

VOL. 3

NO. 10

THIRD SESSION OF THE
THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL
ASSEMBLY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I have already discussed this matter with the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and he agreed that I could have leave of the House to make a short statement.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to give recognition today to a great Newfoundlander who will be inducted in May of this year into the Canadian News Hall of Fame. He is a journalist who has won widespread respect, not only in his native Newfoundland, but the respect of all of Canada as well in winning the National Newspaper Award for Feature Writing in 1968 and the Stephen Leacock Award for Humour in 1981.

Mr. Speaker, the man of whom I speak is none other than one, Ray Guy -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - whose rapier wit and pen were formidable weapons in the political wars of the 1960s and the 1970s. There are only a few veterans of these wars now left in this House, Mr. Speaker. I feel sometimes that maybe Mr. Guy should perhaps bring his pen back to the Newfoundland arena once again.

As one who has provided Mr. Guy with some of the fodder, Mr. Speaker, for his writing,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I know first-hand of the strength of his particular unique brand of humour. There are times that we thought that instead of being a great writer and a great writer of satire that he was an s.o.b. Nevertheless, Sir, he has done Newfoundland great and is now being honoured as a great Canadian literary figure.

Here is a small toast,
Mr. Speaker, that I would like to make to Mr. Guy:
It is written that the pen is mightier than the sword/
It must be, because your books are a big hit. / So, may I
wish you the very best and pray/you never mislay that
sword from where you sit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise
on the government side to support that motion presented,
I might say, in a rather peculiar fashion

MR. MARSHALL: in some respects, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Mr Guy is undoubtedly a distinguished Newfoundlander who has certainly made his mark on the journalistic scene. He might also, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman made oblique references to references to him, be styled as a revolutionary as well, because he contributed to a great extent, I think most people will agree, to a revolution which occurred. And I do not think we will get into what that revolution resulted in, but you do not have to look too far to see what the revolution did result in and he contributed to that. Indeed, Ray Guy with his humour and his ability as a journalist is another indication of the young breed of Newfoundlanders who have made their mark on the Canadian scene and we are certainly very proud that he has attained this very justifiable award and we add, with all members of the House, our congratulations to Mr. Guy on this great achievement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DAWE: Commencing the month of April 1984, the Motor Registration Division of the Department of Transportation will be inaugurating an entirely new computer system to register motor vehicles, licence drivers and perform related work.

This, Mr. Speaker, is another in a long list of improvements that have been developed in my department in recent years.

MR. DAWE: For example, in 1981 seat belt legislation was introduced in this House and became law on July 1, 1982, after an extensive public awareness campaign. Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have consequently become leaders in Canada in wearing such devices and this has resulted in fewer serious admissions to our hospitals.

In 1982, the Motor Registration Division introduced a method of staggering the issuance of vehicle licence plates. This has resulted in a much improved service to the motoring public in that certain vehicles are registered at certain months of the year rather than all having to be registered before the March 31st deadline.

Also, Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1982, Newfoundland became a member of the Canadian Agreement on Vehicle Registrations which is a plan of truck registrations whereby those involved in the Intra-Provincial Trade enjoy a greater deal of flexibility of operation and reduced fees. This plan requires drivers to pay only according to the number of kilometers they drive in each Province.

This latest improvement to the Motor Registration Division of my department, Mr. Speaker, this on-line computer system, will further enable our staff to provide a much improved and faster service to the motoring public.

Upon entry of a vehicle or driver transactions, the data contents are verified for accuracy and if acceptable the Motor Registration files will be updated and licences will be issued immediately. With

MR. DAWE: the implementation of this system the motoring public will no longer have to be issued temporary documents with regular documents to follow within a certain period of time. With such an immediate up-dating, all driver and vehicle records will be changed to reflect such information as validity of documents, changes of name or address, transfers of vehicle ownership and information on traffic violations and fines. This system will be invaluable to the police as an enforcement tool since it will provide immediate identification and status of records.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: Further enforcement facilities have been included to identify vehicles by serial number, colour, owner's name, make and geographic location. In designing the system, every effort was made to try and use elements or information that conform to standards used in other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, this new on-line system of issuing driver's licences has also made possible the implementation of an organ donor consent form whereby motorists will be able to indicate their desire to donate parts of their body for transplanation or research.

The organ donor form is an attachment to the driver's licence and for those motorists wishing to become donors the required information and conditions can be indicated on the form and remain attached to the driver's licence.

MR. NEARY: Why do you not donate your brain to science?

MR. SIMMS: For you it would be a minor operation.

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

MR. DAWE: In the case of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), if he wished to donate his brain it would certainly be minor surgery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

For those who do not wish to become donors, the form can be removed from the licence. Organs can be removed at most of the major hospital centres with programme co-ordination being provided by the Health Science Centre at St. John's. A permanent 24 hour telephone listing has been established at 737-6600 to accept all donations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, in responding to that Ministerial Statement, I might say that, number one, of course, I believe that most provinces across Canada already have most of what the minister mentioned there. He went back two or three years and talked about seat belt legislation and so on but I, along with the minister, compliment the staff of his department because all of these things obviously would have and could have been done if the minister had never existed, it is just par for the course. And as I said, most of it borrowed, the ideas are borrowed from other provinces. But we welcome it and I guess it means that perhaps the next step that the minister will be taking is going into the point system as they have in other provinces of Canada. But anyway there is nothing new there and the minister was really scraping the bottom of the barrel, I think, to come up with a Ministerial Statement today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). He was here and left again, I do not know where the minister is. He is coming again now.

I have a couple of questions, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Come By Chance oil refinery. Of course, I am sure the minister is aware as I am - I was informed on the telephone this morning by a Petro-Canada official - that the Come By Chance oil refinery will be scrapped in the not too distant future. I am sure that the minister is aware of that as well. But on March 16, just over a week ago, Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister several questions about the Come By Chance oil refinery. The

MR. CALLAN: Would the minister come clean on this matter? Would the minister come clean on it? What is the future of the Come By Chance oil refinery?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, Petro Canada has made a release on the future, and I am sure the hon. member has read it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the minister, I am sure, has read it as well. But last Fall I asked him questions and the minister evaded them and he evaded them a week ago and it seems as though the minister plans to do the same thing today.

Mr. Speaker, the scrapping of the refinery, would the minister tell the House does this mean that the storage tanks as well will be dismantled and carried away? What about the assets of the sale of the parts in the refinery? Will this Province get any money from the assets of the sale of the refinery? In other words, was that part of the agreement that this government made with Petro Canada when they passed over control of the refinery? Was there in that agreement a clause which said that in the event of a scrapping sale that this Province would get some of the money from the sale of these assets? The taxpayers of this Province have invested approximately \$50 million in that facility, will the Province be getting any money from the sale of the assets?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there was a very bad agreement made about the Come By Chance refinery, I forget what year it was but sometime back in the

DR. COLLINS: 1960s anyway, when this Province was put on the hook for monies going into the refinery with very little prospect of getting the monies back, no agreements whereby we would get it back if things went wrong, as of course they did and they were bound to do because of the way the whole thing was set up. So I do not know if that is what the hon. member was referring to when he said was there an agreement put in place when we put our money into this refinery to get it back. As I say, there was absolutely no agreement made at that time about that situation.

Now Petro Canada subsequently bought the refinery. They bought it at a considerably lower cost than the amount of money that went into it. At no time did the Newfoundland Government own the refinery. We were a minor investor in it with very little protection for our investment at the time it was made. When Petro Canada bought the refinery they undertook to do their very best to rehabilitate and to reactivate it. They have now had the refinery for

DR. COLLINS:

approximately five years, they have made strenuous efforts in a very, very difficult, almost impossible, really, world oil market, especially in terms of refineries, and they have now announced today that they are at the end of the line and that they see no prospect that it can be successfully rehabilitated, and they, of course, can now dispose of the refinery as they see in their own best interests. They are the owners of the refinery. They had an obligation with the former owners of the refinery to give them a certain amount of notice, which they have given. They also entered into an agreement with us and they had no obligation to do this because, as I mentioned, we were not in an ownership position at any point in time, perhaps we should have been, and if so there should have been something put into the agreement back in the 1960s. But anyway we never were in an ownership position but they did enter into an agreement or an understanding with us to keep us informed as to how the situation was unfolding. They did that, they did that approximately a month ago. I informed this House at the time that they had told us that the situation was still not such that they could see their way way clear to rehabilitate the refinery. I informed the House that we said, 'Would you please go back and review every prospect that you possibly can and try to come up with as definitive an answer to your future plans as possible? Because, of course, everyone is beginning to understand that after five years or longer monthballing the possibility of rehabilitation and reactivation are becoming very, very, slender and, even though there are only a small number of people working out there now, they have an increasing feeling of uncertainty. So Petro

DR. COLLINS: Canada undertook to do that. They said, 'We will try to get back to you before the end of the month.' It is now before the end of the month, and they have been back to us a number of times. And as the hon. member has indicated, they made a release today saying that in their best judgement, and they do not think they will have any cause to change this judgement, there is no possibility that the refinery can be rehabilitated by themselves or anyone else.

Mr. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should ask a supplementary to the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor). When I asked the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a couple of questions a week ago, one of the questions was handed to the Minister of Development and I asked what was the Department of Development doing to try and find a developer or whatever for the Come By Chance refinery. And let me quote from Hansard, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Development said, "In fact, we have had discussions with

MR. CALLAN:

"companies who may perhaps be interested in being involved in Come By Chance as part of a petrochemical complex. And from my perspective, at least at this point in time, it would certainly seem to me that if Come By Chance has a future, it may not be as a pure refinery but as a refining operation in conjunction with a petrochemical complex, and there is some interest in that.' The minister categorically says, 'We have had discussions with international companies that have some interest.'

Let me ask the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), in view of today's announcement, what happens now? Did the minister know what he was talking about last week? What happens now to the plant and the prospects? What happens to Come By Chance now?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, obviously that question was answered a week ago. Nothing has changed in that regard. We have had discussions with international companies that had an interest, they still have an interest and we will continue to pursue them.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) a question.

We have out there, Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure for an offshore development site. We have a \$20 million wharf out there. Come By Chance is a deep water port. It has all of the infrastructure, the roads and everything else there. Let me ask the minister

MR. CALLAN: what does the minister see for the future of that area? Will the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), will the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), will ministers of this administration be working like they were working, for example, to reactivate Baie Verte and St. Lawrence? Will this administration and will the Minister of Finance be commissioning studies to see what alternate plans can be put in place for that site, Come By Chance, now that the refinery is going to be gone?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member pointed out, there is a wharf out there. It is a deep water wharf, at least it is a wharf that can accommodate very deep draught, very large ships but, of course, it is not our wharf, it is the federal government's wharf. They put it there, I believe at a cost of something like \$20 million, and it is in their possession and they own certain works in front of it and so on and so forth. If there is anything to be done with that wharf now, I am sure the decision will have to be made by the federal government. I have no doubt

DR. COLLINS: that we will be discussing the matter with them about the final use and disposal of that wharf.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, also that in making the announcement today Petro Canada said that they would anticipate that the dismantling of the refinery would be completed by the end of 1986 and that in the meantime they will develop a plan in conjunction with the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador; that is, they will keep us informed, they will consult with us, they will be the ones responsible for actually drawing up the plan because it is in regard to their property, but they said that they will do it in consultation with us over the next couple of years.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: I presume that the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is aware that in the 1979 Provincial General Election the present Leader of the Tory Party, the present Premier of this Province (Premier Peckford), announced as one of the planks in the party's platform that the oil refinery would be reopened in ninety days. Now if the hon. gentleman is aware of that, could he please tell the House why that commitment was not honoured?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to receive from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) some document saying what he just said. I have never seen such a document.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, 1,381 days overdue now the Premier's promise. Some 1,471 days have gone by, minus 90, is 1,381 overdue. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) a question in connection with the oil refinery, because the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in his reply to my colleague a few moments ago said that there was no obligation on the part of the original owners of that refinery to give revenue, or to honour their obligation to the Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know what happened in the case of Eastern Provincial Airways, The administration there opposite left the final say for EPA go a couple of years when they could have had the final say. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Justice this, There were two or three companies established to build and construct the refinery, Shaheen Natural Resources and Newfoundland Oil Refinery Construction Limited,

MR. NEARY: Could the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) tell the House if in any of these agreements the company was on the hook and the Moores' administration let Shaheen Natural Resources off the hook? Our rights were protected, Mr. Speaker, we were the owners of that company in the event of default on the loans and so forth. Now would the hon. gentleman tell the House if in any of these agreements - and if the hon. gentleman does not want to answer me now he can do his research, go back over the agreements and read them because I remember it very vividly, Mr. Speaker - that Shaheen Natural Resources was committed to the Province but it was the Moores' administration, the same as this administration let Eastern Provincial Airways off the hook, the Moores' administration let Shaheen Natural Resources off the hook? Would the hon. gentleman confirm or deny this?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge the Moores' administration did not let Shaheen off the hook on any matter. When it became bankrupt any rights that the government had were exercised. There was certainly no deal that I am aware of, and I am sure anybody else is aware of between the Moores' administration and Shaheen Natural Resources, I think was the name of the company, and the company went bankrupt. But I am certainly not aware of any action that the government could have taken and a benefit accruing therefrom to the Province after Shaheen Natural Resources went bankrupt.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is answering my question off the top of his head. But I

MR. NEARY: recall, Mr. Speaker, that there were a number of clauses in these agreements that protected the public interests and, through the transfer of shares and so forth and so on, the Moores' administration left the public investment, the taxpayer investment, unprotected

MR. NEARY:

and, Mr. Speaker, that is where the trouble started. But I would submit to the hon. gentleman that he go back and read the agreement and he will find out what I am saying is correct.

