



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Second Session

Number 50

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**  
*(Hansard)*

*Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas*

Tuesday

10 June 1986

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to be able to inform the House of two fisheries access road upgrading projects recently approved by my department. One of those projects is to be carried out at Bell Island and the other one at Flowers Cove.

Mr. Speaker, since the closure of the iron ore mine at Bell Island, the development of fishing activity has been hampered by the lack of a proper harbour and facilities. Fishermen have recently moved from the ferry wharf area to the vicinity of the old mine wharf where they now have a landing wharf, a slipway and a boat storage area, all constructed through C.E.I.C. make-work programmes. Mr. Speaker, the road leading to the wharf is approximately 700 meters in length and was constructed many years ago by the mining company. Not having been maintained by any agency for years, it has deteriorated considerably. Since this road is used exclusively by fishermen, it has been recommended that my department assume full responsibility for this access road. The Department of Transportation informs us that the cost of upgrading the access road to minimum standards is \$28,000.00.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that my

department has recently approved this expenditure and has authorized the Department of Transportation to undertake the project on behalf of the Department of Fisheries.

The access road to our marine service centre at Flowers Cove was constructed a number of years ago at a low grade on the existing ground. This road is approximately 730 meters long and requires extensive upgrading to reduce problems with drainage.

Mr. Speaker, the road also needs to be raised considerably to permit easier maintenance during Winter conditions, since it is now very difficult to keep the road open in drifting conditions because of the low elevation. Our operations and engineering personnel have recommended that we proceed with this work as soon as possible and I am pleased to inform this hon. House that my department has authorized the Department of Transportation to carry out this work on our behalf at a cost of \$35,000.

Mr. Speaker, these two projects, though not huge, will do much to improve access for fishermen in the communities to which they apply. I believe these projects show that my department is not only aware of the concerns and needs of our fishermen, but they also demonstrate our willingness, where possible, to address their concerns and be responsive to their needs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the minister for giving me a copy of his statement a few minutes before delivering it. You know something, members in the backbenches particularly seem to have great difficulty in understanding that people, whether they live in Liberal districts or in Conservative districts, are taxpayers and they are citizens of the Province and they deserve to be treated fairly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear that the Minister of Fisheries is going to now take responsibility for this road leading down to where the fishermen on Bell Island have their facilities. This is a road which, like, I am sure, roads in many districts, fell into the area of terra incognita, no man's land, nobody wanted to take responsibility for it. The Department of Transportation said it was the responsibility of the town council, the town council said no, it was the responsibility of the Department of Transportation. The fishermen were down there during this past Winter, Mr. Speaker, and on occasion I had to write and point out that fishermen had boats sinking down there because they could not get pumps down to pump out their boats because of the condition of the road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad, I am

delighted, I am happy that after several years of representation the Minister of Fisheries has man fashion stood up and said, 'Yes, I will take responsibility'. It is too bad more ministers will not do the same sort of thing on that side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

It took a little while, but I compliment the minister for taking this action because those fishermen - I do not know how they vote, I did not ask how they voted, and nobody on the other side of the House should ask how they voted - are taxpayers and they are entitled to service from government. That is what we are here for.

MR. TULK:

The Minister of Public Works and Services should follow his example.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, in the same way the access road to the Marine Service Centre at Flowers Cove is intended to serve all the fishermen of Flowers Cove, whether they voted Liberal, whether they voted Conservative or whether they were foolish enough to vote something else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the minister has been specific. He has allocated, Mr. Speaker, a specific amount of money and I am glad that the access road to the Marine Service Centre at Flowers Cove is also going to be improved. This will make it easier, Mr. Speaker, for the

fishermen of both districts to carry on a legitimate profession; get out there and work hard and earn a dollar and contribute to this Province. And that is what government is here for, to help people do that.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MATTHEWS:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As Minister Responsible for Culture, I am pleased to inform hon. members that, as a result of numerous discussions between the Chairman of the Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council, officials of my department, and the recipients of funding under my department's programme for sustaining grants for professional performing arts companies, the amount of \$130,000, which has been provided in the 1986-1987 budget for my department for this programme, is being transferred to The Arts Council to administer. The Chairman of The Arts Council, Dr. D. F. Cook, has been notified of this decision, as have the client groups of the programme. This decision has been made at the request of the majority of recipients to have this programme come under the jurisdiction of The Arts Council, and we are pleased to respond positively to their wishes.

The sustaining grants for professional performing arts companies were established three years ago at the request of these major performing arts organizations, as well as the Newfoundland Symphony Orchestra.

These grants provide basic operational funding for these groups, overcoming their financially precarious existences, and allowing them to concentrate more fully on their artistic endeavours. The Arts Council has agreed to carry on this programme in the fulfillment of these worthwhile policy objectives.

It is also my pleasure to announce today that The Arts Council is to be provided with office space in the St. John's Arts and Culture Centre.

In its efforts to diminish administrative costs so as to place more funds into the hands of Newfoundland and Labrador artists, The Arts Council approached government to provide office space in a government facility. We are very pleased to respond to this initiative of The Arts Council, and one could think of no more appropriate location for their offices than the Arts and Culture Center.

These changes, Mr. Speaker, demonstrate our full confidence in the excellent work of The Newfoundland and Labrador Arts Council. We are certain they will continue to provide the greatest possible support and leadership for the Newfoundland and Labrador artistic community.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
What a pleasure it is today to see

another Liberal initiative brought forward by the Tory Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

I will give you some background on this. The leader of the Opposition and I attended this arts conference with open eyes and open ears, and we heard about the problems they have had over the last number of years.

