And we are not going to be put down by the Conference Board of Canada. I would like the Conference Board of Canada, for example, and some others, to look at the fishery in Newfoundland and where it is going to be in the next five years. I do not think they give enough credit to what is going to happen in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, or in some of our other resource sectors.

Let the facts speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker, and we will see, over the next few years, just how accurate the Conference Board of Canada is in its predictions on the Newfoundland economy. We do not happen to agree with the Conference Board of Canada. We say it clearly and unmistakably, they have been wrong before and they do not do the kind

of intensive study on the economic situation in Newfoundland, compared to that in Ontario and Quebec, and, therefore, we do not put too much credence in it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. MARSHALL:

A very brief point of order and I make this in the interest of order and decorum in the House. The hon. Premier is giving his answer and there is an hon. gentleman not sitting in his seat - I am not sure it is the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) or Buchans-Windsor, he does not know which area he is supporting - constantly interjecting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

Oh, yes!.

MR. MARSHALL:

There you go, you see, constantly interjecting and the hon. Premier nor anybody else can be heard over his interruptions. And he should not be speaking from another member's seat, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. The point is well taken, but I would like to point out to the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) that when he was making his point of order, interruption was exclusively from the left side of the House.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

A further question to the Premier. It would appear now, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is saying there are falsehoods in the Conference Board of Canada Report, as well. It would appear that is what he is saying. Well, Mr. Speaker, 1985 was not the first time the Premier promised jobs. On June 6, 1979 he promised to create 40,500 jobs. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would indicate whether his administration has created any jobs at all, whether they have created any jobs in the past four or five years? If so, how many? If not, why not?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in the last four months we have created 8,056 jobs, for the hon. member's information, 8,056.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And, Mr. Speaker, we would have created tens of thousands more jobs from 1979 to 1982 if the hon. member's cohorts in Ottawa did not want to take the offshore and put it into Ontario and Quebec. Those are the people who stopped us. That is why we were re-elected in 1982, that is why we were re-elected in 1985, because the people of Newfoundland knew it was not our fault.

MR. FLIGHT:

What has Mulroney been doing for you lately?

MR. SIMMONS:

He took the offshore back.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The hon. member over there, the ten-day wonder from Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), has the gall to sit in his place and talk about Mr. Mulroney, when he was in the Cabinet of Canada and he supported them taking everything away from Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And the rest of them cowed down and supported, 'do not allow Newfoundland the tax on the offshore, do not allow Newfoundland joint management.' That is the reason, because we were sabotaged by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Liberal Party of Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. LUSH:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have here a news clipping from The Financial Post which I will table for hon. members, Mr. Speaker, and this item is dated February 15, 1986, a current issue. It says that at that time of publication the Province of Newfoundland, from 1982 to 1985, that is the time the present Leader of the Opposition resigned his position, in that time period the Province of Newfoundland had a one per cent job loss, not a job gain. At that

period, the Province of Newfoundland had a one per cent job loss whilst the national average was a six per cent job gain. Now, how does the Premier reconcile that with his Job Creation Programme? From 1981 to 1985, a time, Mr. Speaker, when the Premier was fully in control of this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker, when you are sabotaged by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Liberal Party of Canada, what more can you expect? When you have people who are supposed to be defending Newfoundland who sell out Newfoundland every day of the week, that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have not created the jobs we wanted to. Now, I know they do not want to listen to the answer, but that is the reason and you are going to have to live with that legacy when we start creating jobs so that we can show the sabotage no longer works. Too, too bad!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
When? When? When?

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

MR. SPEAKER:
On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago the Premier got through stating that they created 6000 or 8000 jobs in the last four months. Mr. Speaker, is that a

falsehood or is The Financial Post also engaging in falsehoods, along with the Conference Board of Canada and along with the Auditor General? Is everybody in the world sending out falsehoods except the Premier? Where are they?

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

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier, to that point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
As I understand it, it was the dates from 1981 to 1984 in The Financial Post

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
1985! 1985!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Well, okay, 1985. I can just tell the Leader of the Opposition that it is a fact that 8,056 jobs were created in the last four months, in Newfoundland. The Leader of the Opposition can draw his own conclusions, but there were 8,056 jobs created. And I do not take my guidance from what The Financial Post says, I know there were 8,000 jobs created. We know that to be a fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Can I answer without being interrupted? I know I am hurting them.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The Premier is speaking to a point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, lets deal with the point of order, so I can get on to the answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

I must rule that there is no point of order. The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the report of the Livestock Owners Compensation Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present an answer to a question from the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) which appeared as Question No. 39, December 5, 1985.

Petitions

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a petition from seventy-five signatories from the community of Churchill Falls in Naskaupi district. I will read the prayer of the petition to the hon. House of Assembly.

"The petition of the undersigned, being residents of Churchill Falls, Labrador, humbly sheweth: That a new hunting zone be proposed for the Northern Caribou Hunting Zone; that this zone would drastically cut down the congestion of hunters in the McPhadyen area; that such a zone would reduce the chances of having a serious hunting accident and the number of hunters having to contend with railway crossings etc.; that the Northern caribou herd at this time extends from the McPhadyen area to Orma and Sail Lakes; and that this new proposed hunting zone does not take in any moose hunting areas and it will not come close to the Lake Joseph herd.

"Your petitioners request that all these points be taken into consideration and the existing boundaries extended to take in the areas as outlined on the attached map. Your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray."

That is the petition, Mr. Speaker. I will speak in support of it for a few minutes. As was mentioned in the prayer of the petition, there is an attached map

which outlines the proposed new hunting zone, and, in this context, new means expanded, as opposed to an entirely new zone. The map will designate exactly what the co-ordinators are for the suggested zone.

With respect to the congestion in the McPhadyen area, it has been described to me by the hunters from the Churchill Falls area that when you have perhaps eighty or ninety hunters in a small section of the zone, the incidents of hunting accident close-calls have been fairly frequent. They would like to see that possibility lessened. Obviously, a larger zone would allow a greater disbursement of the hunters using the area.

The fact that it does not conflict with the Lake Joseph herd is important as well, nor does it come in conflict in anyway with moose hunting areas.

I was informed just today, which is quite a bit after the actual receipt of this petition for presentation here, that something in the area of approximately 100 people from the Caribou Hunters' Association of Labrador West have also supported this particular petition, as presented by the people of Churchill Falls. This would be of interest, of course, to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and other Labrador representatives.

I can say in brief terms, and this is of interest to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), of course, because it is in his jurisdiction, that the proposed zone boundary would go from the extreme Western end of the Northern zone at the moment on a straight line down to Hook Bay

and, then roughly East Northeastward. It would bring it much closer to the Churchill Falls area and, as has been indicated, the herd does extend quite a bit South from where the current boundary for the Northern zone is now.

If acted upon, not only would it lessen the chances of hunter accidents because of the congestion, an expansion would also bring the zone itself a lot closer to the people who are making use of it in the general Churchill Falls area.

I look for support from members of the House and, I particularly refer it to the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews). No matter what we manage, if we manage anything, such as hunting zones, by the objectives we set for the zones, then we would have to consider that sometimes the best suggested solutions come from where the problem exists. So, if we take into consideration what these seventy-five people in Churchill Falls and the hundred and some odd, say, in Labrador West who have supported it, have said in the petition, we would have to give due consideration to the fact that the problem exists in that area, the people of that area are well aware of the problem and they ask the minister's and the House's consideration of every point they have raised.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition from the seventy-five residents of Churchill Falls. As the member for Naskaupi just said, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to management of resources the people who are affected directly are the people who, in many ways, know solutions. They do not always have to be complex.

What the seventy-five people are pointing out here is that it is a congested area. They have to contend with railway crossings as well as the possibility of hunting accidents and they do not take in the moose hunting area. I have to praise the people in Churchill Falls for doing the attached map and outlining what I consider a reasonable solution to a problem that probably could be serious if a life is threatened by an accident.

The petition also concerns management. I am sure the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), in charge of wildlife, will agree, with the vastness of the caribou herd in the North and also now the caribou herd in the South, people are wondering what is going to be happening down there. I would ask that his department, when they are coming up with management schemes, boundaries for moose and caribou hunting zones and when they are deciding to designate areas, that the hunters and that the communities involved be consulted. I think if this consultation would have taken place with the residents in Churchill Falls, we would not have this petition. The hundred or so people in Western Labrador who are supporting this petition also points out the need for his

department to have greater co-operation and consultation with the grass roots.