But let me ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) another question in connection with that refinery that was alluded to by my hon. colleague.

This is a very valuable asset that is being scrapped, Mr. Speaker, and no doubt Petro-Canada will receive tremendous revenue through the scrapping of this resource, and the taxpayers of this Province have \$47 million invested in that refinery. What happens? Is the administration there opposite going to sit back, lay back and let Petro-Canada scrap that refinery and take the revenue and put it into their own coffers? Or will the administration there opposite make some attempt to recover some of the \$47 million that was invested by the taxpayers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, let it be quite clear on this, The Smallwood Administration entered into a terrible, terrible, terrible deal with the Shaheen interests, a total, you know, blowout, a bust. No investor in his right mind would have gone in on the grounds the Smallwood Administration went in on. Once they had gone in that way and circumstances occurred that did occur, that is, when the oil problems arose in the Middle East and so on and so forth, when all these things occurred there was no way that Newfoundland had any chance of getting its investment back. When this administration came in we were left with this terrible thing on our hands and we worked at it day and night for many months. The only protection we could get was through the agreement by Petro-Canada to keep us informed about certain things and to make their best effort. We had no hold over them as an owner, our

DR. COLLINS: investment had gone down the drain about ten or fifteen years before that, and the best we could get out of it, as I say, was to be kept informed by Petro-Canada, who are now the legal owners. They bought it from the people in Great Britain to whom the ownership of the refinery had devolved due to the bankruptcy of the Shaheen outfit and so on. So for the hon. member to suggest that somehow or other we can get monies back from the refinery now, it is cuckoo land, it is fairyland.

In so far as great revenues that Petro-Canada will get from this, I am sure Petro-Canada will have their own

DR. COLLINS:

words to say on that. But the information that we had when we looked at the refinery a long time ago, before it was certain what would happen to it, we found that the breakup cost would hardly be covered by the sale of whatever assets were salable. In other words, it was at most a break even point. There was no great benefits to anyone from breaking up, dismantling the refinery and trying to sell parts of it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this was indeed a good deal when it was made. What made it a terrible deal was what the Moores administration did when they changed the agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making a speech defending his, the Smallwood administration, which, thank God, is long since defunct. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to make a speech, let him talk about the hundreds of millions of dollars that was saved to the Province of Newfoundland as a result of renegotiating that. The Province today would have been liable for what Kleinwort, Benson had to pay. But, Mr. Speaker, if he wants to enter into debate, we will debate with him at any time, but it is not the time to talk about the defunct Smallwood administration which the hon. gentleman was a proud member of and which plunged us into near bankruptcy.

MR. MARSHALL: in this Province but for the advent of another government.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to Your Honour that there is no point of order, that I am merely asking questions of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the hon. gentleman obviously seems to think that I have touched a nerve. As the hon. gentleman is aware, it was the changes in the agreements and the transfer of the ownership of these companies that made it a terrible deal and that was done by an administration that the hon. gentleman was a member of. Hon. members can go back and check their Cabinet directives and check the agreements and they will see that this is true, Mr. Speaker. So I would submit there is no point of order. We are allowed a little bit of a preamble, Mr. Speaker, and I was about to put my question to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To that point of order, the Chair did recognize the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) on a supplementary question and certainly there is hardly a need for any kind of preamble in asking a supplementary question. It did appear that members on both sides were entering into a kind of debate on this issue. I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to pose a question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I was about to ask the Minister

MR.NEARY:

of Finance (Dr.Collins) if he would undertake to table all the Cabinet directives that have been issued on the oil refinery at Come By Chance since the administration took office on January 18,1972 , lay the information on the table of this House and let the members of the House and the media be the judge of who made this a terrible deal? Would the hon. gentleman undertake to do that?

AN HON.MEMBER:

From the beginning of the deal?

MR.NEARY:

the deal.

Yes, from the beginning of

MR.SPEAKER (Russell):

Finance.

The hon. Minister of

DR.COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is up to a lot of nonsense again. All this information was made public over the years, the whole sorry tale was laid out. Mr. Shaheen stood in this House and was questioned by members of this House through the piece. I mean, to suggest that this matter has not been thrashed out and the whole hopeless situation laid out and the finger pointed where the blame was is ridiculous. And I am sure the media will not be taken in by such a barefaced subterfuge.

MR.NEARY:

A supplementary.

MR.SPEAKER:

Leader of the Opposition.

A supplementary. The hon.

MR.NEARY:

I am not sure if I understood the answer to the question that I asked the hon. gentleman. Is the hon. gentleman refusing to table the Cabinet directives in connection with the changes that were made in the agreements on the oil refinery? Is he refusing to table these Cabinet directives that have been issued since

MR. NEARY: 1972? And if he is refusing, why is the hon. gentleman refusing? Why cannot this information be put on the table of the House to be scrutinized by the press and by the people of this Province and by members of the House?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Again, Mr. Speaker, the little game that is going on here, I am sure that anyone who has attended this House for any length of time knows all about it. Everyone is quite clear that Cabinet directives and Orders-in-Council are never made public. That is part of Cabinet secrecy. Now what the hon. member is trying to do is give the impression that that only applies to this case and therefore government has something to hide. Government does not table, never has, never will table Cabinet directives and Orders-in-Council. But what has been tabled is the whole sorry mess. And I will take this obligation in mind: I will ask the Clerk of the House to go back through the files and dig out all the information that was made available. There was voluminous quantities of it. It is all most unappetizing reading because of the terrible deal that the Smallwood administration put this Province into but I will ask the Clerk of the House to dig out all this stuff and load it up on the table and then if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) wishes to be a masochist and go through it he is quite welcome to do it. I am sure the press does not need to do it because they know

DR. COLLINS: if they would look up their own files they will know what was said about this terrible deal right from the word go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: My question to the hon. gentleman was whether or not he would table Orders-in-Council and the answer the hon. gentleman gave was that Orders-in-Council are private and confidential. That is not so, Mr. Speaker. Orders-in-Council are sent to the Public Accounts Committee, they are sent to various committees of the House, they are sent to various organizations around the Province. I have seen Orders-in-Council all over the place, Mr. Speaker, so the hon. gentleman cannot hide behind that statement he just made that Orders-in-Council are private and confidential. In actual fact, they are not and they have never been. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask the hon. gentleman again; would the hon. gentleman undertake to table the Orders-in-Council that have been made on the oil refinery since January 18, 1972? Yes or no.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Yes or no! What a dramatic request!

Mr. Speaker, we can go on like this forever, I suppose, but Orders-in-Council are not displayed all over the place. You do not find them in barbershops.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: You do not find fish and chips wrapped up in Orders-in Council and that sort of thing.

DR. COLLINS: Orders-in-Council are part of Cabinet secrecy. Sometimes the substance, the meaning and the effect of an Order-in-Council is passed on because it has to be passed on to someone, but the Orders-in-Council themselves are not the subject for public reading and public scrutiny. The substance of the Orders-in-Council reaching back to not only 1972 but reaching back to the 1960s when this terrible deal was struck in the first place - why anyone would want to do it, you know, boggles the mind - but anyway from the time this terrible deal was struck back in the 1960s by the Smallwood administration, the substance of those were tabled in this House in the various statements and the various releases made.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, everytime I go down to the grocery store I see on the shelf two little rolls or four little rolls in a package called 'budget', and every time I look at this little package on the shelves of the stores I cannot help but think of the hon. gentleman and his budget. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously is refusing to table this information. These Orders-in-Council, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman might not find them in the barbershops, but they are commonly distributed to the Public Accounts Committee,

MR. NEARY: I have seen organizations get Orders-in-Council sent them, Mr. Speaker, so therefore, the hon. gentleman cannot say that these matters are private and confidential.

Now, let me ask the hon. gentleman another question that my hon. colleague alluded to in his opening questions, Mr. Speaker. What about the storage tanks? Are they going to be dismantled and taken away? Also, Mr. Speaker, what will happen now when Hibernia goes into production? Does it mean that we will have to build another oil refinery in Newfoundland? Has the administration abandoned the idea of refining oil?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am asking a question.

Has the administration now abandoned any idea they might have had of refining and processing oil in this Province and have they given up on a petrochemical industry for this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Finance?

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as the statement by Petro Canada said, they will be fairly soon bringing forward a plan to implement the decision announced today. The effect of that decision will extend over approximately a two-year period. They will be discussing the whole matter with us. I am sure that the oil tanks themselves will be in that plan, and when that plan is brought forward, we will be able to see what they intend doing with them.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) also asked, 'Are we going to build a refinery?' He is very imprecise in his use of words. I do not know what he means by 'we'. If he means

DR. COLLINS: the Opposition, they are not going to be in a position to build anything. If he means government, government has never at any stage said we are going to build a refinery. If he means we, the people of Newfoundland, I cannot speak for the private sector in this Province. If he means we, as Canadians, again I cannot speak for the private or the public sector in Canada. Who does he mean by 'we'? 'Are we going to build a refinery in the future?' If he can define his question, I might be able to make a shot at answering it.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would direct this question to either the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) or the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) or the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor).

In light of the decision to dismantle the Come By Chance refinery, have there been any discussions with respect to, at the very least, maintaining the tank storage facilities in the context of a need for such tankage from a Hibernia development?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member was asking have there been any discussions about the tanks. Yes, there were discussions about the tanks.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: And has there been a decision to maintain those tanks for use in any future Hibernia development?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I do have to go back to what the statement put out by Petro Canada said and what I said. They will bring forward a plan for implementing their decision and I am quite sure that the disposal of the tanks will be part of that plan and they will be discussing that plan with us over the ensuing months or however long it takes to put the plan in place.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue, a supplementary.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, let me ask the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) what happens to the eighteen employees who are presently employed at the refinery? How soon will they be laid off and will there be alternate employment found for them by Petro Canada? Can the minister tell us that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, we do have firm undertakings from Petro Canada. They will make very effort to find alternate employment in their own operations, either here or elsewhere in Canada, for those eighteen employees. And if a particular employee, or one

DR. COLLINS: or two employees cannot avail themselves of that, because the positions are not there or they do not wish to do it or they do not wish to move away or whatever, there will be the usual severance pay type of arrangements put in place.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The time for the Question Period has expired.

Before we continue, it is a pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today the Mayor of Makkovik, Mr. Toby Anderson, and the Town Clerk, Mrs. Myrtle Groves, from the district of Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Livestock Act," carried.
(Bill No. 4)

On motion, Bill No. 4 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Elevators Act," carried. (Bill No. 3)

On motion, Bill No. 3 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Boiler, Pressure Vessel And Compressed Gas Act," carried.
(Bill No. 2).

On motion, Bill No. 2 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

March 26, 1984

Tape No. 363

NM - 3

On motion that the House resolve
itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply, Mr. Speaker
left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

We are discussing a resolution pertaining to Bill 10, Interim Supply.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we have another example before us today of why this administration have a reputation for closing up industries, for shutting everything down in this Province, a shut-her-down administration.

Mr. Chairman, back in the 1979 - by the way, Mr. Chairman, I have to say this, that we do not need a lecture from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) on what we are currently debating before the House, we are well aware it is the Interim Supply Bill. But, Mr. Chairman, what is happening is that the administration there opposite is asking the House to approve \$600 million, over \$600 million or over 25 per cent of the total budget, Mr. Chairman, so that the administration there opposite can carry on their same policies, can proceed on the disaster course that they are on. And, Mr. Chairman, the reason why we are debating from this side of the House the way that we are is because we are trying to convince the administration to alter their course, to change their course, to change their direction, Mr. Chairman, because as hon. members are aware, the administration is on a disaster course. They have one failure after another, Mr. Chairman, one failure after another. They have no success. They cannot point their finger at one success they have had in the past twelve years, since the Tories took over in this Province, just one string of failures after the other.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have no alternative on this side of the House when the administration are asking for three months supply, or \$600 million to carry on the

MR. NEARY: same tired, worn out policies.

So we have to take advantage of the situation to try to persuade the administration there opposite that they are on a disaster course, that they are going to ruin the economy of this Province, that they are going to push Newfoundland over the brink and into oblivion forever. Mr. Chairman, we have an incredible financial mess brought about by the mismanagement and the incompetence of the administration there opposite and that is why we have to debate the Interim Supply Bill the way we are debating it.

So now I go back to how I started my few remarks there a couple of moments ago, and that is, Mr. Chairman, to point out to the House the fact that the administration there opposite, led by the hon. gentleman, promised the people of this Province back in 1979, in a provincial general election—

MR. TULK: No, when he was elected leader.

MR. NEARY: When he was elected leader. Yes, when he was elected leader of the party just prior to the election, and then during the election repeated his promise. And what was his promise, Mr. Chairman? What was the hon. gentleman's promise? To show you what kind of a track record the hon. gentleman has, his promise was that ninety days after he became Premier of this Province the oil refinery at Come By Chance would reopen, ninety days. 1,471 days ago the hon. gentleman made that promise.

MR. TULK: No, 1,472.

MR. NEARY: Leap Year, that is right. My hon. colleague is absolutely right. I made a mistake here in my calculation. As this is a Leap Year, 1,472 days ago the hon. gentleman made a promise the same as he did on April 6, 1982, when he promised the people of this Province if they gave him a mandate the hon. gentleman would deliver an offshore agreement.

MR. NEARY: And now they are hedging on that, they are saying now they cannot deliver an offshore agreement, they are going to wait until after the next federal election. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman was not given a mandate to play political games.

MR. TULK: Tell them what Mr. Mulroney said today.

MR. NEARY: What did Mr. Mulroney say today about it? Read the Evening Telegram today and see what Mr. Mulroney said about it. He said that it is very unlikely - Mr. Chairman, listen to this - it is very unlikely - do you have his exact quote there? - very unlikely that Mr. Trudeau even if he wanted to could give the resource back to the Province.