I have, by the way, to give some credit to Ms Cheryl Stagg, of Stephenville, who went there and helped make this initiative a reality, along with a lot of other people in the arts community who did a very good job. The minister, however, decided he could not attend that weekend, he could not come to the conference.

MR. BAKER:

Where was he?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

He was off playing soccer somewhere. I do not know where he was. But I will tell you one thing, he was supposed to be in Montreal somewhere, but I heard he was in Grand Bank.

But I do want to pat him on the back for coming forward and accepting the initiative of the arts community. It is not the initiative of the Tory government, it is the initiative of the arts community who have done a good job.

I also want to say that they had to eat their words again today. Because, last fall, they put out a press release condemning the arts group down there on Duckworth Street for spending too much money on the wrong things. Now they are giving them office space,

recognizing the fact that they were spending too much money on trying to have some decent space to operate in. So you ate your words again today, Gentlemen, and you are going to do it more often in the next few years. This is a good Liberal initiative, and it is good to see it come through. Congratulations!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Oral Questions.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

We have questions for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young), we have questions for the Premier. Now, would the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) indicate whether both the Premier and the Minister of Public Works have decided to duck this issue and stay out of the House until it blows over?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

That is no point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

As Your Honour said, there is no point of order. The Premier is here daily, the Minister of Public Works is here daily, and if the

hon. gentleman has any questions let him ask his questions.

MR. TOBIN:

The Minister of Public Works is at a conference.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I would like to ask the Government House Leader, since I set out a specific list of questions that I asked the Premier to supply information on to the House yesterday, does the Government House Leader have that information?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House yesterday.

MR. EFFORD:

You could have gotten the information this morning.

MR. CALLAN:

They are taking turns staying away.

MR. MARSHALL:

I will respond, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition can control his minion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I was not in the House yesterday. The hon. gentleman says he gave a list of questions to the hon. the

Premier. Well, the Premier is not very shy about answering questions. He answers all the questions put to him. He answers them summarily and I am quite sure the hon. gentleman will get the answers to his questions in very short order.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, until the Premier makes himself available and the Minister of Public Works makes himself available, prepared to answer questions in this House on this issue of political patronage and lying to the House of Assembly, there will be no questions, Mr. Speaker, because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Name him! Name him!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the word 'lying'.

MR. BARRY:

Until the Premier and the Minister of Public Works are prepared to come into the House and make statements that are non-contradictory, non-inconsistent with the facts, that do not result in terminological inexactitudes, that tell the situation as it is instead of how they want to pretend it to be, - Mr. Speaker, Question Period in this House, Question Period in this Province, is a farce, the entire legislative process is a farce, and the

official Opposition will not be asking questions until the government is prepared to give the answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Following that great blow for democracy by the hon. gentleman, I would draw to Your Honour's attention that the hon. gentleman used the words that the Minister of Public Works and the Premier - I believe he coupled them together - were lying. I think those statements are obviously out of order and they have to be withdrawn. I do not care whether the hon. gentleman asks questions or not, but he is to withdraw that particular statement.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, as I understood it the Speaker asked to have it withdrawn and the Leader of the Opposition has substituted phrases which are perfectly parliamentary, which are perfectly true, which describe the situation exactly as it is, that the Premier and the Minister of Public Works are staying out of this House with the hope that an issue, that the Premier knows he is wrong on and does have the courage to address,

will go away.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I did ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the term 'lying'. He has not done so.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry about that. I substituted. I withdrew it. If Your Honour has any hesitation I withdraw it again. I substituted that the Minister of Public Works and the Premier -

MR. SPEAKER:

I am quite satisfied the hon. Leader withdrew.

MR. BARRY:

Hold on, Mr. Speaker. I think it should be made clear. I am entitled to explain what took place before in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I asked the hon. Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the term 'lying' and he has not done that until now. I do not want any further explanation about the matter.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

The point of order is that when a member in this House substitutes other phrases, phrases such as 'engaging in terminological inexactitudes', 'engaging in making statements that are inconsistent with reality,'

engaging in making statements that they would want the House to believe are the truth but are only what members opposite are pretending to be the truth,' Mr. Speaker, then we are entitled to say that in parliamentary language, whatever we are prohibited from saying regardless of what we think. Until we see the Premier of this Province in his seat and the Minister of Public Works and Services in his seat, this is a farce.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition knows very well I just simply asked him to withdraw that term and he did not withdraw it. But he has done it now and I am satisfied.

MR. SIMMONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe it is given that one of the traditions in parliament is for the ministers to be accountable to the House. I believe it is a legitimate question to put to the government, the one that was put in another form by the Leader of the Opposition a few moments ago: Can we expect the Premier and/or the Minister of Public Works and Services in the House today? We have some questions we would like to put to these two gentlemen and, I believe as part of their responsibilities to be accountable to the House, we should be informed whether or not they are

going to be here today or how soon they are going to be here. Now, it is worth noting, Mr. Speaker, that after the Premier made a statement on TV Thursday he did not show up Friday in the House. The minister did not show yesterday, neither has shown today. They may have good reason, but at the very least, Mr. Speaker, the House should be informed, I maintain, as to whether or not these gentlemen are going to be in the House today and, if not, when they will be in the House.

MR. MARSHALL:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

I am advised that the Minister of Public Works and Services is at a Ministerial Conference in Vancouver, British Columbia. The hon. gentlemen there opposite take themselves infinitely more seriously than the people of Newfoundland do if they think that the Premier of this Province is out of the Province because he is cowering from questions that the hon. gentleman may put to him. The hon. the Premier has business of the Province to attend to on an hourly and a quarter-hourly basis. He will be here in due course and there is never any problem in answering questions. As I say, how foolish are the hon. gentlemen. They obviously take themselves infinitely more seriously than the people of Newfoundland if they think the Premier is not in the House because he is afraid to come in and answer questions.



MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order. The hon. member took the opportunity of offering an explanation about a certain matter.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We would like the Government House Leader to indicate whether the reason the Premier is not in the House is because, as was indicated by the member for Carbonear (Mr. Peach), government members have been eavesdropping on the Opposition caucus.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

We are on a point of order now.

MR. BAIRD:

Poor old 'Leo.'

MR. PEACH:

Who has been feeding you lately? You do not seem to be the same.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we wonder if the Government House Leader would confirm that the reason the Premier is not in the House is because the member for Carbonear and other designated eavesdroppers, Mr. Speaker, have been eavesdropping on the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

- Opposition caucus room? We wonder if the Government House Leader could confirm this?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. That seems to be more a question than a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL:

And, Mr. Speaker, what a foolish question! The hon. gentleman was down to 7 per cent a little while ago, and now he has gone out of sight.

MR. PATTERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Placentia on a point of order.

MR. PATTERSON:

With reference to the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, we do not need any scientific, technical devices to hear what goes on in their caucus, because any time a contentious issue comes up, like the member for the Straits (Mr. Decker) was trying to get rid of you to bring in Smallwood, you usually throw a tantrum and we can hear it all through the building.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, do we go back and

forth?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, it is obvious that the gentleman, the puffball of poison from Placentia, is over there again trying to use another diversionary tactic to take away from the business of this House, to take away from the fact that the Premier of the Province and the Minister of Public Works do not have the courage to do what is right, to come to this House either to answer questions. The Premier, of course, does not have the courage to ask the Minister of Public Works for his resignation, which he should do. In view of his confessions on public television and in view of what has gone on in this House, it is obvious that there have been contradictions, and what we are seeing here is a deliberate attempt by the member for Placentia to again divert the issues. He should hang his head in shame, Mr. Speaker, and if he does not, the Speaker should ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw those kinds of remarks he is making and ask him to leave the precincts of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

The member for Carbonear should watch what he is getting on with, too.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! I have already ruled that there is no point of order. When the hon. member

wanted to say a few words I did not think he wanted to make a speech.

The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Opposition obviously are not interested in asking any questions I move that the Orders of the Day be now read. That is, the precedents will show, non-debatable and non-amendable.

Question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question!

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour, 'Aye'?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:

Non-debatable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is a question now before the floor. All those in favour of adopting that motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

Carried.

### Orders of the Day

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 15, Bill No. 1.

MR. SPEAKER:

The continued debate on second reading of Bill No. 1.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the fact that Question Period is a farce is because there are no members opposite prepared to give information.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:

It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) should be so concerned about Question Period when he left this party, the seat of democracy, to join a party that did not have a Question Period. There was no Question Period until we formed the government in 1972.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how members opposite have changed since they came into government. They came into government with the

great boast of reform; the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) came in on the promise that things would change, particularly matters relating to the procedure of this House.

MR. PATTERSON:

We got rid of you.

MR. MARSHALL:

We are debating the Accord now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

You sit and listen now, you know the rules.

The Government House Leader came into this House, Mr. Speaker, with great ideas of reform, as did the Premier. They said, 'We are going to set up a Question Period where the issues of the day can be raised and, Mr. Speaker, where government will be held accountable.' And what have we seen? What have we seen for the last four days? What it boils down to, Mr. Speaker, is that members opposite are prepared to answer questions on issues which they consider to be politically non-damaging, but anything that goes to whether in fact there is corruption in government, anything which goes to whether a minister of the Crown has been abusing his authority by hiring on the basis of political patronage -

MR. J. CARTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. J. CARTER:

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the rule of relevance is a fairly

relaxed one and that fairly wide-ranging debate is allowed, but, as I understand it, we are on Bill No. 1, the Atlantic Accord, and so far the Leader of the Opposition has yet to even allude to it let alone mention it.

MR. BAKER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

I think that the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) should have listened to the Government House Leader when he gave his introductory speech on the Atlantic Accord. He used about an hour and a half, Mr. Speaker, and for one hour and fifteen minutes he hardly mentioned the Atlantic Accord but went on a savage personal attack on the Leader of the Opposition, going back over the years that had nothing to do with the Atlantic Accord. So, I would say to the member for St. John's North, he should wake up and listen to his own House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition has an hour and he can develop his speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What? An hour?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the reason I want to deal with the question of parliamentary procedure is because we see the same thing with respect to their great promise of reform of the legislative process, as we

saw with respect to the great promise on the Atlantic Accord. Before the Atlantic Accord was introduced, they called a press conference at the Hotel Newfoundland and it was supposed to be the answer to all of Newfoundland's problems, including the unemployment problem. Now, Mr. Speaker, not only do we see members opposite not even bothering to rise on the other side of the House to debate this great flagship legislation, we see them playing petty politics with the jobs, with the bread and butter of families in this Province. Instead of delivering 40,000 jobs - what was it the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) promised, between 10,000 and 20,000 jobs? - we have yet to get an announcement that Hibernia is going to go, even though the Premier got up earlier this Spring and said unless there was a decision by early June, there would be no Hibernia development start this year.

MR. MATTHEWS:

That is what you are hoping.