I would like to conclude by saying that the management of caribou herds, moose, black bear and other wildlife in Labrador, is something that people are extremely concerned about. Those that are concerned with management want to see some light at the end of the tunnel and if the department is continually saying to areas of Labrador that they cannot have caribou hunting or moose hunting areas, particularly in the South Rigolet and Cartwright area then, I question whether the hunters will continue to abide by the rules. They may say, "Okay, we have waited ten or fifteen years for the herd to build up and the herd is built up." Would the minister at some later date give the people in Southern Labrador an idea of if there can possibly be a caribou hunt in Southern Labrador?

With regard to this petition, I hope they have consultation with the people in Labrador. If they had consultation with the people of Churchill Falls and Labrador West, we would not have had this problem. Once the map is shown to the minister and his officials look at it, I am sure it is only a matter of time. The member for Naskaupi may agree with me, it will only be a matter of time when these officials will straighten out this matter.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I must compliment the member for Naskaupi for doing such an able job in presenting the petition. He makes me wonder, on occasion, when he stands in the House and he does things so well, how come he is not over here next to me.

MR. SIMMONS:

He has some principles, that is why.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) who talks about principles. He is the real one in this House to be talking about who has principles and who does not. In a way, my comment was just to compliment the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) for doing such a fine job in presenting the petition.

All I would like to say to him is I will take the prayer of the petition very seriously. I am interested in having a copy of the map and whatnot to pass on to my appropriate officials in the Wildlife Division.

I can say to the remarks made by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) that we do try to maintain as good as possible a liaison with hunters in each respective area. As a consequence of the liaison and co-operation we have had since I came into the department last April, I have had wildlife officials go to various parts of the Province to sit down with local people and hunters in public meetings and discuss concerns in their local area as it pertains to big game and small game hunting areas and so on. So, we are trying to establish that.

I would just like to say to the hon. member for Naskaupi that I will certainly very seriously consider the points made in the petition and will pass this concern on to the members of Wildlife Division for investigation.

There are studies ongoing all the time by our biologists. I guess you are very familiar with the people that we have in Labrador. They are looking at this matter and others as it pertains to the Mealy Mountain herd and so on. So, we are having a look at it. If there is something we can do to facilitate the local people, we will certainly try.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to present a petition signed by 173 residents of the town of Grand Falls who live in the Grenfell Heights Extension area of Grand Falls. Before I read the prayer of the petition, I want to preface my remarks on the petition and by saying a number of those who have signed this petition have told me that they are absolutely delighted with the representation they are receiving from their present member, the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), and that, of course, is evidenced by the fact that he, only ten months ago, received the majority of the votes up in that particular area. So, it has nothing to do with the individual member's

representation.

I will read the prayer of the petition and I know hon. members will find out clearly what I am trying to say. The petition says:

"Whereas Grenfell Heights Extension is presently within the boundaries of the electoral district of Exploits; and whereas Grenfell Heights Extension is a part of the town of Grand Falls in the electoral district of Grand Falls; and whereas the residents of Grenfell Heights Extension pay their taxes to and receive services from the Town of Grand Falls; we, the residents of Grenfell Heights Extension, humbly petition the provincial government to have the area officially included in the boundaries of the electoral district of Grand Falls." So capably represented - no, they do not say that. That is not in the petition.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there is 173 residents that have signed the petition. I just want to give hon. members some information. In that particular area, Grenfell Heights Extension, there are 155 households, approximately 299 voters in total as of the municipal election in 1985, and probably somewhere between 400 to 500 people in total. They are actually in the town of Grand Falls, but they are not in the Grand Falls electoral district.

Most of these people, Mr. Speaker, work in Grand Falls and their children attend school in Grand Falls. They pay their taxes to the Town of Grand Falls. Most of their goods and services are purchased in Grand Falls. They receive their health care in Grand Falls. They depend on Grand Falls for their recreational facilities

and so on and so on.

The most pertinent point of all is that this section of the Town of Grand Falls is geographically located in the town of Grand Falls and is actually a part of the town. It is actually about five miles away I suppose, four or five miles away from the next nearest community in their district of Exploits, which is Bishop's Falls. It is one of those situations I think that is very logical and actually makes a lot of sense.

There has been representation made in the past but, unfortunately, nothing in a formal way. The residents found that out when they raised the matter with me. I told them there was a commission studying it and they should have made a representation to the commission. They did not. They chose to take this route and present a petition and I have been asked to present it.

I support the prayer of the petition whole-heartedly. I would ask that the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) take the petition, consider it and then perhaps present at some time in the future an appropriate amendment to the Electoral Boundaries Act, which I would presume is the proper avenue, to have this change effective and to really correct an unsuitable situation.

MR. BAKER:

There goes your forty-one votes.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, we will let the chips fall where they may, Mr. Speaker. I am not interested in that, Mr. Speaker. I am interested in what the wishes of the people are.

So, Mr. Speaker, I place this petition on the table of the House and ask that it be referred to the appropriate department.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, I take pride in supporting the petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague in this House and my seat mate or district mate in Central Newfoundland. I can concur and verify his leading comments in saying that the people of Grenfell Heights are so delighted and so pleased and so happy with their representative. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they intend to bring him in there permanently so he can live with them forever and not be in St. John's. They want him out there. By the next election they are going to make sure that he resigns and comes out and lives with them. That is how much they care for him. That is how much they want him out there, Mr. Speaker, and that is how much they appreciate him. They want to bring him home for good. I think, after the next election, he will be brought home for good.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) should reconsider very carefully what he is doing here.

MR. BARRY:

Does the Minister of Health (Dr. Thomey) support this petition?

MR. FLIGHT:

The member for Grand Falls should really reconsider this because I assure this House of Assembly, Mr.

Speaker, and I know whereof I speak, if the request in this petition had been granted before the last election, I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. minister would not be sitting where he is sitting today. No wonder the member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey) laughs because he knows full well the results at Grenfell Heights.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition would have been increased by one if the prayer of that petition had been granted before the last election. I admire the member's courage for presenting the petition but, if he is concerned about his political career and his forty-one votes, it would have taken more than the university to have delivered that great victory.

Mr. Speaker, while we are on that, I would say something for the member who presented the petition. I understand, I am told and I hear, there are difficulties. As a matter of fact, I get representation once in a while from people living on Grenfell Heights who are part of the town of Grand Falls, who have been constituents of the minister and will continue to be, about difficulties, in some instances, in dealing with the town of Grand Falls over land problems, service extensions, and that kind of thing. I have seen letters written to the minister asking him to intercede with council because they feel they are not getting the kind of consideration to their request that they are entitled to. I would throw that in so the minister would look at that.

I concur, Mr. Speaker, and I support the petition. It does make sense by way of compacting and making the district the way it

should be. However, as a result of the last election, I cannot help being a little bit partisan. The esteemed member for Exploits (Dr. Twomey), I am sure, is glad when he looked at the results of the last election and at that particular poll to unload it onto his colleague the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr Simms).

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

DR. TWOMEY:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. TWOMEY:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am very grateful and I wish to stand in support of my hon. member, and of you, Hon. Sir, because I have to commend both of you for your diplomatic and pleasant presentation and your support of this remarkable petition. I honestly had to get up further because I am a great believe in democracy. I knew that our contribution here today would have a considerable influence when the decision is made in future as to whether a part of the geographic area of my district and a residential area would be transferred into my confrere's district. I know that the boundary is very vague. In fact, I always felt that I also had three homes in Grand Falls. As to what the future will hold, I cannot tell but, there is always in me a great degree of optimism, a great degree of faith, and a great degree of belief.

I think the request is honest and sincere, because they go there for

their health services, to the courts for their justice, a number of them go to the schools for their education, to the libraries for their intellectual reading and to the Arts and Culture Center for their amusement. All these things are a very important part of it.

In passing over that district, there will be a remarkable contribution. You can call it by accident, faith, destiny, anything, but they have a rather good water and sewer system, I believe. I know that they do pay taxes to the town of Grand Falls and they receive their fire protection from Grand Falls and we have done a certain amount of relocation. It is a rustic and rural area attached to an urban center. It has its own mystiques and its own charm.

On behalf of all these people who believe in democracy, I certainly support them and support the principle of the petition which has been so dutifully presented.

Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:
Order 22, Bill No. 59. The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons) adjourned debate and he has about one minute left to conclude his remarks.

The hon member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that of the normal thirty minute clock time I would have minute or so but I understood that the spirit of this debate has been that a member be given a little latitude, just a few minutes, and if that could be indicated to me, then I would proceed.

MR. J. CARTER:

No, no Mr. Speaker, not a second.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

It seems to the Chair that leave has not been permitted.