MR. TULK: Who says that?

MR. NEARY: 'The federal PC leader says he feels the "tremendous wealth" of Newfoundland's offshore resources should "first and foremost" benefit the Province, which in his opinion has "not gotten a fair share from Canada so far." Mulroney stated his position in a meeting with the Financial Post's editorial staff.' 'Mulroney said after the Supreme Court of Canada ruled Newfoundland did not have jurisdiction over its offshore resources, he went to the House of Commons and encouraged Energy Minister Jean Chretien to immediately "send a signal out" to the Province to start negotiations. The basis of such negotiations, Mulroney said, must be that 'benefits go principally to the people of Newfoundland.' In considering the issue he has come to the conclusion' - listen to this, Mr. Chairman, I want the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the hon. the Premier to hear this - 'In considering the issue,' he said, 'he has come to the conclusion that the federal government must ensure early development of the resource and devise a formula that ensures Newfoundland and Labrador will be the first to benefit.'

MR. NEARY: 'Mulroney said he doesn't anticipate the federal government giving Newfoundland jurisdiction of the offshore.'

MR. TULK: Who?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Mulroney, the great Tory, the hopeful, the great white knight on horseback, the saviour of the Tory party, so we are led to believe by the crowd there opposite.

'Mulroney said he doesn't anticipate the federal government'- and listen to this, Mr. Chairman, just listen - "... the day when the Prime Minister can sign a piece of paper and say I am hereby giving you the offshore... that's gone," he said.'

Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. What did the Tory leader say, the one that they are placing their hope in? He says, "...the day when the Prime Minister can sign a piece of paper and say I am hereby giving you the offshore... that's gone."

'Even if the Prime Minister did say that, Mulroney said, he could "no longer deliver the goods" if the provinces said no.'

Mr. Chairman, do I have to repeat that again? Because I am afraid I have not got the ear of the hon. gentleman.

'Even if the Prime Minister did say that, Mulroney said, he could "no longer deliver the goods" if the provinces said no.' If the provinces said no they could not deliver the goods. And now they are telling us - and now he is leaving. No wonder he is running away. After Question Period every day he scoots out of the House, Mr. Chairman. He cannot stand the heat. 'Even if the Prime Minister did say that, he could "no longer deliver the goods" if the provinces said no.' So what are we talking about,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman? We are talking about a Constitutional change which will be vitually impossible to bring about at the moment because you have to get the agreement of at least seven provinces of Canada. And so that is gone down the tube. Now what are they going to hang their hat on next? The Premier said he would deliver an agreement, 'Give me a mandate.' Just the same as he said, I will open the oil refinery, 1,382 days ago, if you give me a mandate. And 1,382 days later the oil refinery is being scrapped and taken away and sold. The taxpayers of this Province have lost \$47 million or more because of transfer of ownership, because of changes in the agreement that were made by the Moores administration, another Tory administration. They cannot deny that, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. gentleman, as I said during the Question Period, cannot hide behind the fact that Orders-in-Council are not for public consumption. What silly nonsense. What silliness, Mr. Chairman. I will bring up some Orders-in-Council from my files tomorrow.

MR. DINN: Where will you get them?

MR. NEARY: Down in my office. Mr. Chairman, I did not get them down at the telephone company. I am not on the payroll of the telephone company or I was not before and after I became a member of the Cabinet.

MR. DINN: I was not a mushroom grower either.

MR. NEARY: I am not being bribed by the telephone company, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: so if I were the hon. gentleman I would just keep quite. The Orders-in-Council, Mr. Chairman, to which I refer are public information, they are in the public domain. So the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) can very easily lay on the table of this House the Orders-in-Council showing the changes that they have made. I have them somewhere in my file if I can only find them.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be on Interim Supply but the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) sets the tone for the debate just about every day and I would like to deal with a couple of the points that he attempted to make. With respect to Orders-in-Council. The hon. gentleman knows that Orders-in-Council are generally not public documents. The only ones that I know were public documents were back in his day, when Mr. John. C. Doyle would go around with an Order-in-Council saying, 'I have here from the Newfoundland government \$119 million.'

MR. SIMMS: Where would he carry it?

MR. DINN: He carried it around in his back pocket, given to him by Joey. The hon. member did not know what was going on even though he was in Cabinet but these things used to be given out, Orders-in-Council, so that Mr. Doyle could go over to Europe and peddle that to build a linerboard mill. He would go over with an Order-in-Council saying, 'I have \$119 million that the Newfoundland government

MR. DINN: will guarantee and now I can build a refinery. Come on over to Newfoundland, I mean, these guys are easy pickings. And now he is bringing up another smoke screen here today with respect to the refinery. Well, let us have a look at what happened with the refinery. Mr. Smallwood signed an agreement with Mr. Shaheen and the agreement basically said, here is \$35 million that we will give you, approximately \$35 million, plus any interest that accrues because of giving that \$35 million cheque to Mr. Shaheen, here it is, go on out now and see if you can build an oil refinery for us out there in Come By Chance. You can have the land and you can have whatever else you need. And if there are any worries in the money markets of the world about this refinery we will guarantee it, the Newfoundland government will guarantee every penny any bank, Kleinwort, Benson or ECGD may put in jeopardy on that refinery.

Here is \$35 million and we will pay for that, do not worry about that and here is an agreement whereby we will guarantee any losses or anything else on that refinery. Well, Mr. Chairman, that was another complete disaster in this country and if we had held to that agreement, if that agreement had not been changed, which it was, but if that agreement had held when the refinery went bankrupt we would be on the hook now for \$600 million. That is what this Province would be on the hook for and the Province would almost have to declare bankruptcy, or it would have to pay out this \$600 million. But what happened?

MR. SIMMS: That is not the way he described it.

MR. DINN: This is not the way the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) describes it, no. But he is talking about Orders-in-Council. Yes, Orders-in-Council were fairly regular things in those days.

MR. SIMMS: Yes, I know.

MR. DINN: Mr. Smallwood would go down in front of the London window and he would be having a Cabinet meeting by himself as the former Minister of Finance, Mr. Crosbie, would say. He would have his Cabinet meeting and he would make out his little Orders-in-Council. One for Mr. Doyle saying, 'Here is \$119 million, go over and pay it to Latin Europe and we will guarantee anything. Go out and build a linerboard mill in Stephenville.' And, 'Come on in, Mr. Shaheen, we have lots of money. You do not have to take any chances with us. Here is \$35 million. We will cover all the interest. And not only that, if there is even a thought that there might be a loss-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: We will pick it up.

MR. DINN: I mean, hon. members will get the documents because the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has asked the Clerks of the House to put all this together. It is all there in documented form and the hon. member can read it. It is about that thick, it will all be put together for the hon. member but he will not read it. He will go around in his little smoke screen. He goes around like that little fellow on 'Peanuts.' What do you call that little

March 26, 1984

Tape No. 366

ah-4

MR. DINN:

fellow on Peanuts that goes
around in a cloud all the time? Well, that is like the
hon. member over there. He goes around in his little
cloud. But that is basically

MR. DINN: what happened in the refinery thing. Just to explain to the hon. member again, \$35 million up front and, 'go out, Mr. Shaheen, we will guarantee anything else.' Now that is what happened. So they went out and they got their money and they built a refinery. Well, Mr. Shaheen came in again one day to the former administration, Mr. Moores, and he said, 'Mr. Moores, we are going to build a petrochemical complex. How do you like that?' Well, Mr. Moores says, 'Well, we are on the hook for anything that you do out there now. If you have all of this arranged, Mr. Shaheen, why do we not change this agreement so that we are not on the hook? I mean, we have to build roads and water and sewer, and we have things that the government has to do. We cannot be on the hook for the oil refinery at Come By Chance. And Shaheen, in his great, big way,' says, 'Well, there is no problem there, Mr. Premier, we can change that. Get your boys up and we can do another agreement.' So up came the phone and the lawyers came in and did a new agreement. Well, as a result of that agreement, we were on the hook for the original \$35 million because that was already paid out, but we were on the hook for nothing else after that. Okay, so what happened? Mr. Shaheen signed the new agreement, the Newfoundland government was off the hook. It is all there. The Clerks of the House will get it together for the hon. member. He should know about it. It is all public, you know, the press know it, the people of Newfoundland know it. And then what happened? So we are on the hook for \$35 million, and we are still on the hook for that, we are still paying the interest on that and so on. That is what we are on the hook for out in Come By Chance. But if we had gone by the way the agreement was originally written, we would be on the hook for \$600 million. Now does everybody hear that? Is that clear to everybody? If we had remained in the same agreement as signed by the

MR. DINN: hon. member's former leader, Mr. Smallwood, we would have been on the hook for \$600 million, approximately, plus or minus a few cents. That is what happened. The hon. members like to get up and downgrade and say things about Mr. Moores' bait, what Mr. Moores did was basically renegotiate that so that he saved this Province \$565 million that we are not on the hook for today. That is one of those deals that we are not on the hook for. So, Mr. Chairman, that was renegotiated. We are still on the hook for \$35 million, way back, plus the interest on that. We are still on the hook for that and, of course, we will never get out of debt for the things the hon. members have done. And we did the same thing with the Upper Churchill, of course, we had to buy back our rights there. But that is basically what happened and, yes, at that point in time Orders-in-Councils were a fairly free thing, you see. Mr. Doyle used to have them in his back pocket and one Order-in-Council was worth \$119 million or thereabouts, you know, plus or minus a few cents. Mr. Shaheen used to get them and he would put his in his back pocket with the \$35 million cheque, he would go over and negotiate a deal with the money markets of the world, whether it be the Export Credits Guarantee Department of Great Britain or Kleinworth Benson or whoever, he would get them all to come over, and, 'Do not worry about it, boys, because she is all guaranteed'.

MR. SIMMS: And bring them down to the private dining room.

MR. DINN: Oh, yes, they would go down to the private dining room and they would drink up a few glasses of wine and walk off with their \$119 million, no problem. And who would not start a business on that basis? Does the hon. gentleman was to start a refinery tomorrow? Here is \$35 million, and anything that is a possibility you might lose we will

MR. DINN: guarantee it and the people of Newfoundland will pay the cheque. Do not worry about it. Go on over and see what you can do.'

MR. SIMMS: I might give it serious consideration if you have a couple of minutes.

MR. DINN: Certainly. Okay. Well, you know, unfortunately, that kind of a deal is not in place right now. Hon. members or people in the investment community or private entrepreneurs can come into this government now and put their proposals there. We will have a look at them. There might be some assistance that the government can give through a truly recognized programme. I mean, there are none of these under the table jobs anymore and there are no Cabinet meetings held down in front of The London, New York and Paris in front of the mirror down there.

It is all done fairly according to correct procedure, you know, according to the parliamentary government we have in place today; it is not a one-man rule anymore. And that is basically what Moores, I guess, will be given credit for in this Province, for bringing democracy back to this Province whereby all the elected people in this Province have a say in what the Hell is going on around here. And the hon. member is quite right: In his day it was relatively easy, it was an easy thing to get an Order-in-Council. Their Orders-in-Council were worth fortunes. Can you imagine an Order-in-Council to build a linerboard mill for about \$119 million, to walk off with it to build a linerboard mill?

MR. SIMMS: There was nothing to it. How much was the mushroom factory worth?

MR. DINN: Well, I mean, we are not going to get into the mushroom factory. The hon. member has

MR. DINN: some information here. I would like to have more time. We only get ten minutes in these debates, Mr. Chairman, and I suppose we will have another ten minutes when the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) or somebody else gets up and brings up these red herring that he is always bringing up; you know, Orders-in-Council are all over the place. They are down in the barber shop and they are in wash rooms over in Halifax, where he gets some more of his information, or down in Panama. It used to be that way. Mr. Doyle used to have the odd one in his back pocket worth a few coppers that he could peddle.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. DINN: My time has expired, Mr. Chairman? Well, thank you very much. I will get back at the hon. member a little later.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: It is really sad and pathetic indeed when the only defence the administration has, when the only spokesman they can put up to defend their incompetence and their mismanagement is the likes of what we just heard. The little fellow, all he can do is - I suppose he learned how to plug in a telephone when he was down with the telephone company. He may have learned to plug in a telephone but I have grave doubts. But is that the best that they can put up, Mr. Chairman? to lower the debate in this House to about the lowest level that I have ever seen debate sink, Mr. Chairman. The administration should hang their heads in shame if he is all they have to put up as their spokesman, the likes of him - low class; no stature, no class, no

MR. NEARY: intelligence, Mr. Chairman,
just rotten to the core. So therefore I will say
nothing else about that. I should not even bother to
recognize him.

MR. HODDER: Do not stoop to that level.

MR. NEARY: No, I should not stoop to that
level. if that is the way they are going to rebut our
charges in our debates, Mr. Chairman. At least the
member for Trinity North (Mr. Brett) had sense enough
that when he is not familiar with a

MR. NEARY:

subject, he has sense enough to sit there and not get embroiled or involved in something that is over his head. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, who just took his seat showed what an ignorant incompetent he is when it comes to this matter -

MR. SIMMS: Unparliamentary.

MR. NEARY: - it is parliamentary - when it comes to the matter of the oil refinery. So that is enough, I am not going to say anything else about that.

But, Mr. Chairman, in due course the story of how the changes were made back in the 1970s by the Moores Administration, the previous Tory Administration, will get out. And not only changes made, Mr. Speaker, but I have to point out to hon. members of this House - are their memories that short that they do not remember? - I should not have to remind them -

MR. CARTER: Who are you talking about?

MR. NEARY: - that on the board of directors of these companies was none other than three prominent Tories.

MR. CARTER: Who?