MR. BARRY:

No, that is not what we are hoping. What we intend to do is put the member for Grand Bank's (Mr. Matthews) and the rest of his colleagues' feet to the fire and we want to see them produce what they promised, which was jobs, and we want to see those jobs allocated on a non-partisan basis, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We want to see ministers of this House and the Premier, when we get up and ask a question as to whether in fact the Minister of

Public Works cancelled a competition because he wanted those he had appointed to the temporary jobs held there on a permanent basis, we want to have the answers to our questions, Mr. Speaker, with respect to dates when he received recommendations for those permanent positions, dates when he cancelled the competition, copies of memoranda that he sent out ordering public service employees not to sit on departmental selection boards, we want to know, Mr. Speaker, why is it that the Premier of this Province is prepared to leave a Minister of Public Works in office who not only by his own admission has abused his responsibility, has abused his position of public trust but, Mr. Speaker, has come into this House and told this House other than the facts in that particular case.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We want to know, Mr. Speaker, have we reached yet another low in political morality in this Province, a low which has not yet been reached in any other parliamentary country in the world, I do not think, where a minister is able to come into this House and tell something that is not true in response to a question from the Opposition, say something that is untrue and, when proven to be that which we are not allowed to call him but which we all know is the label one applies to somebody who tells untruths, why is it, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier will not give answers to those questions? Does he think that the issue is going to go away? Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader can carry this back to wherever the Premier

is hiding, and here is the message: Every day that the House of Assembly is open, and we will keep it open as long as we can, we are going to ask questions on the issue of the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) and his kiddy patronage until we get the answers that we are looking for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

We are not going to let the Premier of this Province put up a stone wall between the Opposition and the truth, Mr. Speaker. The Premier can stonewall and the Government House Leader can assist in that stonewalling. But the Government House Leader, his recommendations on strategy so far in the last three sessions boiled down to cutting your losses, terminating the House of Assembly, and running. Hoist your tails and run is the name of the game that is recommended by the Government House Leader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the government can have that option again, they can try and terminate this session of the House, but I will tell them here and now that we are going to ask questions again tomorrow, during Question Period, on the question of Public Works hirings. We are going, Mr. Speaker, to ask questions every day while this House of Assembly remains open, and we are going to try and keep the House open as long as we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Because I think that this is, not I do not think in the fact that matters which are untrue have come

across from the other side previously, but it is the first time that we have seen it done in such a baldfaced fashion. It is the first time, Mr. Speaker, I think probably in the history of, well - I am just trying to think back. How long is it that we have had a Premier stay in his seat and refuse to stand up and answer questions of the Opposition?

MR. TULK:

It was never done as far as I know. Was it ever done in Newfoundland?

MR. MATTHEWS:

You had one for twenty-odd years who did not answer questions.

MR. BARRY:

No, I was trying to think back to the time of the previous Premier. I do not think that I remember Frank Moores ever staying in his seat and being afraid to answer a question. I know Joe Smallwood did not sit in his seat and not answer questions.

MR. MATTHEWS:

No, because you were not allowed to ask questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

As a matter of fact, Joe Smallwood was prepared to bring the television cameras in and answer questions, and was prepared to bring witnesses in on the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

He brought Shaheen in here and he ripped us off for millions..

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is the expert on rip-offs in this Province, so we will let him discuss that. The Placentia Puffball of poison is the expert on rip-offs.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Tell us about Valdmanis?

MR. PATTERSON:

Come down and run against me boy!  
Come down!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not even sure that we will mount a campaign. The member for Placentia is going to be like the guy in Texas who was defeated by a chap who had died two weeks earlier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

All we need do is go out and find a name on a tombstone, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Placentia will be gone.

MR. REID:

You will be in the graveyard anyway.

MR. BARRY:

He is in the political graveyard right now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen in this House, Mr. Speaker, is members opposite try and pretend that a problem is going to go away, that if they can refuse to answer questions long enough, refuse to supply answers, refuse to table documents as requested, they think that the issue is going to go away. Well, Mr. Speaker, they have another thing coming. This issue is not going away and we are going to use every

procedural opportunity, every legislative device that is available to us to get at the truth as to what took place, and the truth is that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) -

MR. J. CARTER:

Do not point at me.

MR. BARRY:

No, I know the backbencher now -

MR. TULK:

He is pointing at the Chair in front of you.

MR. BARRY:

- sitting in that seat is waiting. He is hoping that the minister is going because before the seat is cold he thinks that he is going to be in it. Well, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) had his shot at a Cabinet position and it was not very long before it was discovered, Mr. Speaker, that it was not safe to leave the member for St. John's North in a Cabinet position because one did not know where he would next turn up, whether it was in Moscow seeking advice on how to educate and discipline the children of this Province according to the communist methods there employed, or whether it was in the study of some other obscure and eccentric method of discipline, Mr. Speaker, that is where you can find the member for St. John's North.

But what we have now, Mr. Speaker, is a degree of duplicity on the part of members opposite with respect to this patronage issue. They are caught. "Oh, what a tangled web we weave/When first we practice to deceive!" Mr. Speaker, that tangled web is over there now and members opposite, the Premier and the Minister of

Public Works (Mr. Young) particularly, think that the only way out of that tangled web is to stay out of the House of Assembly. Well again, Mr. Speaker, they can run but they cannot hide. They are going to have to come back at some point in time, Mr. Speaker, and they are going to have to give the answers that we have been seeking.

Just in terms of duplicity, let me go to the Atlantic Accord for a minute and let me go to the responses of the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), to the five points that I listed in the course of my debate on the Accord. Just dig out the Government House Leader's speech for me so I can refer to the specific questions.

MR. TULK:

Was that the one in February?

MR. BARRY:

No, the one he gave just recently.

Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader got up the other day -

MR. PATTERSON:

He cut your salary once, he will cut it again.