MR. SIMMONS:

I was not requesting leave, Mr. Speaker. I was requesting that the informal arrangement we had entered into which allowed the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to go on for an hour, continue. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what I cannot say inside this House, and it is becoming less and less, what I can say here, I will say outside the House.

Mr. Speaker, the chief practical aspect of this Bill is that it does propose a mechanism, however flawed, for getting on with offshore development but, otherwise, apart from that aspect, Mr. Speaker, it is a badly, seriously, scandalously flawed agreement, the adverse effects of which Newfoundlanders for generations to come are going to be plagued with.

Some of the shortcomings of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, include: no control for Newfoundland over the rate of development. The author, Dr. House, says this in his quotation on page 309, "The

Province would have been more firmly in control under the 1977 regulations," brought in by my colleague from Mount Scio-Bell Island, "than it is under the Atlantic Accord," Dr. House says. No control!

A lack of bargaining power for Newfoundland on pricing, Mr. Speaker, is another shortcoming. The third one is lack of bargaining power in terms of federal taxation levels relating to the offshore. A fourth shortcoming, Mr. Speaker, is no provision for continuing exploration incentives. A fifth shortcoming, Mr. Speaker, is there is no right of participating in discoveries by Newfoundland.

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Six, Mr. Speaker, inadequate provision for processing in Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Number seven, failure to maximize long term job opportunities resulting from the sellout to Central Canada, Mr. Speaker.

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:

Mr. Speaker, by the clock in this House that we all agree to adhere to, the hon. member has had two

minutes. Thirty minutes is the allotted time and I certainly object to him having any more.

MR. FLIGHT:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

The Speaker will remember that on the Friday before this debate started - it started on a Monday - the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) stood in this House and pointed out that his hour that he would normally have was not long enough. We unanimously said, because of such an historic debate, he could have as long as he liked. The hon. the Government House Leader spoke in excess of two hours, Mr. Speaker. I was granted, which is not normal in this House, two hours. I spoke for in excess of two hours. Every member in this House has, because of that original agreement and that understanding, been given extra time to clue up. Mr. Speaker, it is not fair and it will be taking away the member's rights if he is not permitted to continue.

The member for St. John's North cannot withdraw leave. It is not unanimous consent that is needed here. It is by agreement, not by unanimous consent.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

I am not finished the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I will be finished very quickly.

I do not understand that the agreement we made with the

Government House Leader would be that unanimous consent would be required for a member to keep speaking. It was an agreement on both sides of the House. The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has not got the right to withdraw the member's right to continue his speech. He should be given the time he requires.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough on that point. I would like to draw hon. members' attention to Standing Order 49, sub-section (1) which reads: "Subject to subsections (2) and (3), no member shall speak for more than thirty minutes at a time in any debate." The hon. member has spoken and I asked if the member had leave and that was objected to by one member.

So I now call on -

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this issue is not a matter relating to leave. This is a matter of changing the rules in the middle of the game. On the Friday preceding the commencement of the debate, this House entered into an informal agreement. We have to assume that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), in entering into that agreement, had the concurrence of the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) because, at that time, he raised no objection.

On the basis of that agreement,

that the gentleman for St. John's East, being the proposer of the government's initiative would have just whatever time he needed, the gentleman responding for the Opposition would have a reasonably lengthy amount of time such as he would require to address the issue, and then that the other members, in particular, the Minister of Finance, would be given a fairly extensive period and, indeed, that every member in this debate, without exception until now, has been given something in excess of the thirty minutes to conclude remarks.

I therefore submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not a matter of leave. It is a matter of whether the Chair is prepared to enforce to the end of this debate the agreement that was freely entered into, clearly with the concurrence of a majority of the House, because there was no objection at that time. I submit, in tandem, that it is not proper and not fair to the privileges of any member of this House to change those rules when I have sat here in silence. I have not refused consent for the gentleman for St. John's South (Dr. Collins). I had that prerogative but I did not have it in this circumstance because I was party, as a member of this House, to an overriding agreement that for this debate members of the Chamber would be given a little extra time in which to make their points, given the significance of the document we are debating.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think I have heard enough on that point to rule now. I refer

the hon. member to a ruling that I made on Monday last, and it was to a point of order. I said, "I heard enough on that point of order. The hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has had ten minutes to conclude his speech by agreement and by leave of the House. All the other hon. members, according to our Standing Orders, will have a half hour to speak." That is the position as it is as the present time.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am rising to participate in this debate. I am not getting up on any further points of order. I thank Your Honour for recognizing me.

I would like to start off my address, Mr. Speaker, by an apology. The apology is to the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach). It so happened that while the member for Carbonear was speaking I was snoozing in my seat. What I had attempted to do was to adjust my sleep pattern to coincide with the times that the hon. members' opposite were speaking. But, of course, because of the extra time that was allotted to them, my sleep pattern got out of phase and, as a result, I was caught napping while the member for Carbonear was speaking. I would certainly like to apologize for that.

I have checked through Hansard and I have also checked with two former Speakers of this House. It is not unparliamentary to sleep while you are present in this

House. You are required to give attention to the people who are speaking but, I think the proper attention to give to the hon. members opposite when they are speaking is to sleep. Another former Speaker suggested to me that while sleeping one should not snore. I do not apologize for sleeping when hon. members opposite are speaking because the kind of stuff that comes out is the most incredible rubbish.

Hon. members opposite might be able to take some comfort from the fact that I do not entirely agree with this legislation. I have a very substantial point of disagreement with this legislation and I will outline that in a few minutes.

In 1933, the last independent sovereign government of Newfoundland was elected and, among other things that they did when they first met in the session of 1934, was pass The Newfoundland Act. That act effectively wiped them out. They voted themselves, not only out of office as a party and as a government, but they voted the Dominion of Newfoundland out of existence as a dominion. It is a matter of history that this was followed by a Commission of Government and subsequently, by Confederation with Canada up to the present day.

I was born in 1933, so for the period that I have been alive, Newfoundland has not up to now had full independence. You know, I do not consider myself old, but I certainly do not consider myself a teenager, so Newfoundland has been behind the eight ball for a long, long time, more than fifty years.

I happen to know personally at least four members of that

particular government that was elected in 1933, and I knew them well enough to speak frankly with them. Each one of them agreed - one of them is still alive and I think that he would concur - that there was a feeling of absolute hopelessness. They were casting around for any means of survival and they grasped the offer of the Government in England to give them a Commission of Government as their only way to financial salvation. So they voted themselves out of office.

I also knew, and I am sure some hon. members opposite knew, a great many of the members of the National Convention. In fact, as a school boy I used to watch the National Convention's proceedings. The same feeling of nervousness and the same fear of independence was apparent there. They were afraid to go it alone and that was why when the possibility of confederation with Canada became a real possibility, they grasped at it, allowed it to go on the ballot paper and, of course, the rest is history.

So this bill is entitled, "An Act To Implement An Agreement Between The Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador On Offshore Petroleum Resource Management And Revenue Sharing." My disagreement is with the title of the bill. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the title of this bill would be more apt and it would be more proper if this were called, "A Bill And Act To Repeal The Newfoundland Act of 1934" because by this act we restore practically all the rights and privileges that we gave up in 1934.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

The hon. the member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

The hon. the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), being a long time member of this House, knowledgeable in parliamentary procedure and the rules of this Chamber, will be aware that this is the time to talk about the principle of the bill. If he wants to amend the title, he should wait until we get to Committee stage and put down an appropriate amendment. I am sure he understands that. Would he therefore refrain from getting into amendments at this particular time, deal with the principle of the bill, try and stick to the subject, because as of now he has about twenty-two minutes left.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, this is a spurious and mischievous point of order and I appeal to Your Honour's good sense to dispose of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please! There is no point of order. It is a suggestion made by one hon. member to another. There is wide range in debate of this matter and I rule, therefore, there is no point of order.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have not proposed any amendment, nor will I but I still say that the title of this bill would more properly be, "An Act To Repeal The Newfoundland Act Of 1934," because by this bill our full rights as a sovereign entity, as much as can possibly be achieved in Confederation, are restored so that I am more than

happy to support this bill. I do still wish that it had been otherwise named.

The Opposition are making a great deal about having the oil from Hibernia refined in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, this to me is a red herring of the worst kind. This suggests that all oil at Hibernia must pass through an artificial bottle neck. In other words, it cannot be sold on the open market until it has been pushed through the various refineries that may or may not be built in Newfoundland.