MR. NEARY: Who were they? Mr. Crosbie, Judge Hickman, and Senator Doody were on for Newfoundland.

MR. CARTER: You do not have to criticize them for it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am saying they were on there to protect the taxpayers' interest, to protect the Province, that is why they were put on there, three honourable and brave gentlemen. And, Mr. Chairman, I might point out again for the benefit of hon. members of this House, when the biggest bankruptcy in the world was looming

MR. NEARY: on the horizon, not one of these gentlemen on the board of directors of these two companies knew the circumstances of the bankruptcy.

MR. CARTER: Sure they did.

MR. NEARY: They did not.

MR. CARTER: They knew he would not pay for his oil. He never paid for his oil first nor last.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as I say, the story will come out in due course. I have all the information somewhere in my file. I have the Order-in-Council. I was just going through my old records there, I will find it eventually, that back in the 1970s, because of transfer of shares, because of a change in the status of the company, the Moores Administration, the previous Tory administration, let the owners off the hook.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have my own suspicions as to why that happened. I have my own suspicions, because at the time, if hon. gentlemen will remember, at the time in this House we had a debate on the oil refinery and on Ataka. And, if hon. gentlemen will recall, I asked the Premier of that day if he had ever heard of Ataka before the oil refinery went bankrupt, and he told me that he had not. And so, if hon. gentlemen will recall again, I trotted out a letter and laid it on the table of this House to indicate that Mr. Moores, who was the Premier at that time, was aware of Ataka, did know of Ataka, even though hon. gentlemen there opposite may not have. And how do I know that, Mr. Chairman? Well, I have here in my possession a letter that was sent to Mr. Moores on August 29, 1974, prior to the oil refinery going bankrupt, when he kept telling this House he was not familiar with Ataka. I will read the letter just to refresh hon. gentlemen's memory.

MR. NEARY:

"Your Excellency Premier Moores:

I would like to take the liberty of submitting to you a general proposal for the development of the iron ore resources of the Julian Lake deposit as attached herewith. Since this proposal is based on information gathered from the steel mills of Japan, who have studied the Julian Lake deposit from the general information which they have gathered from reports of the Wabush Lake project and the Wabush Iron Ore Company, and Carroll Lake project,

MR. NEARY: "whose operations are adjacent to Julian Lake deposits, and because the geographical, physical and climatical conditions are similar, we feel that the layouts equipment and the estimate costs are very realistic, except for the fact that it must be understood that all estimates are subject for review and adjustments when actual feasibility studies have been completed. I would appreciate it very much if you would kindly study the proposal and give me your candid opinion and comment, so that this proposal could be refined further." Now who is that signed by?

Now, remember this letter was written before the oil refinery went bankrupt, before the administration opposite then cared to admit that they even heard about Ataka. Now who is this signed by, this letter to the Premier? It is signed by none other than Mr. S. Takagi, Managing Director of Ataka Company Limited, Mr. Chairman. So we can see, Mr. Chairman, the wheeling and dealing that was going on in the Cabinet at that time. And we can see how deals were being made with the Japanese over the Julian Lake iron ore deposits, while at the same time they were turning a blind eye to what was happening in the refinery because the Japanese felt that by giving these unsecured loans and guarantees for the refinery that they were investing in their long-term future in this Province.

MR. CARTER: Would the hon. Leader permit a question? A serious question?

MR. NEARY: Sure I will permit a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) on a question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By leave.

MR. CARTER: A serious question to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Does he, in his opinion, believe that

MR. CARTER: John Shaheen ever intended to pay for any of the oil that he got and contracted from the Japanese?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is a question I cannot answer. That question would be better directed towards Mr. Shaheen. But I do have to say this to the hon. gentleman; the hon. gentleman will remember this debate because he was here, that the Premier of that day cannot plead ignorant, cannot say that he did not know what was going on.

Now the three gentlemen who were on the Board of Directors, Messrs. Crosbie, Doody, and Hickman, may not have known what was going on because Mr. Moores was going around behind their backs wheeling and dealing with the Japanese, making deals with the Japanese, Mr. Chairman. And I do not want to rehash that debate over again, but I raise this merely to illustrate to the House, Mr. Chairman, that there was an agreement, a firm agreement whereby the taxpayers' investments in that refinery were protected, and the administration there opposite gave up the final say, gave up their right. The three gentlemen who were on the Board of Directors at that time, Crosbie, Doody and Hickman, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, did not keep the administration fully informed as to what was happening in connection with that refinery. Maybe they were disinterested, maybe they did not want to have anything to do with a Liberal project or a Smallwood project, but the fact of the matter is that there was three members on the Board of Directors representing the provincial government.

MR. CARTER: They could never get answers from Shaheen, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they were on the Board of Directors and no money could be spent on the construction of that refinery without their say-so or no transfer of shares. The status of the company could not change without an

MR. NEARY:

Order-in-Council, that is what I am trying to tell the hon. member.

MR. CARTER:

We could never get any answers

from Shaheen.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman says, 'We could never get the answers.' The fact of the matter is that the hon. gentleman was in the driver's seat.

MR. CARTER:

I was not.

MR. NEARY:

Well, the administration that he is supporting was.

MR. CARTER: No, they were not. They could get no cooperation from Shaheen.

MR. NEARY:

And they let it go, Mr. Chairman, they let the final say go, the same as they did with EPA.

MR. DINN:

And saved \$600 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, actually we could have sat down and passed Interim Supply, I suppose, really. Does the hon. gentleman wish to pass Interim Supply?

MR. NEARY:

Pardon?

MR. MARSHALL:

Does the hon. gentleman wish to pass Interim Supply?

MR. NEARY:

Well, if you do not wish to say anything, I will get up and speak again.

MR. MARSHALL:

Well, okay. Mr. Chairman, nothing gets the hon. gentleman going more than to have to get up and come to the defense of John Shaheen. I mean, that is all, just mention John Shaheen, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. gentleman is off in orbit. This particular refinery and the position we are in now is another example of the lack of sensible development plans that this administration and the previous administration

MR. MARSHALL:

was left to try to unravel.

I want to deal with one thing though that shows the hon. gentleman understands the subsequent transactions any more than he understood the initial ones because, remember, that this refinery was originally, as the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) indicated to me, envisaged on the carriage of orange juice. They were going to take - imagine anything so absolutely crazy! - they were going to refine oil here and bring it down South, down to Panama or wherever it may be,

MR. MARSHALL: and that they were going to unload the ships and they were going to bring orange juice back to the people of this Province. Now, can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, anything more sensible in this day and age as you look backward and you see that the hon. gentleman supported a proposed industry that was going to bring orange juice to the people of this Province, Mr. Chairman? The hon. gentleman has been juiced up ever since on Mr. Shaheen. What a great imperial concept that was. That was the nature and extent of the depth of the enquiry into the feasibility of that particular project.

Now it is too bad the hon. gentleman is going, because there is one thing that I do want to draw to this attention, which he just does not understand, which is apparent by the words that he is uttering here. He thinks that the so-called transfer of the shares somehow or other were detrimental to this Province. The transfer of those shares, Mr. Chairman, resulted in this Province being freed from a liability of between \$140 million and \$200 million. Kleinwort, Benson were the financiers of that project, and, as the project was set up it was set up as a holding company, and it was only set up as a holding company by the hon. administration there opposite for the purpose of tax protection from federal taxes to this particular project. So the shares were held at the time by the government of the Province with an option to repurchase by Shaheen as soon as the indebtedness was repaid at a nominal sum, purely and simply for the purpose of tax protection. And there was never any real ownership in the sense that there was a beneficial ownership in the shares of that particular corporation, because it was protected with an option, and

MR. MARSHALL: an option to, as I say, to transfer them so there was a tax benefit because it was a provincially owned corporation in the pure technical, legal sense and the project could operate, if it operated with a profit without paying taxes.

MR. CARTER: A tax benefit to Shaheen.

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, a tax benefit to Shaheen, and of course we know, very sadly, it never operated as a profit, it operated at a loss. But that was the reason for it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the so-called transfer of the shares, what the transfer of the shares did, and they were achieved by the Moores Administration in its early days, in effect the transfer of the shares relieved this Province of a very substantial and considerable liability. It was an exercise in great dexterity in itself in order to achieve this particular transfer. And what happened was this: There was at the time discussion, I do not know how, in the name of Heaven, anyone ever contemplated an extension to the refinery, an extension to what happened to be a defunct refinery, At the time when the refinery was being opened, we remember with what hoopla and fanfare it was opened, with the QE II being used, and people going down to New York and getting on the QE II and coming up to Come By Chance. I understand the QE II has never been paid for first nor last. But at the time of the opening it was agreed, with the approval of the people who provided the financing, Kleinwort, Benson, that the shares be transferred away from the government of this Province to the people who were the beneficial owners.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Chairman, the net result of that is this, that it freed this government from a liability of about \$140 million. In fact, it freed this government from the liability which Kleinwort, Benson and the financiers had ultimately to shoulder themselves. Because you see, Mr. Chairman, the Government of Newfoundland would have, in a legal sense, owned those shares, there would have been in effect, although there may be a lot of people may want to argue about legalities and all the rest of it, but it would have put this Province in a position of having to honour

MR. MARSHALL: the indebtedness of that Crown corporation in the event of a default, purely and simply because it was a Crown corporation. Now people can say, because it was a Crown corporation, it was the corporation which owned the debt and not the government, but it is a fact that it would be very difficult indeed for any government to allow a corporation in which it had shares to go into bankruptcy and not honour the debt. So, as I say, the hon. gentleman never understood the project at its inception. You mention Shaheen and, you know, he just goes bonkers. We are talking about Interim Supply and the estimates and the hon. gentleman wants to talk about past history and Shaheen. But even though he is talking about past history and Mr. Shaheen, Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow to remain on the record the inexactitudes which will result as a result of accepting what the hon. gentleman is putting forth. In actual fact, the hon. gentleman, as I understand him, is saying that somehow we lost our rights by transferring of those shares. In actual fact we were bound to transfer those shares anyway; if there had been a profit we would have lost them anyway. But the real test was, Mr. Chairman, before the loss actually occurred, what happened is the shares were transferred and as a result of that there was a saving of liability. And it was a considerable saving of liability because this Province today would be the poorer by \$140 million to \$200 million as a result of that.

MR. CALLAN: More than that.

MR. MARSHALL: Even more than that, the hon. gentleman agrees.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, because of the Premier's procrastination on the offshore.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, anyway, the hon. gentleman is about as sensible as his leader, and that is not saying too much, you know.

MR. MARSHALL: But that is the situation. As I say, the hon. gentleman wants to talk in the past. We are talking today about Interim Supply, we are talking about the estimates of 1984. We are not talking about Mr. Shaheen, who is long since gone, thank God. We are not even talking about the culpable negligence that the hon. gentleman was a party to when he was on this side of the House. What we are talking about, Mr. Chairman, is Interim Supply, and I invite the members of the Opposition to do the same. As I said on Friday, the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has delivered his budget. In that budget there are many beneficial items that are there for the purpose of debate. There is the hospital construction at Salt Pond; there is the continuance of the Clarendville hospital; there is the continuance of the planning with respect to the Central Newfoundland Hospital; there is the finalization of the hospital in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) district, in Channel - Port aux Basques, which is about to be opened. There is plenty of room there for debate with respect to the new super fish company and the implications of that and its affect upon the people of this Province. There is the possibility of debate with respect to the initiatives taken, through the Minworth Corporation, to reactivate the mines in St. Lawrence. There is a possibility of debate with respect to the new graving dock that is being made possible as a result of a contribution by this government to the capital cost thereof. And it is a disgrace, I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the government has to do it because that is a federal Crown corporation, CN. And, once again, in order to get the federal agency to comply with its obligations - and I have to say that this federal agency is very sympathetic to the people of this Province and would wish to get it from the federal government - the provincial government has had to jump in again as it did with respect to the synchrolift.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: So there is that to debate, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just invite the hon. gentlemen there opposite to talk about relevancies of the day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, it seems that at this stage the only way that the Come By Chance refinery might be saved would be for the government to sit down and negotiate an agreement with the federal government with respect to the offshore, and to see that one of the conditions of such an agreement, a condition which the federal government should be susceptible to in terms of maintaining local content in terms of getting probably the

MR. BARRY:

most efficient method of utilization and refining of the product of Hibernia, one of the conditions should be that we have a indigenous oil refinery, an oil refinery operational within the Province of Newfoundland. Now that has always been one of the basic premises which I understood government to take, that government would not participate in or co-operate in any plan for the development of the Hibernia oil field, or of other oil fields for that matter, if discovered, which would not see an operating oil refinery within this Province. I believe it is incumbent upon government to indicate whether it has changed its position now, whether, if it has the opportunity of negotiating an arrangement with respect to offshore development, whether with the current government or with a future government, has it scrapped the notion of having an operational oil refinery in this Province? If that is still an important consideration for government, then I submit that this latest development of Petro Canada, indicating that it wishes to scrap the refinery, this latest development is another indication of the imperative urgency of this government sitting down with the Government of Canada and negotiating a deal with respect to the offshore.