MR. BARRY:

The Government House Leader got up the other day and pretended to answer the points that were raised in my speech.

Now, what the Government House Leader forgot is that I was quoting his own words. When he attacked what I was saying in my speech, he was attacking himself. For example, Mr. Speaker, let me go and just refer to the Government House Leader's comments with respect to participation.

MR. TULK:

Do you have it?

MR. BARRY:

No, I would like to have you speak. I am going to refer to my own speech now.

MR. J. CARTER:

Would the Leader of the Opposition permit a serious question?

MR. BARRY:

On February 21, 1986 when speaking on the Accord, Mr. Speaker, I referred to comments in a report prepared by the Government House Leader, the very person who was asking us to vote for this clause in the Accord on refining. This report was issued in August, 1982. Here is what the minister in the report said: "The promotion of the downstream industrial potential of offshore oil and gas production depends on the number of interrelated factors from future market conditions in the world refining and petrochemical industries to the existence of a preference in the supply of feedstock for local users.

"The general implication of these factors is that downstream development in Newfoundland" - that is refining and processing - "will be undertaken under highly competitive conditions, and that control of the availability and price of feedstock from the offshore will be the critical tool in encouraging local development. This is certainly the case in Alberta where provincial control of natural gas feedstock has to be used to build a world-scale petrochemical industry."

The minister got up the other day and attacked us on this side of the House for saying that it was important for us to try and use

our control of Hibernia oil and gas to see refining and processing onshore in this Province. Whose questions was he attacking? Whose words was he attacking? Was this just another example of the same sort of political posturing that the Premier has indicated he engaged in on the railway? Has the Government House Leader been politically posturing on the offshore since he took over that portfolio in the Fall of 1981?

MR. FLIGHT:

Yes, yes.

MR. BARRY:

Did he really believe what he said in August, 1982 in this report?

MR. FLIGHT:

No.

MR. BARRY:

Listen to what he says about the Nova Scotia agreement. In that report the Government House Leader pointed out that the clause in the Newfoundland Accord was the same as the one in the Nova Scotian agreement. Listen to what he said about the clause in the Nova Scotian agreement:

"Ambiguity exists in determining whether the concept of existing industrial facilities would include a mothballed refinery such as Come by Chance, and whether only industrial facilities existing as of the signing of the agreement, or such facilities as exist from time to time, will be given preference under this clause."

Do you remember the minister came in, after introducing the original Accord and said, 'It is perfectly unambiguous'. He had forgotten, Mr. Speaker, about this report which he prepared in August of



1982. His own words in black and white have come back to haunt him.

Maybe that is why the minister has told officials of the Petroleum Directorate not to prepare any more reports.

We have not seen a report from that Petroleum Directorate in the last couple of years. The reason is because the minister's words come back to haunt him. Whenever he puts anything down in writing, whether it be comments with respect to conflict of interest regulations, whether it be comments with respect to Question Period in the House of Assembly -

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. John's North on a point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is very important in this debate that we have a clear statement from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) as to the Opposition's position on whether or not he feels that the oil produced at Hibernia, or any of the other wells, should, of necessity, be processed here in Newfoundland. I do not mean all of it but the bulk of it. I would like a clear statement from him as it would help very much in this debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order but I will be happy to answer that by saying again what I said on February 21 when the member for St. John's North was,

as he often is, sound asleep. I know he has difficulty reading Hansard, if he went back to pick out Hansard, but I will read what I said. I refer the member to February 21, 1986, Hansard, page 4957.

I said that we will be voting for this Bill in principle, the principle of settling this issue by an agreement with the Government of Canada we accept, but I said we will be proposing an amendment because the Accord, as it is now drafted, is seriously flawed and here is the flaw. I said, Mr. Speaker, that it is flawed in the way it deals with refining.

In my speech, Mr. Speaker, I said that we will be proposing an amendment that oil and gas from Hibernia or any other field off Newfoundland and Labrador should only be produced if there is an operating refinery in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. Whether it is Come By Chance or whether it is another refinery, there should be no production off the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, based on the same theory as I just read out which was proposed by the Government House Leader. The only way we will see jobs from refining and processing is if we use our control to insist that there be refining and processing.

MR. J. CARTER:

All of the oil or some of it?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that, to a certain extent, depends upon how much we are producing. We think that there should be at least a refinery the size of Come By Chance operating which could handle around 100,000 barrels a

day or something in excess of 100,000 barrels a day.

With Hibernia onstream, there will be times, not for the whole life of Hibernia but there will be years when Hibernia would produce more than 100,000 barrels a day and we would accept that during that period of peak production some of the oil and gas could not be refined within the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador but, there should be at least the capacity to refine up to 100,000 barrels a day.

MR. J. CARTER:

Where would you get your market for the refinery products?

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the member, the former minister, is having difficulty getting answers to this type of question from his colleagues in Cabinet, let me suggest that the members support the members on this of the House because they can supply the answers to those questions and when they form the government, as will happen after the next election, they will provide the markets. There are no shortage of markets.

MR. J. CARTER:

For crude oil, yes, but for -

MR. BARRY:

There are no shortage of markets, Mr. Speaker, for product. There are temporary gluts from time to time but there are no shortage of markets in North America for refined products.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, why is Irving having problems?

MR. FUREY:

Be quiet, boy, and go back to sleep.

MR. BARRY:

There may be too many refineries operating.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, yes, that is it, and you think the world has room for another.

MR. BARRY:

But these refineries have to get a supply of oil and gas from somewhere and there is absolutely no reason why those refineries should be kept operational on the oil and gas in Hibernia when we are forced to keep a refinery closed.