This is a ridiculous suggestion. A refinery can be built -

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am carefully following what the hon. gentleman is saying. I am very much afraid I am misunderstanding him. Is the hon. gentleman saying that it is the policy of the Tory Government that they do not want oil to be refined in this Province? Is that the policy?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will treat this mischievous interruption with the contempt which it deserves.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Are you answering the point of order?

MR. J. CARTER:

Yes, I am speaking on the point of order. I am recognized, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that oil can be refined in Newfoundland at any time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Is the hon. member speaking to the point of order?

MR. J. CARTER:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. The hon. member was asking a question.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that oil can be refined in Newfoundland at any time. It does not have to come from Hibernia. It can be bought on the open market. Surely there is no suggestion that oil that is pumped at Hibernia is going to be any cheaper for Newfoundlanders or Newfoundland companies than it is for anyone else. Obviously, the hon. gentlemen opposite have no business sense whatsoever, even to suggest it is to parade their ignorance. It is just ridiculous.

Now, a great deal has been made of the fact that oil prices are varying.

MR. DECKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

This is absurd.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I hate to be

interrupting the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with the very essence of the bill to which we are speaking. I am not sure if Bill 59 allows us to refine or not. It is not clear. I am hearing the hon. gentleman say that the Tory Government does not want to refine Hibernia crude anyway. If this is the stand, make it clear so the people of Newfoundland know exactly what all this racket has been about. Does the Tory Government want to refine Hibernia crude or not? That is the point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

A mischievous interruption by an irresponsible member. I rest my case.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

There is no point of order. Again, it is the matter of a question being raised by one member.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

What I am attempting to say, Mr. Speaker, in spite of mischievous interruption, is that oil from Hibernia can be refined in Newfoundland and oil from anywhere can be refined in Newfoundland. The refining of oil in Newfoundland is not necessarily part of this agreement. The former administration that the hon. members pay some lip service to tried to build a refinery that was designed merely to transfer assets from Japanese industrialists into the pockets of the Shaheen industrialists. It worked very well. It was a triumph of financial achievements. It transferred something like \$60 million into some of Shaheen's dummy

companies.

It also was the biggest bankruptcy since the South Sea bubble. I think there has only recently been a greater bankruptcy and that is only because of inflation. In terms of real dollars, I would submit that the Come By Chance bankruptcy was the biggest in world history.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is that this bill does not require oil to be refined in Newfoundland or oil not to be refined in Newfoundland. It need not be any part of this bill. This bill gives us management and control of our offshore resource. We can buy oil anywhere and refine or we need not buy oil anywhere and refine. But, one thing that is certain, oil from Hibernia can not be sold cheaper to Newfoundland than to anyone else because to do so is to invite chaos. The hon. members fully understand that and of course, I am quite sure that they are quite capable of perverting what I am trying to say. It would not be the first time and I am sure it will not be the last time.

Another point, Mr. Speaker, is that with the tremendous resource and with the management of the tremendous resource that we are going to have, Newfoundland -

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, this is absurd! I appeal to Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

The member for St. John's North, being an experienced debater in this House, a long-serving member, he will know that he cannot mislead the House, particularly deliberately can he not mislead the House. Perhaps he is doing it unwittingly. He is after all, the master of unwitting but, Mr. Speaker, aside from that, he cannot mislead this House. The gentleman has just said that this bill gives control to the Newfoundland government. That is not the case, Mr. Speaker. A press release from the federal government two days ago says clearly that the fundamental decisions are in the hands of the federal government for the next five years. Now, it is all right for him to have a wide range in debate but, that does not give him the license to enter misleading, false statements into the record. There is no control for the Newfoundland government. He knows that! Why does he perpetuate the lie?

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:

That is the kind of interruption that I rely on Your Honour to defend me from.

MR. SPEAKER:

Again, I have to say there is no point of order. There is certainly a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage realizes that this is shared control. Everybody knows that but, it is the kind of control that we never had before and never would have had if the former agreement that we were offered by the snake Trudeau had been even entertained. So, I rest my case there.

What I am trying to say too, is that now with this control -

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman did not intend to refer to a great Prime Minister, a great world statesman, a man who is respected around this world, a man who is no longer involved in politics, as a snake. I am sure that in justice to the rest of Newfoundlanders who are Liberals or Tories or anything or in justice to humanity, I am sure the hon. gentleman would like to withdraw that accusation. Calling a former Prime Minister a snake, Mr. Speaker, brings down the integrity of this hon. House.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Finance, to that point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

I am not sure I understand what the hon. member is talking about. I know many people who have snakes as pets. They have them in their homes. They are beautiful animals and beautifully coloured animals.

MR. FLIGHT:

They are not animals. They are reptiles.

DR. COLLINS:

They are reptiles, okay, but it is still an animal. They are necessary to keep down rodents and that type of thing. A snake is a very useful beast and I do not know if the hon. member meant that Mr. Trudeau is a snake in terms of being useful or in terms of a snake in eating rodents. He referred to Mr. Trudeau as a snake but, that does not necessarily mean that he meant it in any sort of derogatory way.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I can clarify and perhaps refer to the former Prime Minister as being serpentine, certainly in his reasoning but, I will wait your ruling.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The member for St. Barbe.

MR. DECKER:

Just as a point of clarification and perhaps the Minister of Finance has clarified it, we can take it from the Minister of Finance's words then that the hon. member for St. John's North was really praising this truly great Prime Minister.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

There is no point of order. I can only ask the hon. the member for St. John's North if he, in his generosity, wishes to use another word. I am not aware that that is unparliamentary.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for defending me from the reptilian accusations from across the way.

What I was trying to say was that with this acquisition of these rights over our oil resources, Newfoundland will now be one of the big three provinces in Canada. I would suggest Ontario being one, British Columbia being the other and Newfoundland the third. I will predict that within a few years Newfoundland will be one of the three biggest in terms of resources, in terms of affluence and in terms of income. Newfoundland will be one of the three biggest provinces in Canada. As a result of that, it will then have some say in federal - provincial conferences. At the present time we really do not have much say. I am sure the hon. members on both sides will agree with me, that we really do not have much say in federal - provincial conferences.

When we try to renegotiate the Upper Churchill contract and when we try to make our views known and

our arguments prevail, we are listened to politely but, I do not think that what we say is listened to all that carefully and it is a function of size.

MR. DECKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think I am dense but the hon. member is just not making himself clear. Now, look, we have just come through an election which told us about the new spirit of co-operation whereby Newfoundland would become an equal partner in Confederation. Is the hon. gentleman, when talking about this being listened to politely and being sent away, is he saying this is this happening under the Mulroney Administration? Is this something new? I would like for the hon. gentleman to clarify his position because we are, Mr. Speaker, into a new age of co-operation. If this is still going on, obviously something has happened since the last election when we were supposed to be in this great spirit of co-operation with a Tory in Ottawa and a Tory in Newfoundland. God save the Queen! Is it right or is it not right, Mr. Speaker?

MR. TOBIN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member

for St. John's North is obviously speaking in debate and contributing significantly to the debate. He is continuously being interrupted on spurious points of order by the member for the Strait. Mr. Speaker, he will have the opportunity to speak in debate the same as my colleague and the same as everybody else. I would suggest that he is not making a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and has never made a point of order. As a matter of fact, since he came into this House he has spoken a good many times but, he has never said anything. He is continuing to do that and I ask Your Honour to instruct him to be quiet.

MR. FUREY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Burin - Placentia West just feels a little bit slighted because the hon. the member for St. John's North referred to snakes and did not mention gofers. That is his problem.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please!

To that point of order, the Chair has no way to interpret what a member is going to say when he stands on a point of order. Every hon. member has the opportunity, of course, and the prerogative to raise a point of order at any time. The Chair is powerless to do anything about that. I declare there is no point of order.

It being five o'clock, it is time that I announce the items for the Late Show. There are two today. One, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is unsatisfied with the answer from the hon. the Premier on the cost of oil from Hibernia. Item number two: the member for Bonavista North is dissatisfied with the response by the hon. the Premier in respect to unemployment.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is just a fact of size that although what we have to say pertaining to Newfoundland is listened to politely and is listened to carefully, and I think we do get a good deal of co-operation when we talk about Newfoundland as opposed to the rest of Canada, federally and provincially, matters that concern Newfoundland are given a sympathetic ear. There is no question about that. But when it comes to matters of us trying to suggest how Canada itself should be run, I suggest that because of our size we have practically no influence. It does not matter what stripe the government is there. When we try and influence the way Canada itself is run, because of our small size -

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER:

Oh, Mr. Speaker, this is absurd.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sitting here trying desperately to hang on to every word of my good friend and colleague from St. John's North and those two gentlemen over there, the backbench minister, the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) and the hon. the Parliamentary Secretary from Carbonear (Mr. Peach) are carrying on an extended conversation, distracting those of us on this side of the House, and making it difficult for us to hear what the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is saying. Could you ask them to restraint themselves in view of the considerable contribution the gentleman for St. John's North is making to this debate as he always does, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):
Order, please!