MR. CARTER:

What kind of a deal can we have when we have lost everything?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Chairman, if that were the attitude there would not be very much done with respect to the offshore. I would wonder, then, why the government has decided, for example, to maintain the Petroleum Directorate? Obviously there is the hope and the anticipation and the expectation, as there should

MR. BARRY: be, that there can be a deal made with the federal government. Now the member opposite, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) apparently must have spent the weekend reading Mr. Jackson's article in the Evening Telegram, which was carried as an editorial statement by the Evening Telegram. And I must say it just goes to show the simplistic analysis of the Evening Telegram on the offshore issue. I can understand Professor Jackson, who might not have been involved all that long on the offshore until he became convinced by the regular propaganda sheets that are produced by the Premier, but I have some difficulty in understanding how the Evening Telegram could accept such a simplistic statement of the offshore position. I had the opportunity to write a little letter to the editor in reply after reading this article and if the House does not mind I will just read this. I will be happy to table it if the House so wishes, Mr. Chairman. It is addressed to the editor of the Evening Telegram, St. John's. I do not know when it will be carried. I hope it will be carried before we get an opportunity to debate the

MR. BARRY: Private Member's resolution of the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn), which is the first resolution coming up on the Order Paper this Wednesday, on the offshore, to be followed by my own resolution in two weeks time. I said, 'Dear Sir: Professor Jackson's analysis of the offshore resources issue carried in your paper on March 24, 1984 was disappointing. Like him I disagree with the conclusions of the Supreme Court of Canada. Unlike him I believe that we can do something in the near future to bring about agreement with the federal government and Constitutional change to reverse the effects of the court's decision. Professor Jackson contradicts himself. On the one hand he states that no agreement is now possible with the federal government, on the other he suggests that our only salvation lies in having a political will. The political will to do what? Apparently to bring about Constitutional change. Does he think such change is possible without agreement? The Jackson analysis was flawed by several unsupportable assumptions. First he refers to "those who have plotted to deprive us of our resources and keep us poor". In the same vein he mentions, "the infamous and despicable pressure of a centralist thinking regime." Now in the thirteen years that I have been involved in the offshore cause, I met many who disagreed with my view of the law and with my concept of which government powers should be held by the provinces and which by the federal government. But their disagreement was the result of beliefs sincerely held rather than of any sinister plot.

Second, Professor Jackson assumes that to be a true Newfoundlander one must avoid questioning whether the Peckford administration is approaching the offshore issue in the proper fashion. He decides that the Premier has integrity and sincerity, and he ignores the criticism that the Premier, by his image of confrontation

MR. BARRY: 'and inflexibility, may have done more harm than good in the task of explaining the justice of Newfoundland's case to our fellow Canadians. Those who question the effectiveness of the image projected by the Premier are, he believes, fragmenting and weakening Newfoundland's cause.' Indeed, says our philosophy professor, 'they are all either "political enemies of Mr. Peckford" or "activists and lobbyists whose business it is to blame governments for everything anyway" or "cowardly pessimists" or "politically ambitious to cash in on Newfoundland's present vulnerability" or "carping" or "cynical or resentful" or - and this is the real laugh, this is supported by the Evening Telegram, by the way - 'or wishing to "advance media careers".' He lashes into the Newfoundland journalists and says that all of their comments are obviously designed to advance media careers, and the Evening Telegram's editors support this. I think the editors should have a little chat with their reporters.

'And I thought that attributing base motives to those with whom one disagreed had been discarded as a valid philosophical tool for discrediting arguments. What, I wonder, is the professor's view of the place of an Opposition in today's democracy? Does he believe that people cannot have the same objectives as the Premier and be just as interested in promoting Newfoundland's interests, but be concerned about whether he is going about things in the right way?

'Third, Professor Jackson wrongly assumes that the Newfoundland Government can now make an agreement with the federal government only by impliedly assenting to the Supreme Court of Canada's view of Newfoundland's historic status. I say

MR. BARRY: "we can, if we have the political will to do so, negotiate an agreement with the federal government which, if it did not immediately lead to the full package of rights associated with ownership, could contain a clause expressly disavowing the court's conclusions and reserving our entitlement to continue to work through the political process for constitutional recognition of such rights. And if the professor is saying that Newfoundland can never negotiate an adequate agreement with the federal government until the latter acknowledges our entitlement to full ownership, I say we will never know until we try. Professor Jackson's statement that "All the middle ground has been swept away by the decision," is the traditional cry of the political extremist. The Premier was prepared to negotiate on the basis of something less than full ownership before the decision and nothing has changed except that getting a proper deal now may be more difficult. Our bargaining power may have been weakened by the Supreme Court's decision and the loss of legal rights but it has not been destroyed. Our moral and political rights remain.

"The Peckford administration should be engaged in a cross-Canada media campaign to convince other Canadians of the equity of our cause and to put political pressure on before the next federal election."

I have just another paragraph to go.

"The Premier should request the federal government to immediately recommence negotiations. It will not be necessary to accept whatever is offered" -

MR. TOBIN: What is this?

MR. BARRY: It is a Letter to the Editor.
"The federal government should show its sincerity by indicating a willingness to sweeten its last offer" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: I think hon. members should listen now.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: "The federal government should show its sincerity" -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY: Just four or five more lines -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. BARRY: What? Not by leave?

MR. CARTER: By leave, yes.

MR. BARRY: Thank you, just to finish the letter. It is a great letter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time has elapsed.
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, just a word or two on the hon. member's comments. He has a bit of an advantage in that he had his remarks all written out and no doubt he sat down over the weekend and laboured over them, revised them and rewrote them and so on and so forth, so his comments sound very good. But I think that if one looks at many of them, you really have to wonder. For instance, one of the remarks he made was, 'Where does the professor think the Opposition stands?' You know, it is alright

DR. COLLINS: for the Opposition to take various positions because that is a duty of the Opposition. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is what we have always said in this House, that this is a matter where all Newfoundlanders have to support a supportable position and our position has been a supportable position. It has been presented to editors across the country and they have supported it, it has been presented to people in the petroleum industry across the country and they have supported it, it has been presented to most, if not all, of the provincial governments, and most, if not all of them have supported it. So ours is a supportable position and our situation is that if you read our proposal, can you point out where there is something wrong with it? And no one has ever actually pointed out anything wrong with the proposals that we have put on the table. So we say that we have supportable proposals there.

Now, the hon. member's argument still is, 'Oh, well, that does not matter.' In this issue, the Opposition still has to play its little games, they have to get in a crack here and there. Well, no one objects to the Opposition getting in their crack here and there in the ordinary course of events, but this is not an ordinary course of events, this is a very basic, fundamental thing that is going to have repercussions for our economy in our lifetime and in our children's lifetimes. And if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) feels that this is fair game just for little Opposition jibes and snide remarks, well, I

DR. COLLINS:

really think that he should sit down quietly over another weekend and think through really whether he just looks upon the offshore as grist to the Opposition mill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not, of course, hammer too hard on what the member opposite has said at other times. I would just point out though that on November 5, 1980 in Hansard, the member opposite, when he is referring to a letter that was written by Professor Jackson -

MR. BARRY: When was that?

DR. COLLINS: That was on November 5, 1980, and he refers to the letter, "I think it is an excellent letter, I must say an excellent letter written by Professor Jackman. I do not know if it has been referred to earlier in the course of debate. Has it?" Some fellow said, "Never heard of it." MR. BARRY: The title given in the Telegram of November 6, 1980, 'Trudeau's answer to Smallwood' was deceptive, Do you remember? And Mr. Barry goes on to say, "God bless him, he is a marvellous letter writer."

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, to revert to the point I was trying to make, I would urge the Opposition not to look upon the offshore as just an ordinary partisan issue and therefore the Opposition has a right to make jibs and jabs and jibes and so on and so forth. This is not an ordinary partisan issue. This is an issue basic to Newfoundland's future, to the future of our children, and to the economic welfare of this Province.

DR. COLLINS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the other thing the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, as though he is making some new statement that has never been made before, "The Newfoundland Government should sit down and reach an interim agreement in anticipation that at some point in time we may well in fact get our just rights under the Constitution." Now he states that as sort of pointing a finger of scorn at government as though government is not saying that. We are exactly saying that. We are saying we want an interim agreement until such time as the Constitution is changed. The only slight twist, and I say slight in a sort of derisive way, the only slight twist we put on it is that we are not going to enter into any interim agreement. We are going to enter into an agreement, we are going to fight for an agreement, we are going to negotiate an agreement, we are going to insist on an agreement that fully protects our rights. We are going to make sure that we have meaningful management offshore. Because that is the only way that we can protect ourselves and protect the people of this Province. We are going to make sure that we get a very beneficial revenue sharing arrangement, especially in the first years, and later on, when we are up to a national average, then there will be another arrangement as seems necessary by the circumstances pertaining at that time.

Now that is the type of agreement we are going to enter into. The fact that there is an opportunity to enter into some sort of an agreement does not mean we are going to rush in. We are going to make sure that we do not sell out our position in the interim as well as ultimately.

DR. COLLINS: And finally, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member opposite suggests that the government should immediately start a cross-country campaign. Well, you know, I do not really have to tell the member opposite this, that would not be something new. We have been doing cross-country work ever since the offshore was discovered out there. We have been promoting our position both during the Constitutional talks, during First Ministers' talks, during the Premier's speeches to various organizations, and various clubs on the Mainland, and in our regular meetings with other ministers. We put forward our offshore case the whole time.

So for the member to sort of imply that he is now giving the government some direction in this matter by saying, "Do you not think it is a great idea to start some sort of cross country campaign?" I mean, you know, that is a little bit laughable. However, we do disagree with him when he says that we do not need to get the message out to our own people. This message that we are sure is so important has been obscured many, many times. It has been obscured by speeches by the Opposition. It has been obscured by unthinking members, especially in the business sector of this Province. It has been obscured by certain members of the Mainland media. And if the hon. member thinks that I am chasing a ghost, I will dig him out some of the articles which state things that are totally

DR. COLLINS:

untrue and a total distortion of the facts as we here in this Province know them, and as it has unfortunately also been distorted and obscured by some of the people in our own media who sort of just follow on what federal politicians have said, or what Mainland papers have said, they have just gone along with the same old line sowing doubt. It is a reflection, I think, of a lack of confidence. You know, they think if someone outside of the Province says it, surely it must be right. If they say something and we say something and the two are different, surely we must be wrong. There is that fatal streak of lack of self-confidence in many Newfoundlanders, I do not detect it now in young Newfoundlanders. Young Newfoundlanders now are willing to stand up for their rights as much as any other youths in the country. So I think that is a dying trend and the sooner it dies the better. But there is no doubt about it that the people in this Province have to be told time and time again, they have to be reassured of the facts, they have to have the facts recall to their minds because the average person has many things on his mind. In the ordinary course of events, we have to make sure that the truth is known throughout the Province and it is vivid in the people's minds in this Province.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are going to make sure that Newfoundlanders continually are aware of what we know is right about the offshore case. We are going to make sure that the Canadian nation understands our case well. We are going to fight for an agreement, an interim agreement in the meantime, but it is going to be a good agreement. And, finally, we are absolutely convinced that the Canadian nation will ultimately give us in this Province what we rightly deserve. There is no doubt about that.

DR. COLLINS: The Canadian nation takes its time sometimes to arrive at the right conclusion, but this is a democratic country, it is a country with a tradition of developments in many parts of the country, and I do not think they are going to throw that all overboard now. I think that ultimately, in the not too distant future, we will gain the day.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Chairman, I will continue with my letter which, as a matter of courtesy in the normal course of events, I would have expected members opposite to agree to having it presented, but obviously it is hurting, Mr. Chairman. I am glad that it is getting through to them.

Now I will start the last paragraph, where I say, 'The Premier should request the federal government to immediately recommence negotiations. It will not be necessary to accept whatever is offered. The federal government should show its sincerity by indicating a willingness to sweeten its last offer made before the Supreme Court's decision. If the final offer is not adequate, we can try again after the federal election. But we owe it to our thousands of unemployed and to our weakening business community to return to the bargaining table as soon as possible. To adopt Professor Jackson's recommendation would be for us to refuse to talk to this or indeed the next federal government until somehow, without negotiation, our right to offshore resources has been recognized. This would be the governmental equivalent of the child in order to get its own way holding its breath until it turns blue. Even if the federal government turns blue, we will have to negotiate, without preconditions, to obtain the rights which we all wish Newfoundland to have.'

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was very

MR. BARRY:

interested in the statement by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that there is no need for any cross-country tour, when I read the report in The Daily News on page 3 today, where it tells about the Premier having started his cross-country tour with a speech to the St. John's Board of Trade and then the Premier taking the next leg of his cross-country tour to LaScie on Sunday, that is yesterday.

Now, Mr. Chairman, going across the Province is well and good, but I think we all know that 99.9 per cent of the people in this Province support our position on the offshore -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: - support the position of members opposite on the offshore. And members opposite, Mr. Chairman, are going to be unable to run this red herring that somehow we are disloyal Newfoundlanders, somehow we are traitors - that is gone, Mr. Chairman - because we dare question whether the Premier is going about it in the right way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: We are all looking for the same thing, Mr. Chairman, but that crowd opposite are taking us farther and farther away from achieving our objective.

I am delighted, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier is finally recognizing that he is going to have to do a cross-country tour. Now, the only concern I have is, is he going to accept the second part of our message, which is that he should change the image that he projects to our fellow Canadians? The only way, Mr. Chairman, that he will persuade our fellow Canadians of the justice and equity of our cause is if he gets away from this notion

MR. BARRY: that it is all for Newfoundland and to hell with everybody else, Mr. Chairman, which is not government policy, but which is the image which the Premier is portraying day after day after day in the mainland press. Now, the effect of that has been -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I would like a little quiet.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: I am going to have laryngitis if they keep trying to shout me down. I do not mind shouting them down in return but it gets a little hard on the vocal chords. I know, Mr. Chairman, they do not want to listen, I know that they want to try to shout us down if they could. If parliamentary procedure permitted it they would not want to hear anything which deviates from the party line. They would not want to hear anything which raised any question about what they are handed by the Premier, by Planning and Priorities, to get up and vote, one after the other, without thought, without criticism, with nothing more than blind obedience, Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are issues in this Province which merit every member in this House getting up and giving his own opinion, to give us his own honest and independent opinion, and the offshore resource is one of those. As the public of this Province expect, we have to find out from each member opposite whether he believes that the government of the day is promoting the objectives which we all wish to obtain. Is the Premier getting closer to the objective of getting Newfoundland involved in management of the offshore, of getting a fair share of revenue from the offshore?