MR. J. CARTER:

They can get it on the open market, we cannot. I do not see a connection between a refinery and the oil (inaudible).

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, it makes no wonder that the member for St. John's North was flung out of Cabinet because the Premier could not trust him to make his eccentric statements as government policy. Now, the Premier has been kind enough to point out, making it a lot easier for the Opposition, that he does not listen to his backbenchers on any serious question. So that makes it a lot easier for members on this side of the House not to be too concerned about the outrageous statements of the member for St. John's North.

The member for St. John's North should stand up in this House in his proper time when he has the chance to speak in this debate and tell the people of this Province is he saying that we are not entitled to have oil and gas

refined and to have the jobs from refining oil and gas in this Province, even if this means that a refinery closes down in New Brunswick or Quebec or Alberta or wherever the hell.

MR. J. CARTER:

Are you asking me to respond?

MR. BARRY:

No, Mr. Speaker, the member will have his opportunity to stand up. I have my hour and I want to use every minute of it because I have a lot to say, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Speaker if he would try and put a pillow over the member's head or something to keep him quiet and to stop interrupting.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I do not mind him asking me a question periodically but I do mind when he goes on in a constant stream of harassment.

Mr. Speaker, I just quoted the member for St. John's East, the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), where he spoke about using control of oil and gas to get refining and processing. That was only in 1982. Maybe the member for St. John's North should ask his Government House Leader was the Government House Leader trying to mislead the people of this Province and this House when he tabled that report? Was he just politically posturing the way they have been posturing on the railway? Can we believe nothing they say on that side of the House any more?

Mr. Speaker, in that same report, just listen to what the member for St. John's East said about the Nova Scotia agreement. He said,

"What is clear is that under the agreement, new Nova Scotia-based, industrial buyers will not be given access to offshore production unless 'such feedstock is excess to feedstock required to meet the demand of presently existing industrial capacity in Eastern Canada'." The minister goes on. "This means that unlike Alberta, which can use its oil and gas resources to start new industries which can compete with existing refineries in Ontario and Quebec, Nova Scotia can only hope that more oil and gas is found off its coast than Ontario and Quebec will need. This is hardly consistent with a commitment to using the resource to promote local economic development." So does the member now understand? The Government House Leader in 1982 was saying the same thing that I am saying now.

MR. J. CARTER:

Will you give me a minute to respond?

MR. BARRY:

Yes. The member will have a half an hour to respond when he gets up in his place to speak in this debate, if he is allowed to. Maybe he has been told, like the Premier told the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young), to keep his mouth shut so as not to embarrass government. But the Government House Leader in 1982 was saying exactly the same thing as we are saying now, that we should be entitled, Mr. Speaker, to use the oil and gas from Hibernia, to require that it be refined and processed onshore in this Province to create jobs; in the same way we say we will not let fish be exported in raw form so that the cutting jobs and the processing jobs are elsewhere; in the same way we say we want our

forest products processed in Newfoundland; in the same way we say we do not want our electricity flowing out to create jobs in Quebec - fish, trees, electricity and oil, they are all the same. They are all raw, natural resources and they should be used in this Province to create jobs in this Province.

MR. J. CARTER:

Some are perishable and some are not.

MR. BARRY:

Yes and the biggest perishable of all, Mr. Speaker, is the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and his political career. It is what will be called a fungible, I think, and the member for St. John's North is going to get well funged in the next election.

Mr. Speaker, is it only myself and the Government House Leader in 1982 who believed this? Listen to Dr. House who has been appointed the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Employment and Unemployment. Presumably the Premier has some faith in that gentleman's judgement and in that gentleman's ideas. What did Dr. House of Memorial University say should be done as far as oil and gas are concerned? He talked about the Accord. He says, 'A second weakness is uncertainly about the implications of the Accord for a downstream processing industry, refining and petrochemicals for the Province. Under a section on regional security of supply the Accord gives first priority for end use consumption and industrial feedstock to capacity already in place within Newfoundland'. He says, 'It is unclear whether the mothballed Come By Chance refinery

is counted as part of existing capacity'.

MR. DECKER:

Who said that?

MR. BARRY:

Dr. House is saying this and he says also, 'If not, refineries in other parts of Eastern Canada would have first call on Hibernia crude. This would make the prospects for Newfoundland to process its raw material into finished products rather remote for the foreseeable future'. Imagine that now!

Listen to this that Dr. House says, the same Dr. House who was appointed by the Premier to head up his Royal Commission: 'Contrary to the Peckford rhetoric, Newfoundlanders would still be huers of wood, if rather richer ones'. Well, with the drop in the price of oil, we would still be hewers of wood but, unfortunately, not quite as rich.

I do not know! Is it myself, the Government House Leader in 1982 and Dr. House who are now wrong, and the member for St. John's North is right? What is going on here?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address something that has been really bothering me. I would like to address that clarion call for my resignation which went out from the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) with respect to my position on offshore oil and gas. I would like to put this question: Why should I resign for having the same position as the Government House Leader had in 1982? Why is that a reason for my resigning?

The Government House Leader has

found it necessary to back off from the position that he held in 1982. We all know why that was. Mr. Mulroney, who is a member of the same political party as the gentlemen opposite, took the members up to Ottawa and laid down the golden rule of Tory politics, and the golden rule of Tory politics is that we will all speak with the same voice. The theory is that if everybody says the same thing, there will be a better chance of people believing them.