The hon. member's point is well taken in terms of having the right to listen to a member's speech in silence. I would ask hon. members of both sides to keep it quiet.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have the uncanny feeling that I am speaking to a hostile audience. I could be wrong.

So if we are to become much more powerful, as I suggest we will, that is, I suggest we will be one of the three great provinces of Canada, then we will be able to have some influence in the running of Canada itself. I think this is one of the big implications of this bill. I am sure that other members will follow this, but I am glad I was able to mention it first, and I would be very interested in what other members would like to -

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you could tell us how much time the hon. member has left in his speech?

MR. SIMMONS:

I think it is expired.

MR. FUREY:

I thought it did.

MR. SIMMONS:

It seems like a half an hour.

MR. FUREY:

You know, I just wonder if he can conclude his remarks?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down, 'Furey'.

MR. BUTT:

Most unfair.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. gentleman should be through by eleven minutes after five. So he has about nine minutes to go.

MR. J. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A very generous amount of time. As hon. members realize I do not need much time to say what I have to say. It is quite easy -

MR. FUREY:

We know that.

MR. MARSHALL:

In that case, by leave! By leave for eight minutes!

MR. J. CARTER:

So we are going to have some say in the running of Canada in the latter part of this century and in the early years of the next century. It is going to be very interesting. And what kind of things are we going to say to Canada? What would we like to see done?

Well now we would certainly like the oil revenue, we are hoping to get,

AN HON. MEMBER:
How much?

MR. J. CARTER:
It will depend on the world price of oil. It will depend on a lot of things. We may get a great deal, we may get an enormous amount. I do not know. It will be a substantial amount, but it may be a super substantial amount. Between these two extremes, I would hesitate to put a reliable estimate. I think we are going to get many more dollars than the hon. gentlemen have brains and that is for sure. But, of course, that would not be very much.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that the revenues that we get will be wisely used. I hope that they will be invested in the renewable resources that Newfoundland has. I would suggest because of advancing technology that the oil resources themselves are to some extent renewable. That is to say, when oil was first drilled a hundred and fifty years ago a very small percentage of the oil that was found was recovered. As our technology has improved, more and more of the oil can be recovered. I think at the present time we are about the 50 per cent mark but, it is entirely possible within the next few years technology will

improve to the extent that we will perhaps get to 60 per cent or 70 per cent to maybe even 80 per cent.

We do know that the structure out there is fractured so what is discovered in one spot has no bearing on the amount that may be discovered even a few miles away. Therefore, the total amount of oil may be far greater than the present estimates. To be fair to the people who are estimating them, they can only go on the information they have. Nevertheless, I am informed by reliable geologists that the structure out there is fractured and that it may be much, much larger than is presently realized. Therefore, tie the fact of better exploration to the fact that improved technology will allow for a greater percentage of recovery and we may find that as time goes by the proven reserves out there will be much greater.

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

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

MR. J. CARTER:
There is not a quorum here.

MR. J. CARTER:
There is not a quorum!

MR. J. CARTER:
Good heavens!

MR. W. CARTER:
Shameful.

MR. SPEAKER:
Call in the members.

Order, please! Count the members.

Quorum

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Could the clerk count the members?

There is a quorum present, I am advised.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

So, Mr. Speaker, when we become one of the three most important provinces in Canada -

MR. DECKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am rising as fast as I can, as long as we have enough hon. members present to hear this. The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is giving an outstanding speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

I think it is utterly disgraceful that his members do not value his contribution enough to provide a quorum in this House. I think the members should be ashamed of themselves. This hon. member was a previous Minister of Education in this Province, Mr. Speaker, who made a tremendous contribution, who insisted that the value of wearing the blue tie was more important, Mr. Speaker, than the quality of education. The member should be ashamed of himself not to hear this hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER (Hickey):

Order, please! Order, please! I declare there is no point of order but, a very valuable observation made by the hon. member.

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the missionary zeal from the reverend member but, I assure him that I do not need his support in order to carry on.

I was about to say as one of the three most important provinces in Canada, or about to be one of the three most important provinces in Canada, and therefore able to not dictate but certainly to influence the running of this nation of Canada itself, what sort of things are we going to use our new found responsibility and power in order to achieve.

I would suggest that we should try to make some inroads on the social legislation of Canada. Because of our future enormous financial contribution to Canada, I would think that we would be able to suggest that perhaps Canada dust off the old idea of a negative income tax and perhaps put all the social legislation that we now have into a new type of negative income tax whereby people will be - and I think the socialist Opposition might find it surprising that such a proposal would come from me - but I do suggest that perhaps we should look towards the kind of social legislation that would put an umbrella over the entire population of Canada and bring it all under one heading of negative income tax, that is to say, from those according to their ability to pay and, to those according to

their need. That sounds like the war cry of an outdated socialist but I feel that if we can afford it, and Canada may very well be able to afford it because of our future contributions, maybe we will be able to influence them to dust off this old idea and not such an old idea but not that much more expensive. It seems responsible elements already favour it. I think it is quite possible that we may, in our lifetime, see this very forward kind of legislative approach tried.

With those few points, I do not need my full thirty minutes. I thank hon. members for their rapt attention and I look forward to the next speaker.

MR. BARRY:

The member, if he needs some extra minutes in order to complete his remarks, we will be happy to offer leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! The hon. member, because of the Quorum call, had two minutes left to go.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I think that tells us a little something about the ability of the member to analyze the Atlantic Accord, or the willingness of the member -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is on a point of order I take it.

MR. BARRY:

No, it is not a point of order. I want to commence discussion in this debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I will start my debate this evening but I will continue tomorrow with my remarks. I think the members opposite should go and read their Standing Orders, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

You will have ten minutes tomorrow.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You will not get any more than that.

MR. BARRY:

Tell the backbencher, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious debate and I would like, if I could, to have members permit me to speak in silence.

MR. DINN:

You should have said that to the member for the Straits.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I will be asking Your Honour to protect me from any interruption on any side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has asked for the

protection of the Chair. He has asked to be heard in silence and the Chair will accommodate the hon. member.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we have seen by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) sitting down before his time is expired that he has obviously exhausted his ability to comment on the Atlantic Accord. Now let that be noted, Mr. Speaker, and let it be noted that the type of debate that we have seen in this House from members opposite has been, by attacking the Opposition, an attempt to intimidate and to avoid any real analysis of what is contained in the Accord. That is very sad, Mr. Speaker, because it is a large resource that we can have for development.

Let us compare this with the controversy that has existed with respect to the Churchill Falls project. Can you imagine if the debate had proceeded on the basis of whether or not members on one side of the House or the other were interested in the welfare of the Province? Is that, Mr. Speaker, the type of debate that the current Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Ottenheimer), who voted in favour of that legislation, engaged in?

Mr. Speaker, consider another point. Just imagine if, when the Churchill Falls project was being debated, the government of the day had not attempted to identify the cost of producing a kilowatt of power from the Upper Churchill project. Can you imagine the outcry that there would have been at that time if there was an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to have the development of that resource approved while keeping the people

of the Province in the dark as to what the cost of development was going to be? Mr. Speaker, that is what members opposite are about in the case of the Atlantic Accord.

DR. COLLINS:

That is what happened actually.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, that is not what happened. There was information and there was extensive information, if the minister would check the debate, conveyed with respect to the probable cost of development. If there was any error, Mr. Speaker, it was in prediction as to what would take place in the future with respect to the value of electricity and the value of oil. But, Mr. Speaker, it was clearly debated at the time what the cost of the electricity would be and how that compared to the cost of oil at the time. Those facts and figures were clearly set out for the people of the Province to see and to indicate, Mr. Speaker, whether or not they approved.

The way members opposite are acting is as though, between elections, they are entitled to keep the people of the Province in the dark as to what is happening. Well, Mr. Speaker, they may try that but, governments that have tried that in the past have found that the people may be kept in the dark but it is then lights out in the next election for government. That, Mr. Speaker, is what we will see in this case.