MR. BARRY: Is the Premier bringing this Province closer to that objective or are we today further away than we were in 1971?

Now, Mr. Chairman, if I could just borrow my research notes here from my colleague:

Mr. Chairman, we see Mr. Mulroney in a statement to the Editorial Board of The Financial Post stating: "The day when the Prime Minister can sign a piece of paper and say, 'I am hereby giving you the offshore' that is gone." Now, what is it the Premier is now waiting for? Why will he not sit down with the present government? If Mr. Mulroney gets in, is this not an indication that he will have to bargain hard with him as well? And it goes on to say, "Even if the Prime Minister did say that," Mulroney said, "he could no longer deliver the goods" if the provinces said no. And I would like to know from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) whether this is so - I had an opportunity to look at the Charter and the amendment provisions -

MR. BARRY: as to whether the consent of other provinces is required. Now there are certain things where an amendment to the Constitution of Canada in relation to any provision that applies to one or more but not all provinces, for example, an alteration to boundaries between provinces, that may be made by a proclamation issued by the Governor General where authorized by a resolution of the Senate and House of Commons and of the Legislative Assembly of each Province to which the amendment applies. Now is that the section that applies or is it the section which would require the consent of other provinces where it talks about the extension of existing provinces into the territories? Now the Continental Shelf is not ipso facto a territory, but will the Continental Shelf be viewed by the courts as a territory so that any constitutional amendment, which purported to extend the boundaries of Newfoundland so as to take in the Continental Shelf, would that be treated under Section 42 of the Charter to require the consent of two-thirds of the provinces that have in the aggregate, according to the then latest general census, at least 50 per cent of the population of all the provinces?

Mr. Chairman, if it is the latter, if we are involved in a constitutional amendment that will require the consent of the other provinces, then the earlier that the process is started, Mr. Chairman, the better. The Premier has indicated that right now we have the support of the other provinces for our offshore ambitions. If he waits much longer there are going to be changes in the governments of other provinces, and then the process of educating those governments will have to start all over again. Now the time to start this process is now. And the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) should tell us whether we will have to have the consent

MR. BARRY: of the other provinces and, if so, when is the government, when are the members opposite, going to insist that the government start the process of seeing that constitutional amendment comes about and seeing that the consent of other provinces is received. And that can only be done by commencing negotiations today with the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
The hon. member's time has elapsed.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, one of the good things about the movement of the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) from this side of the House to the other side of the House is that now it can be a battle of ideas instead of a battle of words because certainly we were not going to get anything other than words from the scruff that is opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: So it is nice to see that the intellectual level of the Opposition has been raised by at least 200 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder, you know, the hon. member's letter that he has written for the Evening Telegram is rather long and woolly and I doubt if anyone will read it. I suggest he may well have taken the oath that I suggested. I imagine it was taken in private. I understand that no agreement is possible with the present federal government. It just is not possible to agree with this federal government. There will be a time when an agreement will be possible with the federal government, but it will not be until that government has

MR. CARTER: been changed. Now I hope that it is the government of Brian Mulroney, but even if it were not, as long as it is not the government of Prime Minister Trudeau, I am sure that we will be able to have some sort of a deal. But I would like the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) or some other - of course, there is no one of his intellectual equal, in fact, only a fraction of his intellectual equal, so I suppose I will not get anything coherent from any of the other members opposite. But I was hoping that the member for Mount Scio would continue on with this debate and spell out exactly what kind of a deal they would recommend, what would they have us sign, what would they have

MR. CARTER:

Newfoundland sign? Will they spell it out? No, they will not spell it out because they are afraid that if they try and come up with a deal, the only kind of a deal that Ottawa would sign, they will reveal their absolute bankruptcy of ideas. Now I think that the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) has fallen into a bit of a trap. Whereas it may be true that the other provinces will have to agree to any ownership agreement that may have to be put into the Constitution, still the federal government by itself can surely agree to a revenue sharing and a management deal that has no reference whatsoever to the federal Constitution, and I think that is the direction in which the answer must be sought. Our government has shown its willingness to set aside temporarily the ownership provisions and therefore I think that the answer surely lies in a management and revenue sharing area.

Earlier the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) pointed out that members should have to donate their organs if they are in an accident, and I was wondering what kind of a monster would be created if the entire Opposition were to get into a fatal accident. Imagine! How would you combine the mouth of the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the brain of the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the ideas of the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), with the face of the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), the brass of the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the looks of the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and the crust of the absent member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts)? I think that would create a monster but I will seriously ask that this composite monster, or at least one of them, get up and give us a sincere appraisal of what we should

MR. CARTER: sign for the offshore. Spell it out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I could not find words simple enough to spell it out for the hon. gentleman. If I spelled it out in just ordinary, Newfoundland, common sense language, the hon. gentleman would not understand it, his intelligence is so low. Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is a farmer and he knows the value of horse manure and he knows the value of cow's manure and he knows the value of hen's manure but, Mr. Chairman, he also knows that cat's manure, all it is good for is to create a stink and that is what the hon. gentleman just did. It is pure cat's manure, of use to nobody.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring hon. members back to the oil refinery for a couple of moments. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I was accusing the administration of completely bungling the oil refinery just the same as they did with the Lower Churchill and the Muskrat Falls. If they had opted to develop the hydro potential of the Lower Churchill back in the early 1970s when they took over control in this Province, it would have been feasible, just the same, Mr. Chairman, as it would have been feasible to operate the oil refinery when it ran into trouble. But the problem, Mr. Chairman, is that bungled it. And what did they do after they bungled it? They gave the refinery to Petro Canada, dumped it, gave it to them for nothing, at fire sale prices. I do not know if hon. members recall the total cost of that refinery, the original cost of the refinery. The original cost of the

MR. NEARY: refinery was \$200 million. In 1969 the replacement value of the refinery was between \$600 million and \$700 million.

MR. CARTER: That is rubbish. That refinery was never meant to work. It never did work. It is simple trash.

MR. NEARY: There is the cat's manure again.
Mr. Chairman, let me repeat what I just said just in case the hon. gentleman manages to distract any of his colleagues who may be thinking about bolting the party and coming over to sit on the decent and honourable side of the House, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is that that refinery, back in 1969, the original cost was \$200 million and the replacement value, or to build a new refinery, was between \$600 or \$700 million.

MR. CARTER: It never worked.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, add the inflationary cost to that, interest rates increasing and so forth, the replacement value of that refinery today would be \$1000 million, \$1 billion, the replacement value. And the Newfoundland have \$47 million invested into it and that is lost.

MR. CARTER: Pure lies! Lies!

MR. DINN: You people guaranteed all of it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, why does the hon. gentleman not go and play with the telephone cords.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the investment of the Newfoundland people was \$47 million and they lost that through a manoeuvre in Cabinet when they gave up control of Provincial Refining. Just the same as they gave up the final say on EPA, it was a Tory administration that gave up the final say on that refinery. And we have three Tory ministers on the Board of Directors, Mr. John Crosbie, MP, Senator Doody and Judge Hickman, who did not seem to be aware of what was happening. They sat on the Board of Directors, they were appointed by the gentlemen there opposite to protect Newfoundland's investment in that refinery. I can tell hon. gentlemen how the money was paid out, but I do not want to waste my time doing that and I do not want to get too technical. But I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, that the fact of the matter is that once the administration there opposite gave that refinery to Petro Canada it was doomed, and we said so in this House. If hon. members will recall, we objected to what they did. We told them it was going to be scrapped and all Petro Canada wanted was the storage tanks and the wharf that cost \$20 million. That is all they wanted to get their hands on. How wise we

MR. NEARY: were, Mr. Chairman! Our words have come true! The administration there opposite would not listen. Now, Mr. Chairman, what has happened today? Well, Petro Canada put out a news release saying they are going to scrap the refinery and take it away, valued at \$1000 million, and not one cent will go into the coffers of the Provincial treasury. It will go into the coffers of Petro Canada. And they talk about giving things away. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is even more serious than that, because what they are admitting and what they are saying in effect is this, that not a gallon of oil from the offshore development, from Hibernia will be refined or processed in Newfoundland. Mr. Chairman, that is what they are saying. They have abandoned any thought or any idea of refining or processing oil in this Province. Do hon. gentlemen think that once Hibernia starts producing oil somebody is going to come in and build another oil refinery?

MR. CARTER: Does the hon. member
(inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Whatever chance we had for a petrochemical industry is gone out the window, Mr. Chairman. And only a week ago the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), who is not in his seat, told us that people were looking at Come By Chance to look at the possibility of establishing a petrochemical industry down there. Was the hon. gentleman fibbing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. NEARY: He was not.

MR. TULK: He did not know what he was talking about.

MR. NEARY: He did not know what he

MR. HODDER: Oh, no! You did not give the refinery over to Petro Canada lock, stock, and barrel.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what else can I say about that situation.

MR. TOBIN: Who owns Petro Canada?

MR. NEARY: What else can I say about it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they had it in their hands and they threw it away, just as they had the offshore in their hands and they threw it away when they put the matter before the court. The biggest throwaway, the biggest giveaway the most colossal blunder in Newfoundland's entire history was when the Premier of this Province panicked and put the ownership of the offshore resources before the Newfoundland Appeal Court. The biggest blunder in our entire history! If the hon. gentleman's name goes down in the history books, it will go down, Mr. Chairman, as the man who threw away the last opportunity we had in this Province to get a good deal for Newfoundland. Just because of his stubbornness, because he cannot stand anything that is Liberal! He hates Mr. Trudeau, he hates the Government of Canada, he cannot stand to get along with anybody, he wants to fight and squabble with everybody. And he wants to continue his fight, so he told us, until after the next federal election. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is acting in the best interest of Newfoundland and the people of this Province.

MR. HODDER: He is hoping for another election.

MR. NEARY: He is hoping. He has already won two elections.

MR. WARREN: On the backs of the people.

MR. NEARY: Well, not on the backs of the people. He has already won two elections on it, now he is hoping that he can influence the outcome of the federal election.

MR. SIMMS: You are wrong again.

MR. NEARY: And, you know, Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that his strategy is not getting us anywhere. We are on a disaster course. The whole Province is just a welfare state. And the hon. gentleman just lays back and, in almost a sadistic matter, plays his little political games.

MR. HODDER: He is trying to keep us poor, as far as I am concerned.

MR. NEARY: Well, there is a lot to be said for that, you know. A lot to be said. Maybe his psychology is to keep the Newfoundland people poor, keep them on welfare, because if you make them prosperous then they might eat you up, just the same as what they say happened to Mr. Smallwood after twenty-three years of Liberalism. They say he educated the people too much. And in the Third World countries, leaders no doubt are watching this. If you educate your people, you make them prosperous they will eat you up. Well, that is the same psychology we are getting from the hon. gentlemen there opposite. Keep them poor; that is why they will not stimulate the Newfoundland economy, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

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

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I cannot sit still and listen to this nonsense without replying to it. In 1977 I went through the plant at Come By Chance, I asked the people who were running it if I might be shown through and they were very cordial to me and they did show me through, they showed me the whole plant. My conclusion as a result of that tour is that the plant was trash. It did not work properly then, it did not work properly before, and, as subsequent of events proved, it could not work. I do not think it could have worked even if

MR. CARTER: you had given them the oil.

Now what I saw was a refinery or a plant where live steam was pouring out at you, you had to watch your step to avoid being scalded, the flare tower was burning down like a candle, the control room was dirty and, as far as I could see, some of the instruments were not working.

MR. CALLAN: That is nonsense.

MR. CARTER: No, it is not nonsense. I was told later that the large storage tanks had no agitators in them so that the heavy oil would come in, the heavy parts would sink to the bottom, all they were doing was high-grading the lighter stuff that floated to the top. There was a large supertanker. I guess it was something like 1100 feet long, it was a 200,000 barrel supertanker at the wharf at Come By Chance at the time. We went aboard that, we were talking to the captain. I learned later that the oil was not all discharged into Come By Chance because they could not pay their bill. I learned later they had paid none of their bills. They did not pay for any of the oil. They did not even pay for the oil that The Queen Elizabeth burnt on that infamous blowout that they had

MR. CARTER: to open the refinery.

Now, I am no chemical engineer but I think any member of the general public who had been shown through that particular installation at the time, would have to conclude that it could not work. Now, I spoke to a couple of people who had worked on the refinery some years prior to that, and they said that the standard of workmanship was appallingly bad. And I think it is disgraceful for a responsible, supposedly intelligent Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to get up and serve up this kind of nonsense to this House where we are supposed to be telling the truth. We may abuse each other, that is our privilege, but we are certainly not supposed to stretch the truth. You may want to put the best face on things but the very best face that can be put on the installation at Come By Chance was that it was designed to transfer our money to somebody else. So there it is.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I think I described earlier what I think of the hon. gentleman's remarks and I say that now in spade, ditto. Cat's manure, that is what it is, Mr. Chairman. And, as hon. members of the House know, cat's manure is useful for nothing. All it does is create a stink. And that is all the hon. gentleman is trying to do, so I dismiss him forthright, just the same as I dismiss the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn).