So, the Premier and the Government House Leader thought about this and they agreed. They felt that their only chance of political survival would be to agree with the Prime Minister of Canada on anything. It did not matter what it was. On free trade we saw the Premier stand up and say, "Me too, me too, me too," what was it, a day or two days after the Prime Minister had announced his position. Other premiers were saying, "We do not know enough about what is meant, we do not know enough about what the Prime Minister intends," but not the Premier of this Province. He was saying, "Whatever is good enough for my Tory Prime Minister is good enough for me". Even though months afterwards, six months, seven months, eight months afterwards other premiers were still saying, "What sort of input are the provinces going to have in these negotiations?", the Premier of this Province was saying, "No, whatever the Prime Minister of Canada says, it is good enough for me."

That is why, Mr. Speaker, the Government House Leader had to change his position because he was told, "Fall in line with Ottawa or else." He fell in line. So he changed 180 degrees and we now

have a situation where he is coming in with the Atlantic Accord which is supposed to be Newfoundland's answer to everything, including sliced bread, and lo and behold, when we look at it, it makes no provision for ensuring that there is refining and processing of oil and gas in this Province, even though only a few years ago the Government House Leader in this report to which I have referred said it was absolutely important, absolutely essential, that we have that refining and processing.

Now, is that the only thing? You might be able to say, "Well, that is just an oversight by the Government House Leader." You might be able to say, "That is only one factor and there are other things in the Accord." Well, let us look at something else.

Let us look at this whole issue of the back-in, the notion of a Crown corporation having the right to have a share in any oil or gas found offshore. The Prime Minister of Canada went down to the United States and before a meeting of oilmen in that country, I think it was at the Park Plaza Hotel in New York, he said, 'I am going to give you back that share that Petro-Canada has in the oil and gas of Hibernia.' The same minute that the Prime Minister was down there making that statement to the oilmen, we were here in this House asking a question to the Premier, because remember there is an hour and a half time difference. So we were here at 3:00 o'clock or 3:15 asking a question to the Premier, and that was about 1:30 or 1:45, the exact moment when the Prime Minister of Canada, following the luncheon down there, was on his feet saying

to the oilmen, 'I am giving you back the 25 per cent of Hibernia which Petro-Canada held.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

An expensive lunch.

MR. BARRY:

An expensive lunch, was it not?

What did the Premier say when we asked him that same moment whether he agreed with this? He said, 'my staff are on the telephone to the Prime Minister's Office trying to find out what is going on.' Then members opposite have the gall to come in here and say that there is now a new era of co-operation and consultation which makes everything better in terms of dealing with the Government of Canada.

Well, you could have no better example, Mr. Speaker, of how the Government of Canada takes members opposite, takes the Premier, takes the Government House Leader and sticks it to him, and does what it wants, whether it is with respect to our oil and gas or with respect to free trade or the railway or any other issue.

All this comes back down to the matter of credibility. You see, it might not be a bad strategy for the federal Tories and the provincial Tories to say, 'we will all speak with the same voice, we will all say the same thing and everybody will believe us.' That is only true if both parts of the team maintain their credibility. What do we see from the Prime Minister of Canada lately as far as credibility is concerned? Well, I guess the best example was his sacred trust with respect to universality and with respect to not attacking old age pensions. Within a couple of months after he

was elected, he tried to cut back the old age pensions and were it not for the senior citizens of this country and their grey power mounting that tremendous campaign, the Prime Minister of Canada might have gotten away with it because members opposite were not opening their mouths. They were not saying a word to protect the senior citizens of this Province.

But then we had a series of ministers resigning for various reasons from the Mulroney Cabinet. The most recent one being Mr. Stevens where, in a fashion very similar to what has been going on in this House -

AN HON. MEMBER:

You mean the stonewalling?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, exactly - the Prime Minister tried to stonewall in the same way that the Premier is trying to stonewall as far as the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) is concerned.

The credibility of the Prime Minister of this country has been severely damaged, and lo and behold, what is happening is that the credibility of members opposite is being damaged at the same time. But do you know something? I think that even if the Prime Minister's credibility had not been damaged, the credibility of members opposite would be questionable now anyhow.

The Premier of this Province only a few months ago got up and said that he had been lying to the people of this Province for, what was it, six years, on the railway. He had been saying that we had a constitutional right to have a railway forever.

All of a sudden we find the Premier of this Province saying, 'No, no, we do not have a constitutional right anymore.' Now, why would he be saying that? If you look at the proceedings of the House of Commons, the federal ministers up there are all saying Newfoundland has a constitutional right, the Prime Minister is saying Newfoundland has a constitutional right, why is the Premier of this Province saying we do not, contrary to his own words of a few years ago? Obviously, he is trying to pave the way to weaken Newfoundland's case, to make it easier to sell-out the railway when the day comes when that will be necessary, and that day will be necessary when his bosses in Ottawa tell him, Okay, 'Brian', now is the time to sell-out the Newfoundland railway. He will do it, he will jump to it, Mr. Speaker.

In the Minister of Public Works and Service's (Mr. Young) incident there last week we got a real insight into the way the Premier thinks. He went on television in this Province and launched into a tremendous attack on the press. Why did he attack the press? He attacked the press for taking unfair advantage of the Minister of Public Works and Services. That is exactly what he was saying. He said, you know this minister is easily flustered. You can dress him up but you cannot take him out. We know he is not competent. That is what he was saying, basically. You know, I only have him there. Why? Because I owe him a favour or because he has something on me. Why does he have him in Cabinet and why is he protecting him? That is a question we will have to put to the Premier when he comes back in the House, if he ever

comes back in the House. The Premier basically was saying to the press, it is not fair what you did. It was cruel and it was not fair for you to trick the Minister of Public Works and Services into telling the truth. That is where we are in this Province today, because the minister never did deny what he said. He said the same thing here in the House, it is in Hansard, that he would hire sons and daughters of people who supported him before he would hire the sons and daughters of other people. Now, those sons and daughters may never have voted in their lives.