I have sat here and I have listened. I must say I was somewhat surprised at the tone of debate. I thought that if members opposite genuinely believed what they were saying about the Atlantic Accord, if their rhetoric

was something which they believed, I really thought that they would come in in a statesmanlike fashion, Mr. Speaker, and lay out the benefits for the Province, fully explain the content of the bill and let the weight of the bill itself do its job in terms of dealing with Opposition concerns. Let the explanation, Mr. Speaker, of these benefits and let the presentation to the people of Province of what would flow from any real understanding of that legislation, let that deal with the Opposition and put the Opposition on guard with respect to raising questions about this great historic document.

I think that the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) put his finger on it when he said, that this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, does not have any great evidence of divinity in its drafting. It is not something, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and the Minister responsible for Energy (Mr. Marshall) brought down from the Mount. I liked his analogy that they had brought the people up to the Mount to promise all but, they did not bring down this Atlantic Accord, graven on stone tablets, Mr. Speaker.

The content of this Accord causes us to suspect, Mr. Speaker, that its origin was not divine. Its origin was less than divine and if nothing else confirmed that it was the way in which members opposite felt that in order to deal with this debate they had to launch into a personal attack on myself and also on anybody who would dare become a member of the Liberal party. That, Mr. Speaker, was the essence of the debate by members opposite in this House.

I have to confess that the logic

of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) left me a little at a loss. Now, the Government House Leader, if I understand his argument, went something like this, they have a document that is the greatest document that has ever been seen in the world! They have a settle, Mr. Speaker, that brings this Province better benefits than any federal/provincial agreement has ever brought! Yet, Mr. Speaker, when I left government I sabotaged it. Is that not interesting, Mr. Speaker? Do they have this great document that will stand the test of time or did I sabotage it?

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, when we look at this document we will find a few cracks. Members on this side have already pointed out there are a few flaws and a few cracks. Do I take responsibility for that, Mr. Speaker? Well, somewhere here I found something the other day when I was looking for something else. I would not waste my time, Mr. Speaker, in going back through my thousands of pieces of paper to establish that I had a little bit to do with the offshore oil and gas regulations, with federal/provincial negotiations and with the policy that was set by this Province in looking for the rights for the offshore.

Just let me refer Your Honour to my maiden speech in the House of Assembly, May 2, 1972. I wonder where the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was when he gets up and launches into his tirade against me daring to speak on the offshore. Mr. Speaker, fortunately we have Hansard. I will refer Your Honour to the debate of May 2, 1972 where I started off:

"Mr. Speaker, we have to look at

what is happening out on the Grand Banks in terms of exploration for oil and gas. I think it is something, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of us do not yet realize -" Do you know something? There was nobody in the government of the day who realized it until that point in time, until that maiden speech. I have to say, in all humility, Mr. Speaker, that this maiden speech earned me a Cabinet position within six months. It earned me an appointment to an energy committee within a matter of days after the speech. It earned me involvement with Bill Doody on the team that was negotiating with the Eastern Provinces while I was still a backbencher, Mr. Speaker. This speech! "- the extent of the capital outlay which is being made and which will be made by oil companies on the Grand Banks over the next few years."

Mr. Speaker, I referred to the fact that 50 per cent of Canada's potential oil and gas reserves lie under water on the Continental Shelf, not something generally accepted at that time and that 50 per cent of that lay on the East Coast, on the Grand Banks primarily, in other words.

Mr. Speaker, listen to this! I talked about certain concessions that had been given without due thought at that point in time. "There have been concessions given without the Government of Newfoundland having made priorities, having determined, for example, how much it is going to insist on oil companies using Newfoundland labour." First time it was ever raised, Mr. Speaker, in this House of Assembly. "How much it is going to insist on oil companies having their oil rigs serviced within the Province of

Newfoundland," Mr. Speaker. I said "the oil companies are not coming in as philanthropic organizations and we have to set priorities." I am not going to read all this, Mr. Speaker. Just let me have a few more extracts.

"To what extent should the regulations ensure a large Canadian participation in the offshore development? To what extent should that be allowed to affect the rapid and efficient location and development of the resource? To what extent do we say, 'Go to it', without restriction because the quicker we find oil and gas, the better we are, that we are not going to slow you down by requiring that you use Canadian labour, that you train Newfoundland labour, that we are not going to require you to use oil rigs built in Canada. That was one trade-off," I said. "Do we want them to find it as quickly as possible or do we want to say no? Do it a little more slowly to give us time to gear our economy into what you are doing."

Mr. Speaker, I raised the fact that Canada at the time was negotiating with France with respect to the line around St. Pierre and Miquelon. I go on generally to set out and basically to draw the attention of the government of the day, the first Tory administration since Confederation, to the need to develop an oil and gas policy.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I had had some involvement previously in the oil and gas industry because I had a Summer job washing dishes on a supply boat when I was at Memorial which, Mr. Speaker, I turned down for another job but I had that first inclination when I got that job that there was something going

on out there beyond our shores that I had to become aware of.

Mr. Speaker, then I got involved at law school in international law and I became aware of the significance of the Continental Shelf off Newfoundland and Labrador and the potential that was there if the Law of the Sea negotiations went the right way for this Province. By the time I came back and got elected to this House of Assembly, I wanted to be involved to make sure that our rights as a Province over that tremendous resource were acquired. I looked forward and did, in fact, participate at the United Nations in the Law of the Sea negotiations, helping Newfoundland acquire and helping Canada acquire offshore rights.

What was the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the member for St. John's East doing at this point in time? Where was his priority? You know where his priority was during that period? His priority, Mr. Speaker, was in making sure that this Province had a set of conflict of interest regulations developed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

I am just going to say one thing. I am not going to waste time in this debate. I just refer the Government House Leader, the member for St. John's East to a poem. We all remember this: I am Ozymandias, king of kings:/ Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!/ Nothing beside remains. Round the decay/ Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare,/ The lone and level sands stretch far away./

Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is that I have devoted my life in politics to set of works. I have had an input into these offshore oil negotiations and in the development of policy for this Province. The Government House Leader and member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has had his input into the development of conflict of interest regulations and, do you know something? I am prepared to have our two works laid out and compared.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we can already refer to the conflict of interest regulations of the Government House Leader and say, look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair! We have already seen how they stood the test of time.

Mr. Speaker, when debate continues tomorrow, I am prepared to go through, Mr. Speaker, year by year, issue by issue, and establish why, when members opposite are long gone, when we are forming the government after the next election -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

- and for centuries in the future, Mr. Speaker, I will be prepared to stand up and say, 'yes, I have had some involvement with the development of oil and gas regulations in this Province and, by God, you can look at my works and ye need not despair.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it now being 5:30 and it being Late Show time, I am happy to adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

We have two questions before adjournment. The first is by the hon Leader of the Opposition (Mr Barry). He is not satisfied with the answer of the Premier on the cost of oil for Hibernia and he would like to debate it.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I assume the Premier is somewhere within the precincts and listening to this. I passed him over my calculations and the question that I asked the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is gone.

MR. BARRY:

No wonder he is gone.

I passed over my calculations and my question was clearly geared to what is the base price needed before calculating anything for taxes, royalties, profits for the companies, interest during construction, or interest on debt.

MR. WARREN:

How do you do that?

MR. BARRY:

It is very easy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE:

I know how you can do it but, it

does not mean anything.

MR. BARRY:

The Premier can tell us are the projected costs, as estimated by Mobil for building a fixed platform, acceptable to government? Does government agree that that is the approximate cost of building a concrete fixed platform? Does government agree that those annual operating costs are properly estimated by Mobil and, if so, Mr. Speaker, must the Premier not then agree and admit that a price in excess of \$17 a barrel will be needed in order to cover just that annual operating cost and the cost of capital, the cost of amortizing the fixed platform?

What is going on in their heads? Why are they so afraid to inform the people of the Province? A few moments ago I pointed out how absurd it would have been in the Upper Churchill debate if there had been no discussion of the potential cost of building that project, of the potential cost per kilowatt hour.

MR. J. CARTER:

It was spurious.

MR. BARRY:

Spurious or not, it is a hell of a lot better than no discussion at all, which is what we are getting from members opposite.

MR. J. CARTER:

It is worse. There are children in the audience.

MR. BARRY:

There is one representing the district of St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

Mr. Speaker, will the Premier tell us what the cost of a barrel of

oil from Hibernia is going to be? He is making a farce of his commitment to run an open government. He is making a farce of his commitment and his election promises to keep people informed. He is betraying the people of this Province. He is turning his back on those people who he promised he would keep informed. Will the Premier indicate to us whether Mr. Hopper was correct when, in the interview in the Toronto Star, he stated that, in his opinion, at \$20 a barrel, Hibernia is becoming dicey and it is becoming shaky? He said, "Hibernia will not yield any royalties to either Ottawa or Newfoundland for some time under that scenario and may even need direct cash infusions from the federal government, if oil prices do remain at about \$20 for several years." That would pretty well correspond, Mr. Speaker, with the figures that I have set out there today. With \$17, add another \$3 to cover interest during construction, interest on debt and you do not have any money, Mr. Speaker, even at \$20 a barrel for taxes, for royalties and for profits.