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that they have goofed, they have blundered, and I believe, as I said when I wound up my last ten minute speech, the fact that the psychology of the administration there opposite -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder could I have this returned to the sender because I am afraid to open it, it might explode? Could we have it returned to the sender, Mr. Chairman? I do not know if there is anything of an inflammable nature in it, whether it will explode or whether we will get contaminated, but I would submit, Your Honour, that it be removed from the floor of the House by the security people and returned to the sender. Mr. Chairman, I notice over in Great Britain during the coal miners' strike they were tossing urine around. Now, I do not know if that is what is in the envelope or not, but I would submit that it be returned to the sender there opposite, Mr. Chairman. Get it out of the way, take it out of our sight before we get contaminated or before the air gets polluted.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, the fact of the matter is that they completely bungled the situation. We have lost the refinery. It was a good project. We have lost the refinery, Mr. Chairman, and we will never see another refinery built in this Province. Whatever opportunity we had to get a petrochemical complex is gone.

Now, I am not going to belabour the point. I want to come back for a few moments to the offshore resources, and I want to comment on a so-called editorial by Professor Jackson that I read in the weekend edition of The Evening Telegram.

I have a sneaking suspicion, Mr. Chairman, that the author of that article was probably

MR. NEARY: one of the Premier's secret advisors and that he is tremendously upset.

MR. YOUNG: He is a true Newfoundlander.

MR. NEARY: Probably one of the Premier's secret advisors - no doubt he has been on the payroll, and if he is not on the payroll he is looking to get on the payroll.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Because, Mr. Chairman, his position was so idiotic that I could hardly believe that a learned gentleman would be willing to expose himself the way he did to the people of this Province in that editorial. I am sure that his colleagues on the staff of the university must be ashamed to admit that they have such an unintelligent professor on staff. Mr. Chairman, the man did not know what he was talking about. Any student of history, any professor of history, anybody who knows anything about Newfoundland history, knew that the man was 'way out, that he was 'out to lunch', Mr. Chairman.

MR. CARTER: Why?

MR. NEARY: Why? Mr. Chairman, I will tell the hon. gentleman why. All you have to do is look at the history of this Province. From the time that we were a colony, a dominion, if we were ever a dominion, Mr. Chairman, our jurisdiction -

MR. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): On a point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, this House is very concerned with the truth and especially constitutional truth. For a member of this House to suggest that we did not have full dominion status prior to Confederation is a

MR. CARTER: most unheard of thing!

MR. SIMMS: Totally out of order!

MR. CARTER: Totally out of order!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the 'cat manure'

is at it again. That is not a point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): To that point of order,

I must rule that that is a difference of opinion between
two hon. members.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the
matter is that before Confederation, our jurisdiction
extended out three miles.

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland Appeals Court said it, the Supreme Court of Canada said it, we had jurisdiction three miles out from our Coast, and that was it. Hon. gentlemen surely must remember before 1977, before Canada declared a 200 mile management zone, before Canada did it. That happened because we were a Province of Canada.

MR. CARTER: That is rubbish.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before that, hon. members will recall, down in my own district of Rose Blanche people used to look out and they used to call me up and say, "Look, there is a city out there. The Russians are out there. The Japanese are out there. The French are out there. The Americans are out there."

MR. CARTER: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: I cannot sit here and listen to the hon. gentleman misleading this House. I am not saying he is doing it deliberately, but certainly this House is being misled. If, and the other members of this House who are lawyers can probably instruct me as to the proper way to say this, but if something is proven to be our right, even though it was done only last year, then that right is deemed to have been held forever.

For instance, the hon. member was not born a Canadian, I certainly was not born a Canadian, but we are all in this House deemed to have been born Canadians even though we were born before

MR. CARTER: the Act of Confederation.

MR. SIMMS: A good point.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): To that point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if you can get high sniffing savoury or not but the hon. gentleman certainly sounds like it today. There is no point of order, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is being mischievous. His House Leader, I challenged him last year to stand in this House and say, "I am a proud Canadian." I would like for the anti-Confederate over there to stand up and before all members of this House, and the media and the people of this Province, I would like to see both hon. gentlemen stand up and say, "I am a proud Canadian."

Mr. Chairman, there is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order, I rule there is no point of order, it is a difference of opinion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before Canada declared a 200 mile management zone can hon. members remember the complaints about the foreign fleets that were out there, that you could see from shore, that were inside our 12 mile limit after Canada gave us a 12 mile zone? They extended the jurisdiction from 3 miles out to 12 miles, and then went out to 200 miles. And can hon. members remember, Mr. Chairman, the historic rights of these foreigners, the Portuguese, the Spaniards, the French, and the British, historic rights? I have been here so long I can remember some

MR. NEARY: hon. gentlemen who are still over there coming into this House condemning the Government of Canada for not giving us a 200 mile management zone so we could get the foreigners off our fishing grounds.

MR. CARTER: Who owned it then?

MR. NEARY: Who owned it? Mr. Chairman, it was international water then and that is the point.

MR. SIMMS: Then why did Joey put the placques out there saying it was ours? And you helped him.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Neary, we put two placques on the floor of the ocean to claim the Grand Banks in the name of Newfoundland. But, Mr. Chairman, saying you own it and proving you own it are two different things, are they not? And, so, Mr. Jackson is completely out to lunch.

The hon. gentleman did not trust the Supreme Court of Canada, he put it before the Newfoundland Appeals Court because he said the Newfoundland judges are patriotic, they will make their opinion based on how they feel in their hearts and not on law. And it did not work that way. The three Newfoundland judges said, "No, you do not own it. You never did own it." The Supreme Court of Canada says, "You do not own it, you never did own it and never will own it."

Now, Mr. Chairman, they can bury their heads in the sand all they want. The ownership question is no longer an issue. It is over and done with. It is settled. But what they did in the process, Mr. Chairman, is they threw away whatever bargaining power they had when they put the matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court. They threw it away. Instead of going to

MR. NEARY: the bargaining table with some bargaining power, what did they do? They waited until two courts ruled and now they are sitting over there stark naked, no bargaining power. Now they are playing political games. And now, Mr. Chairman, their policies have failed.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the Liberal Party is on its way out. It is totally on its way out. What the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) just said in the last few minutes or so, there is not a single Newfoundlander who goes

DR. COLLINS:

along with that line of thought. If that is a reflection of what the Liberal party policy is, they are as dead as dodos. They are gone, they are a nonentity, to misinterpret, for one thing, what the 200 mile limit is and the Continental Shelf. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) speaks as though they are one and the same thing. They have nothing to do with one another. They are totally different. The 200 mile limit is a management zone for the resources of the sea. The Continental Shelf issue is something entirely different, it is something that has been crystalizing - I think the lawyers use the term - crystalizing since the early 1940s and for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to obscure the two issues; I mean if he honestly confuses the two he really should go and read up on something because he has got a responsibility as Leader of the Opposition to try to say something that is of sense and gives some leadership to public opinion in this Province, and if he does not understand the issues, he is really neglecting his responsibility. Now if he does understand them and he is just confusing the issues for partisan politics, I think that is most reprehensible. Now there is no connection between the two. The fact that there were Russians out there with lights on their trawlers and so on and so forth has got nothing whatsoever in the slightest way, to do with the Continental Shelf issue. The point is was the ownership of the Continental Shelf settled or not by the time we entered Canada in 1949? That is one question. There are many, many people who will say it was settled. Something like thirteen countries in the world had already laid claim, and this has now been substantiated and upheld all through the years, had already laid claim to the Continental Shelf by 1949. The second point is, did we have

DR. COLLINS: the right as an international person, this Province, to make a like claim offshore? And if the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) thinks there is a Newfoundlander alive who thinks that we were not a dominion he has got another thought coming. No matter what the Supreme Court of Canada says, one accepts their decision but one does not necessarily have to agree with their interpretation of the facts. They have the right to make the decision but every person has the right to interpret the facts as he knows them to be. And for the Supreme Court of Canada to say that Newfoundland was never a dominion and that if it was a dominion it was never recognized as such in international affairs, no Newfoundlander will accept that. And certainly if there is something, if there is a quirk in Canadian law that makes the Supreme Court of Canada take that view, which is against the whole history of Newfoundland, that quirk has to be remedied and, as I said before, I am quite convinced that the Canadian people will correct that quirk.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition also to imply that the Newfoundland Supreme Court came to the same conclusion, because that is what he said, he said that the Supreme Court of Canada said we did not own it and the Newfoundland Supreme Court said we did not own it, to say that the Newfoundland Supreme Court came to the same conclusion, i.e. that we were never a dominion and never had any possibility of acquiring a Continental Shelf for us, that is a blatant misunderstanding of the facts.

DR. COLLINS: The Supreme Court of Newfoundland said that we were a Dominion, that we were an international person, that we did have a right to the offshore. But they then went on to say, 'However, we are constrained from giving it to Newfoundland because there was a prior ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada by which we feel we are bound.' But they did say quite clearly Newfoundland had Dominion status, it had international status, and that it had acquired, because the whole Continental Shelf question had crystallized, it had acquired the Continental Shelf. So, Mr. Chairman, I would really appeal to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who is aiming to be the Leader of his Party over there, confirmed in the leadership of his Party, he is now, in some respects, an interim leader, he is aiming, I am sure, to be the Leader of his Party and I think, quite frankly, he should be. He has been in public life in this Province for many, many years, many things he said I disagree with, nevertheless he has done his best, he has been in the trenches, he is a yeoman fighting for his Party. He is fighting for his Party incorrectly now, he should put his Party aside when it comes down to the offshore rights. So I certainly fault him there. But, nevertheless, apart from that he has every right to be the Leader of his Party, more right than anyone else sitting opposite there. But if he is going to be a Leader of his Party he must get his thoughts straight. He must be able to say things that are credible, that stand up under the scrutiny of facts, that are historically honest. And I would appeal to him, especially on the offshore and especially on the Continental Shelf, to really research it out, consult people who have given the true view of things, and I can suggest no one better than Lynn Jackson, consult these people, get his thoughts straight on it and I am sure that if there is some possibility of a future for the Liberal

DR. COLLINS: Party, which I doubt there is, but if there is some possibility, at least he will be able to do something about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I am not concerned about what we were before 1949, I am concerned about what we are going to be in 1999. My concern is with the direction this Province is taking. Where are the Premier and the government that is in power, and will be in power for the next two or three years, where are they leading us? That is my concern and I believe it is the concern of many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. However, I believe that regardless of the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Newfoundland Supreme Court there is only one alternative left and it is for this government to sit down with the federal government and negotiate an offshore oil deal. It is pointless for the Premier to wait until the next federal election, it is pointless, because let us face it, it is not Mr. Turner or Mr. Chretien who will decide who is going to be the next Leader of the Liberal Party, it is going to be decided the same as it was decided when Renee Levesque became Leader of Quebec, it will be decided by the media. It was decided by the media that Mr. Mulroney become the Leader of the Opposition. It was the influx of the media that caused Mr. Mulroney to become the Leader of the PC Party. And the same thing will happen. It is the media that makes or defeats governments. And regardless of the June 18 Leadership Convention in Ottawa, regardless of who will win that one, whether it is Chretien, whether it is Turner, I would honestly say that the momentum will grow, the momentum will build that a certain individual will become the next Prime Minister of Canada and what will our Premier have to hang his hat on then? He will have to hang his

MR. WARREN: and we have to look at the direction in which the Premier of this Province is leading us, which, I would say, is opposite to what the people intended when they gave him a mandate on April 6th, 1982. The people gave him the mandate to negotiate and the Premier, in all due respect to the gentleman, I believe he wanted to negotiate, he wanted to try and negotiate but his ego overtook him. His ego overtook him and subsequently we lost our day in the sun, as the Premier would say, we lost our day in the sun and now it is the people in Newfoundland and Labrador who have to suffer. The fifty-two members in this House may be comfortable for the next two or three years, I am sure some of us probably will be for the next number of years, however, I think that once in awhile, regardless of political stripe, we should stand up for our convictions. And the members on that side have not stood up and been counted. When it was necessary to be counted, the members have not stood up and been counted. Just because they are Conservatives they are going to toe the Conservative lines. I do not think the people in Grand Falls, or the people in Humber West, or the people in Fortune-Hermitage voted for the hon. members to toe the party line under all circumstances, I believe that they voted for the hon. members because they believed that they were going to do what they could for particular districts. But an hon. member cannot do what he can under the circumstances and under the direction in which this Premier is leading us. We have a new colleague in this hon. House who was elected in a by-election, the new member for Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), who has not yet spoken in the House and the House has been open for two weeks.

MR. WARREN: What is he waiting for, a rainy day? Mr. Chairman, I would think his conscience will not allow him to speak. Because he is a man who is concerned for his district and concerned for the people, deep down he does not want to toe the party line as much as the Premier and Cabinet ministers want him to. The hon. member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) who represents a fishing community is really concerned. In fact, in my estimation she is one of the hardest workers on that side and I am sure the hon. member would be speaking up more in this House but for the fact the Premier and the Cabinet ministers have laid the iron rod down, have stopped her from saying what she believe in. I believe she believes that this government should do more. I believe that the hon. lady should get up more in this House and expose her views. The reason she is not exposing her views is because the Premier and the government of the day are keeping the backbenchers glued to their seats. It is almost like the Premier comes in just before three o'clock each day and puts some glue on the backbencher's seats and they cannot move until six o'clock. I find it, Mr. Chairman, very unnecessary for the hon. member, my former school teacher from Bonavista-North-

AN HON. MEMBER: You are lucky that you survived.