If the Premier is expecting the people of this Province to buy a pig in a poke, he is going to be sadly surprised in the next election, Mr. Speaker. We want an answer to that question. What is the cost of a barrel of oil from Hibernia?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, one of the things which characterizes the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), and always has, is his preoccupation with theory. He is an excellent theoretician. There is no question about it. I remember years ago talking to him about a whole bunch of things.

It is like the other day when we were talking about the painting over here in the Extension, there was a great theory about the artist's freedom and who is to be the final arbiter of the public taste and all the rest of it. You can go on endlessly. You can have wonderful chats around the fire, Mr. Speaker, over all those kinds of things. What I said to the press the other day in response to the Leader of the Opposition on that art work was simply that, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to live in the world of theory, that is fine, I do not mind, let him go right ahead and do it. I happen to live in the real world and certain times one has to make decisions on behalf of the people of the Province.

Here we are now again today. I understand he is the Leader of the Opposition. He has to oppose and he has to concoct a whole range of things which will put a negative light upon the government. That is his role and I understand it but, it does not hold very much water once it is examined. One can concoct a whole range of various theories as it relates to Hibernia development or the gold discovery or Baie Verte or St. Lawrence, and under one set of assumptions, it is this, under another, it is that.

What the Leader of the Opposition knows when he does, now and then, enter into the real world, is that

we are involved in a massive project of \$4 billion or \$5 billion. There is in that development one group of participants called Mobil Corporation of New York and Chevron and Gulf and Petro-Canada. They have certain interests that they want to protect to get this development going. And they, Mr. Hopper included, are going to do their studies and put out their various pieces of information because we are now entering a very critical stage in the development of the first oil field offshore.

Based upon the assessment that their consultants do, they are going to put out certain numbers, and then the federal government is going to assess them and the provincial government is going to assess them, and so on. I can say in a general way that we have seen already in, for example, the gravity-based structure, which up until several months ago was an impossibility for the Island of Newfoundland because of cost. The cost was exorbitant! The companies were saying it. It was in the papers that it could not be done here. It was impossible because of the cost! I remember, Mr. Speaker - I can disclose this - getting numbers from the consortium which demonstrated from their perspective why it could not be done in Newfoundland because the cost was so high. Then we went back to Mobil and the consortium and questioned their numbers. We went through it in various details, a whole range of things, fifteen or twenty different components. Finally, another study was done. One thing was the time frame, for example. The time frame was forty-five, forty-six, perhaps forty-eight months for a gravity-based

structure and, if we were to do a floating structure, it would be thirty-nine months. Then, finally, we got them to accept that the difference might be one month - thirty-nine months versus forty months. I remember that argument very, very well. Then we got down to the costs, after we got the time frame almost the same. And finally a new study came out we had done, that we presented, done by consultants from around the world whose names I do not remember off the top of my head - I can get it from the Petroleum Directorate or from the Department of Development, or both - in which they questioned the numbers that the company had. So we went back to the company with these numbers and, lo and behold, one fine day the consortium took a completely different approach to the gravity-based structure than they took earlier on. It was a negotiating position.

We are into negotiation over the largest development in our history. Now, are the companies going to come with their bottom line first time around? Of course not. That is negotiation.

The same way with the federal government as they create their new budget which will be coming down February 26, dealing with taxation measures and so on. We are now involved in negotiations with these companies over the costs and already we have seen a variation between different consultants, on costs, involving hundreds of millions of dollars and that will dictate the kind of price that you are going to be talking about for the barrel of oil. We have a pretty good, clear consensus now from all parties on what the cost is going to be for the gravity-base structure, We

do not yet on the cellar deck have a consensus on the cost, we do not have a consensus yet on what the federal government's royalty and taxation regime is, there is no consensus on what the provincial take should be from the development, at what time, what rate and so on like that.

So these are factors which render this theoretical equation completely meaningless. It is hogwash! It is complete hogwash! It is an attempt, I agree. I can see it is an attempt by the Opposition to try to discredit what this government is doing. That is the role the Leader of the Opposition has to play, and I accept that. That is fine!

And then in my response as leader of the government I have to say to the Leader of the Opposition, fine, Sir, I will give you a "B" for effort as Leader of the Opposition for bringing this forward. You have to do this, you have to try to discredit the government. You are the alternative government for the next twenty years, and that is fine, so you have to try to work out different ways in which you can discredit us.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the Premier's time has elapsed.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have to say in response that this is theory, it means nothing until we can decide specifically what those other variables are going to cost.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave. By leave.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if I might on a point

of order, or whatever. We would be happy to give the speaker a few more minutes, since there are only two things on the Late Show, if he so wished. My point of order is to ask the Premier has there been a change of policy and when did the change of policy -

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. He is asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Wait now! Wait now! Do not get excited! The Premier gave a very reasonable response for a change, Mr. Speaker, to a serious question. Now, I would just like to ask the Premier, has there been a change of policy?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Ah, Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous.

MR. SPEAKER:

I do not think asking a question on a change of policy is a question of order.

MR. BARRY:

Your Honour has not heard what I am trying to say.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am listening.

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, you are listening to my being shouted down by the backbenchers, as is regularly the case.

MR. SPEAKER:

No, I am listening to the hon. member and he is not making a

point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, up until 1981, this Province prepared computer reports as to the economics of Hibernia and published those.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is not a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

Well, then, will the Premier answer, has there been a change of policy, that you are now not going to do provincial studies and publish them? Why not?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am negotiating.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

I will now call on the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. FLIGHT:

You have been negotiating for nine years.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) is not satisfied with the answer he got in regard to unemployment and he wishes to debate with the Premier.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today we have exposed the government's stark, empty job strategy programme. Today, we have exposed the vain boastings of the Premier for many years about the numbers of jobs that his administration has created. Now,

Mr. Speaker, it is funny when we get this government in a corner, when we produce truth, they close the House or they start blaming or condemning; they start condemning reputable organizations, reputable newspapers, reputable boards. They condemn the Conference Board of Canada, a board that is very, very reputable with respect to making financial predictions and financial reports, they condemn the findings of a paper with the reputation of The Financial Post, they condemn the Auditor General, they condemn the provincial Liberals for the Churchill Falls deal, they condemn the Leader of the Opposition for sabotaging the offshore agreement, they condemn the Liberals in Ottawa for no jobs, and the list goes on. Blame, blame and condemn!

Now, Mr. Speaker, at what time is this administration going to assume some responsibility themselves? At what time are they going to assume some responsibility instead of this political rhetoric of blaming and condemning others? The Premier today gets up beating his chest and boasting about 8,000 jobs created. That is the mandate he asked the people for. Surely goodness, the Premier could have gone and created 8,000 jobs without asking our people. Eight thousand jobs, Mr. Speaker, that is the truth of the mandate. And he had the nerve and the audacity and the effrontery to stand here today and tell the people of Province, when we have approximately 80,000 people unemployed, that his government created 8,000 jobs. That is the first time, Mr. Speaker, he admitted to defeat, and that is the first time he admitted that is all he has created, 8,000 jobs.

What has happened in the decade 1975 to 1985, in that decade of Tory reign in this Province? Let me quote from this paper that I have tabled: "Employment growth in Manitoba, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland was a sluggish 15 per cent to 16 per cent in the decade 1975 to 1985." But in the time period 1981 to 1985, in the decade that we had a sluggish average of 15 per cent to 16 per cent, the national average was 22 per cent growth in jobs. Then broken down a little further, in the last four year period, 1981 to 1985, what did we do? We had a 1 per cent job loss when the figure for Canada was a 6 per cent increase, job gains. In that total ten year period when we did nothing, when we were again dragging behind the rest of Canada, we had periods of Tory rule in Ottawa - 1979 Mr. Clarke and in all of 1985, Mr. Mulroney. So, the Premier cannot blame it on the Liberals.