MR. WARREN: On the Open Line there a while ago a comment was made and I did not like the comment that was made about my hon. colleague, my former school teacher. Someone said, he does not say anything in the House of Assembly because, well, he never does anything. Now I do not believe that. I do not believe that at all. The hon. member does not come

MR. WARREN: in and give the government members and the Premier and the Cabinet ministers a rough time. Maybe he does it in caucus which is his prerogative. You know, we are too easy going the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Osmond), for example, is another. We have been elected by the people to speak out on their behalf. So I suggest that it is high time we did speak out on their behalf. The hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), for example, in the last session of the House of Assembly that hon. member was on his feet practically every single day. Now, for some reason the Premier and the ministers must have gotten to him and said, Look, you are making a fool of yourself, either you get up and support us all the way or you say nothing, because he has not said anything since this session started.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me get back to what I was going to discuss, in my closing remarks-- I see I only have a couple of minutes left. The hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) - I would like the hon. minister to pay attention to this instead of talking to his colleague. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss some of the expenditures in Culture, Recreation and Youth, those pertaining to the Wildlife Division in particular. Just before the House opened the minister, back in the Old Year, brought in a ministerial statement concerning a sport's hunt in Northern Labrador.

MR. CHAIRMAN (McNicholas): The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed.

MR. WARREN: I thank you very much. I thank the hon. gentlemen and ladies for giving me leave.

MR. WARREN: The hon. minister brought in this ministerial statement, and there was no consultation with the people. So I was hoping that the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) could probably respond to these my final comments. He will not even listen to me. The latest development Postville concerning the minister's department was the Labrador Inuit Association passed a resolution supporting the hunt with the following conditions: The hunt will be carried on in consultation with the people; that there would be a catch store set up in Nain to co-ordinate the hunt, a catch store, which means it would be the originating point for the sports hunt instead of using Goose Bay as such a centre as the minister had intended. If the minister would go along with those recommendations on the harvest of the caribou hunt in Northern Labrador, I believe that the people in my district would agree with it. But the unfortunate thing about it -

MR. SIMMS: What was that?

MR. WARREN: If the minister would go along with the recommendations that came out of the annual meeting of the Labrador Inuit Association - I understand the Mayor of Nain will be meeting with the minister within ten days or so, and the Mayor of Nain is also the President of the Labrador Inuit Association.

MR. SIMMS: He could not make it and they had to cancel it.

MR. WARREN: He is going to be meeting with the minister, and I will have an opportunity to discuss it too, but the recommendations that came out of that meeting are telling the minister we will support the hunt on the following conditions, and those conditions are contingent upon the minister consulting with the people, which he never did. That was number one. Secondly, that the outfitters and the local

MR. WARREN: people in Nain would benefit from such a hunt, and such a country shop, we call it a country store, and a country meat killing process would be started up. And if the minister would follow those four -

MR. SIMMS: The meat will be marketed along the coast.

MR. WARREN: - recommendations, I will tell the minister now that I will definitely support the hunt as well. I would even be positive towards the minister, because the minister will do exactly what I said he would do in this House. He said exactly the same thing as I said in my statement, both of us have been saying the same thing, that consultation is the answer. If there is consultation there is no problem.

MR. WARREN:

I have no problem in supporting the minister's stand on wildlife if he will talk with the people and do as the people dictate.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that the government of the day is in a terrible mess, it is getting worse, and the only thing left for the Premier to do is go down to Military Road and visit the Lieutenant-Governor and let the people decide if they still want him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I heard a little bit of what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said when he was speaking, and I must say that I have never heard such a disgraceful speech given either in this House or in Committee. The hon. gentleman showed himself to be an handmaiden of Ottawa, a stooge of Ottawa, an errand boy for Ottawa. He showed himself to be uninformed. And how the hon. gentleman can say that Dr. Jackson's editorial was anything other than it was, the most powerful, incisive article that has ever been written with respect to the offshore?

The hon. gentleman there opposite gets up and talks about historic rights. Now, 'What are historic rights?' is the question one has to ask when he talks about the foreign countries fishing, which has nothing to do with the question at issue. But I would like to ask him to address himself to the question of what historic rights Ottawa ever had in the Banks of Newfoundland? Now, if the hon. gentleman can show me what great historic

MR. MARSHALL: rights Ottawa had or the Canadian nation had in the Banks of Newfoundland, and he can prove that the Banks of Newfoundland, as Dr. Jackson so eloquently indicated, are Banks Canada or the Banks of Canada, and historically they had the right, well then I would be prepared to accept some of the nonsense that the hon. gentleman emoted in the Committee. But what is awful about it, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. gentleman happens to be an elected representative of the people of this Province, and to see, on such a sensitive issue as this, the hon. gentleman get up and make statements of that nature means he is a disgrace to the people whom he represents and he is a disgrace to the people of Newfoundland.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that all that type of statement does is just give fodder to the patronizing central Canadian press on the mainland of this Province to depict Newfoundland the way they do. Make no wonder they depict Newfoundland in the manner in which they do when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Neary), as Leader of the Opposition, can get up and make statements of that nature, statements that are so much against the interests of the people of this Province. Obviously, the only thing that the hon. gentleman is concerned about is supporting the present regime in Ottawa rather than addressing himself to the points at issue.

The hon. gentleman apparently agrees that we were a colony when we entered Confederation. He will accept the fact that we will be a colony forever and a day if that decision of the Supreme Court of Canada is implemented in all of its legal ramifications. He does not mind that. An elected representative who is prepared

MR. MARSHALL: to get up in the Legislature of this Province, Mr. Chairman, and state that we are a colony and is prepared to accept the situation with respect to that particular decision with all of its ramifications and all of its effects on the people of Newfoundland, you know, I know the hon. gentleman there opposite is just toeing the party line. But there comes a time when one should not be toeing the party line. One should put his Province and the people of the Province before his own party. As I said, all the hon. gentleman does is he gives food, he is fodder for the patronizing mainland press that has so wrongly depicted Newfoundlanders as they are not.

I saw a letter in The Evening Telegram today from somebody from Toronto, a disgraceful letter. And the reason why those letters can be written, Mr. Chairman, is because of the attitude taken by the hon. gentleman there opposite.

Now, the hon. gentleman there opposite, I remind him once again we are on the matter of Interim Supply. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has brought down his budget, once again in timely fashion this year, so all the projected heads of expenditure are known, and we are talking here about three months supply. And instead of derogating the people of this Province, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has done with respect to the offshore, instead of talking about Mr. Shaheen, as he has occupied most of the time this afternoon with with respect to the defunct refinery, why does not the Leader of the Opposition talk about the budget that was brought into this House by the Minister of Finance? Why will he not address himself to the fact that the Minister of Finance has brought in a budget with a deficit of merely

MR. MARSHALL: \$30 million on current account when, last Friday, the Province of Nova Scotia, which is supposed to be prospering so much from offshore development, brought in a budget with a current account deficit of \$180 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. MARSHALL: \$180 million.

Last year, their current account deficit was in

MR. MARSHALL:

the vicinity of \$200 millions. So you can see, with the wherewithal that this Province has, what a tremendous task it was for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to craft a budget to the nature that he has and he is to be complimented on it. If the hon. gentlemen want to discuss that, if they want to talk about the offshore, why do they not talk about the offshore in the context of what extra revenues will be flowing into this Province and what type of budgets we could look forward to in the future with the additional revenues? Why do they not talk about the items with respect to the fishery in this Province and how we would get much better revenues if we had the ability to be able to control all of our marine resources including the fishery? They do not want to talk about that, Mr. Chairman. They do not want to talk about the hospitals that have been provided in this budget down at South Pond on the Burin Peninsula, in the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Neary) own district out in LaPoile, in Clarendville and in Grand Falls; they do not want to talk about the prospective opening of the mines in St. Lawrence; they do not want to talk about the support that has been given to the Marystown Shipyard by this government; they do not want to talk about the graving dock that is being provided for the synchrolift in St. John's, Mr. Chairman; they do not want to talk about the retail sales tax exemptions that were given for areas of Labrador. Of the two members for the Labrador area over there, neither has gotten up and talked about the exemptions that have been given by the minister to provide relief for businesses in the border areas of Labrador. All they want to do

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, is get up and talk about gross irrelevancies when they are derogating their own province as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) does from time to time. They want to talk about irrelevancies, As I say, you could take the speeches made by the hon. gentlemen there opposite for the past two or three years from Hansard just table them before the Committee and we would be just as far ahead. Mr. Chairman, what we are considering here the matter of Interim Supply. Now I assume that the hon. gentlemen are addressing themselves to the rules of the House. and they know what the rules are, and that the hon. gentlemen realize what is involved in Interim Supply and, that being so, I would think, Mr. Chairman, that this Committee would be much better served if the hon. gentlemen there opposite got up and talked about the expenditures that are going to be made under Interim Supply, instead of derogating their own Province and getting up with the disgraceful kind of speech that the Leader of the Opposition is making from time to time, exulting in the fact that there was a loss in the Supreme Court of Canada, exulting in the fact that there had been a loss before the Newfoundland Appeals Court, you would not know, Mr. Chairman, but he were a Mainlander himself from the way that the hon. gentleman is talking. Mr. Chairman, the situation in this Province today is too serious to allow the type of debate that has been coming from the Opposition side of this House to go out without noting it. We have a situation in this Province where we have the highest taxes in Canada, we have the lowest per capita income, we have had the lowest per capita income since Confederation; we have an opportunity for the people of this Province to start climbing the ladder of Confederation and acquire an income which is equal, at least

MR. MARSHALL: approximates the average of all of Canada. The hon. gentlemen there opposite would be well advised to address this possibility and support the government in these endeavours. At the same time they could transpose the results of that on future budgets, because what would happen them, Mr. Chairman, is that we would be able to reduce the high taxes we have. We have a sales tax now which is 12 per cent. We have the highest income taxes in Canada. You name it, we have got the highest of the worst and the lowest of the best and what we are trying to do, Mr. Chairman, is to try to change this around. But it is very difficult, Mr. Chairman, trying to change this around when you have people like the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) who, as I say, is fodder for the Canadian press, he is a handmaiden for Ottawa, he is a stooge

MR. MARSHALL:

for Ottawa. Mr. Chairman, he just gets up and emotes everything that Ottawa would have him emote to the detriment of the people of this Province. The hon. gentleman should realize the seriousness of the situation, what we are about and what we are attempting to do instead of getting up with the balderdash that the hon. gentleman has gotten up and talked about from time to time. He does not address the issues. What we are talking about in Interim Supply is the expenditure of three months supply that is necessary, and the hon. gentlemen there opposite would be much better advised to address themselves to the specifics rather than what the hon. gentleman is doing.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman there opposite looks across at us with his beady eyes, and with his snake-like tongue he squirts out bile and poison across this House in an unbelievable fashion. And he accuses the Opposition of being handmaidens of Ottawa when only the other day we saw what the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) did for the Provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is followed by the lapdogs there opposite. They run along behind him as he squirts his bile and his poison across the House. They toddle along behind him, Mr. Chairman -

MR. TULK: Like chihuahuas.

MR. NEARY: - like little chihuahuas, and they take great satisfaction in the fact that the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), again with his snake-like tongue has downed the Opposition, one-upmanship, and they are proud of it. Now, Mr. Chairman, what did the hon. gentleman say? The hon. gentleman is speaking for the government. What did he say in his ten minute speech that he just made that the unemployed in this Province can take comfort in? What did he say in his ten minute speech that students, who are being shafted by the administration there opposite, who are having their allowances cut, what comfort can they take in statements just made by the hon. minister? And what comfort can consumers of electricity, what comfort can they take in the spokesman for the government, the gentleman who just took his seat? And what about the people who are paying high income tax, high gasoline tax, and the highest retail sales tax in Canada, and the record number of people who are unemployed, especially young people? What comfort can they take in the poison and the bile that was just squirted across the House by the hon. gentleman?

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman again is taking a nationalistic position. They are wrapping themselves in the Provincial flag because they think that is the thing to do. They think that is the way to get votes. They are putting their party and partisan politics and little political games before the Province, and the people are getting wise to them, Mr. Chairman. That is what is hurting the hon. gentleman, and that is why he takes his nasty pills before he comes

MR. NEARY: into the House so that he can squirt out his criticism across the floor of this House, Mr. Chairman.

Now what did I say in my remarks earlier that upset the hon. gentleman so much? What was it I said? I said that two courts, the Newfoundland Appeals Court, and the Supreme Court of Canada said to the whole world, "Newfoundland, you do not own the resource offshore, you never did own it."

MR. BAIRD: Are you happy or sad?

MR. NEARY: I am sad about it because the Supreme Court of Canada also said this, they said, "Newfoundland, you came before us with a weak case." Did they not say that? Did not the Supreme Court of Canada say, "You should be ashamed of yourselves because you have such a weak case"?

Now, Mr. Chairman, why does the hon. gentleman get so nasty and so mad at me? Why does his eyes become so glassy and beady when he looks across at me in his anti-Canadian fashion, his anti-Confederate way, with his snake-like tongue? Why does he get so mad at me? I did not say it, it was the Supreme Court of Canada, and that is all I said that made the hon. gentleman so angry. I said the Supreme Court of Canada and the Appeals Court.

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland have said, 'No, you do not own it, you never did own it and it belongs to Canada'. Now, Mr. Chairman, I also followed up by saying that it was the Premier who walked away from the negotiating table and put this matter before the Newfoundland Appeals Court. I notice, Mr. Chairman, Your Honour probably wants to rise the Committee, it is getting near six o'clock. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returns to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to them referred, report some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I shall try to look at you so I will not psyche the Opposition out.

The Estimates Committee, this evening at 7:30 the Government Services Committee will examine the estimates of the Department of Transportation. Tomorrow evening at 7:30 the Social Services Committee will examine the estimates of the Department of Justice. All the Committee meetings are at the Colonial Building, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What about tomorrow morning?

MR. MARSHALL: We are endeavouring, Mr. Speaker, to accommodate the Opposition and there is going to be one meeting at a time. The hon. gentleman need not go into

MR. MARSHALL: a state of apoplexy.

MR. BAIRD: We know you are not too bright
in the morning.

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

On motion, the House at its
rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 1984
at 3:00 p.m.