Let the Premier stand in his place today, in man fashion, and tell us if he has confidence in the future, if he has confidence in the fact that there is now a Tory government in Ottawa. Let him stand in man fashion and tell the people of this Province precisely what his job creation strategy is. If he has confidence, let him tell the people by how many percentage points he plans to reduce unemployment over the next few years. Let him tell the people how many new jobs he plans to develop, how many new jobs he plans to create over the next year. Let the Premier stand in his place if he has confidence in the Tory government in Ottawa, if he has confidence in the future, if he has plans, because if the Premier cannot tell us, then he has no plans. If the Premier

cannot stand here today and tell us by how many percentage points he plans to reduce the level of unemployment in this year, then the Premier has no plans and no confidence in his federal counterparts.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier:

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have been watching the member for Bonavista North over the last week or so and he is starting to get really excited. I have got a sneaking suspicion he is trying to keep his present status in the caucus over there. There must be a danger that somebody is gaining on him or something; he is not doing as much in question period and in speeches as he should, and some of the young turks in the backbenches there are sneaking up on the status that he now has in the caucus over there, because he is supposed to be a bit of veteran. He is starting to really feel his oats over there lately, and I suppose that is the reason for it.

Mr. Speaker, there are lies, lies and damn statistics. If you look at last year, in January 1985 there were 151,000 people working in Newfoundland. In January 1986, there were 161,000 people working. There were 10,000 more people working in Newfoundland in January 1986 than were working in January 1985. Now, that tells me something.

MR. BARRY:

What about 1981?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are in 1986 now. From 1981 to

1984 or 1985, as the hon. member said - he tried to allege that there was a P.C. Government in Ottawa for most of that time, from 1981 to 1985, and he mentioned Mr. Clark and so on. The majority of time, from 1981 to 1985, saw a Liberal Government in Ottawa, and it was a Liberal Government which sabotaged any chance we had to get the offshore going early. It sabotaged it, and members of the Liberal Party opposite assisted in that sabotage and stopped it from happening.

Now, if they are saying today that the Atlantic Accord is worse than the Nova Scotia agreement they wanted us to sign, then they have an awful lot to answer for. I think the majority of Newfoundlanders agree with us, that it was a lot better to hold out and not sign that silly, foolish deal that Mr. Trudeau and members opposite wanted us to sign and wait to have a substantial agreement over 700,000 square miles of land offshore, Mr. Speaker. So it was the Liberal Party of Canada, aided and abetted by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, which sabotaged our attempts to do something to cure the structural problem of unemployment in this Province. They did that and they were very effective in doing it.

But the fact of the matter is now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I was quiet, Mr. Speaker, I said not one syllable when the hon. member spoke, nor did I when the Leader of the Opposition spoke.

Now, all I am asking is that I be able to make my submission in silence, in the same way the member for Bonavista North did, and that is all.

Mr. Speaker, we are now in 1985 - 1986 and that is what matters. Between 1985 and 1986, January to January, there are 10,000 more people working. That is a fact. In the last four months we have created 8,056 jobs and we will be publicizing that all around the Province over the next couple of weeks, publicizing it everywhere we can. The Minister of Social Services, who is not in his chair at the present moment, through his department created 12,000 jobs, took people off able-bodied relief, or who -

MR. BARRY:

Phantom jobs. Phantom jobs.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Twelve thousand. There were 12,000 by Social Services alone through 1985. There have been 8,000 in the last four months, Mr. Speaker. So we are going in the right direction.

The unemployment rate, January to January, demonstrates that we are down over 5 per cent generally, and with the youth, from eighteen to twenty-four, we are down over 6 per cent. We are down more in our unemployment rate in Newfoundland from January to January than any other place in Canada. So, obviously, we are not moving in the wrong direction.

If they want to cite history, from 1981 to 1985, then they are the guilty party, because they were the party who sabotaged our attempts to create more jobs by trying to take away 700,000 square miles and feed it into Ontario and

Quebec. They have to live with that. I accuse them of being guilty of sabotage on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now that we have the Accord, now that we are negotiating, Mr. Speaker, because we have the Accord and we are close to getting an agreement for the green light on Hibernia, what do we find them doing now? They sabotaged from 1981 to 1985, they cannot do that anymore, now they have to concoct theories of all the ways in which Hibernia will not be developed. They lost on their sabotage. It worked for three of four years, but now that is gone. We have the Atlantic Accord, we are moving in the right direction. Now they have to try to create in the minds of the press and the people of Newfoundland that there is something inherently wrong with this Hibernia development, there is something wrong here, this cannot go ahead; this must be stopped, because this P.C. Administration just cannot get credit for it and, therefore, it is not going to go ahead.

Well, I have news for hon. members opposite. They are now guilty. They are now frustrated. I cannot believe to look at the Leader of the Opposition two years from now, I cannot believe to look at him. His blood pressure now is way above the norm, where is he going to be two years from now as we get these various projects underway and the unemployment rate continues to come down. I shudder to think where the Liberal Party is going to be come the next election.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

It is moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

February 20, 1986

NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

TEMPORARY POSITION

Manage. Analyst II
* Custodial Worker
* Stockhandler
* Stockhandler
* Retail Store Clerk
* Retail Store Clerk
* Retail Store Clerk
* Stockhandler
* Stockhandler
* Stockhandler
* Retail Store Clerk
Community Deve. Off.
Clerk-Typist I

Native Employment
Officer
Community Deve. Off.

INCUMBENT

Donald Seaward
Gus Barbour
Lewis Ford
Hank Andersen
Ivy Strangemore
Susan Sheppard
Elizabeth Winters
Levi Nochasak
Edward Gear
Henry Mistenapeo
Elizabeth M. Nui
Terry Nippard
Sheila Goudie

Vacant

Mervin Linstead

STATUS OF POSITION

Internal Competition
* Local native persons hired from
the Northern Communities to work
in the Labrador Retail Stores
operated by the Department.

Internal Competition
Student Moved to Temporary
Position
N/A

Internal Competition

AGRICULTURAL BRANCH

(Continued)

<u>TEMPORARY POSITION</u>	<u>INCUMBENT</u>	<u>STATUS OF POSITION</u>
Dept. Program Co-ordinator Agriculturist III	Reginald King	Competition/Public Service Commission
Agricultural Tech.	Linda Bartlett	Competition/Public Service Commission
Agricultural Tech.	Robert Dicks	Competition/Public Service Commission
Clerk III	C. Dale Howse	Competition/Public Service Commission
Clerk II	Jeanette Decker	Transferred from Forestry (Depart- mental records do not indicate status at time of hiring)
Clerk-Typist II Agricultural Tech.	Vera Sullivan	Transferred from Forestry (Depart- mental records do not indicate status at time of hiring)
Agriculturist II	Joan Bowen	Internal Competition
Agricultural Tech.	Frances Smith	Internal Appointment (Previous Departmental Employee)
Clerk-Steno II	Donald Belbin	Competition/Public Service Commission
	Roger Churchill	Competition/Public Service Commission
	Barbara Walsh	Internal Competition

AGRICULTURAL BRANCH

TEMPORARY POSITION

Agriculturist III
Agriculturist III
Agriculturist III
Land Use Technician
Land Use Technician
Land Use Technician
Land Use Technician
Engineering Tech.
Cartographic Tech.
Land Use Technician
Agriculturist III
Word Processor
Equip. Oper. I
Land Use Technician
Agricultural Lab.
Technician I

INCUMBENT

Randolph Ricketts
Jeffrey Whalen
Herbert Burry
Richard St. Croix
William Snow
Harold Barbour
Dexter Whalen
Donald Howell
Henry S. Butler
Keith Mooney
Granville Martin
Denise Murphy
Cyril Hookey
Karen Ryan

STATUS OF POSITION

Competition/Public Service
Commission
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Internal Appointment (Previous
Departmental Employee)
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Student Moved to Temporary
Position
Internal Appointment (Previous
Departmental Employee)
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Internal Appointment (Transferred
from Another Temporary Position)
Internal Competition
Internal Competition

*Conserved to 4/1/56
20 Feb. '56*

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL, AGRICULTURAL & NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

TEMPORARY POSITION REPORT

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

TEMPORARY POSITION

Clerk Typist I
Clerk II

INCUMBENT

Donna Whalen
Catherine Williams

STATUS OF POSITION

Internal Appointment
Competition/Public Service
Commission

RURAL DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

TEMPORARY POSITION

Craft Marketing Spec.
Craft Design Spec.
Craft Deve. Off.
Craft Deve. Off.
Craft Deve. Off.
Economist I
Economist II

INCUMBENT

Georgina Queller
Donna Rammo
Karen Thistle
Maxine Cheater
Christine Benoit
Dan Fallon
Vacant

STATUS OF POSITION

Competition/Public Service
Commission
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Internal Competition
Competition/Public Service
Commission
Internal Competition
N/A