DR. COLLINS:

You are flogging a dead horse, like always.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I admit that the Minister of Public Works and Services is a dead horse and we want to see him six feet under, politically.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

And we want to see the Premier of this Province throw the first sod down on his political grave. That is what he should do, if he had any honour as a Premier. He should not permit the Minister of Public Works and Services to engage in those kind of corrupt practices, that patronage, that punishment of all those 40,000 young men and women who are looking for work because they did not vote for the member. In the House of Assembly the minister said, 'I said that the person who worked for me politically, his son and daughter had a better chance of getting a job than the son and daughter of a person who worked against me.' Now, that is

corruption, that is an abuse of office, that is a despicable attack on every young person who has not been politically active.

Mr. Speaker, dead horse or no, to remove the stench in the political nostrils of this Province, that dead horse has to be politically buried. Mr. Speaker, we all know there is a ritual, we all know there is a formality to go through. Mr. Speaker, we all know about the formality and the formality requires the Premier of the Province to be the main pallbearer in this type of situation. The Premier of this Province is the main pallbearer.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works the end of last week, last Friday, when he was feeling the heat on this issue to which I just referred, he said to members on this side of the House, after the House closed - I cannot use the term he used - 'You will not be able to get me next week, because I am going to be out of the Province'. Well, Mr. Speaker, we see the minister living up to his words. He is gone out of the Province so that we cannot get at him. But not only is he gone, we see the Premier of this Province, who was here, by the way, last Friday, in this building and would not show up at Question Period, and, when I gave him a list of questions that I wanted answers to today, we saw the Premier take the list yesterday and not have the courage to show up today.

Now all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is does it make any wonder that we would question whether we should believe members opposite on the Atlantic Accord when it goes contrary to what the minister was saying a few years ago, when it goes contrary to what the Premier

was saying?

This is the other point now: The Government House Leader attacked me for having the audacity to say that we should go back for this 25 per cent back in, that there should be the right of a Crown corporation to have a share of Hibernia, that it was not right for Mr. Mulroney to do this without ever consulting with the Premier, because, you know, once Mulroney did it, naturally the Premier then could not say anything but, 'Well, I agree with it'.

What was he saying a couple of years ago? Let us just look at what they were saying about the participation. Remember, we started a Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation? Now, let me quote the words of the Premier on January 25, 1982. Listen to this. "Through direct participation in the resource development process, the corporation, that is the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation, is designed to help the Province achieve a fair share of revenues, jobs and industrial benefits while operating in a manner which is sensitive to local needs." Now listen to what he says: "Under the Province's regulations, said the Premier" - this is in 1982 - "more than half of the income to government from Hibernia will come through the participation of the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Corporation." More than half of our revenue!

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier was taking the same position in 1982 as members on this side of the House are taking today. He was supporting the notion of having a Crown corporation to participate



in the development of Hibernia. Now, I do not know if I can find his exact words, I looked at them a couple of days ago. But, when the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) was attacking me in his speech on the Accord, he forgot, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier had been saying the same thing, and the Government House Leader said, 'That is total foolishness, total nonsense!' Total foolishness, he said, to think about getting revenue through a Crown corporation. Well, did he consult with the Premier? Is he saying that the Premier was a total fool in 1982, and does he still think that the Premier is a total fool today? Or at what point in time did the Premier cease to be a total fool? Was it when the government changed in Ottawa and when the Premier stopped criticizing the government in Ottawa? Is that when the Government House Leader stopped thinking that the Premier was a total fool? Or does he still think he is a total fool but is afraid to tell him?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:  
Now, the minister got up and asked me for my resignation and he quoted my letter of resignation where I said, Mr. Speaker, that I did not think the Premier would be able to bring about a settlement along the lines of what he was proposing when I resigned. And do you know something?

MR. TULK:  
You were right.

MR. BARRY:  
I was absolutely right. Because within six months, Mr. Speaker, or less, actually it was within four

months, the Premier had to give up this notion of negotiating through a committee and he had to send the minister up to meet face to face, first with Mr. Lalonde and then with Mr. Chretien. He had to give up this notion that you could negotiate through a committee.

Now, was I wrong in saying that their approach was going to delay getting a settlement?

MR. TULK:  
You were absolutely right.

MR. BARRY:  
It was back in September, 1981 that I resigned, almost five years ago. Now, have we overheated the economy so far? Has the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador been blackened by that petroleum? Are our salt water cowboys, Mr. Speaker, riding the range on their million dollar ranches from all the money they are making offshore? Is the Government of this Province rolling in revenues from the offshore so that they can keep the Come By Chance hospital open, or keep the Grand Bank hospital open, or keep the St. Lawrence hospital open? Are they rolling in revenues so that they can fund the university?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Order, please!

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

MR. PATTERSON:  
I notice the trained seals are managing to get their flippers up on the desks and they pat them

very gently. The Leader of the Opposition was mentioning about the offshore and the wealth and so on. He is the only fellow who made any money off the offshore so far. You do not have to be in the offshore in Newfoundland to drive a Mercedes, all you have to be is a lawyer. That is all you have to be, and an unscrupulous one, at that!

MR. BARRY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the puffball of poison from Placentia has never made an honest dollar in his life, has never been able to keep a business going, has never been able to do anything for which people were prepared to pay him. Now, fortunately, Mr. Speaker, that was not like me. Fortunately, people were prepared to pay for my services and pay well, and get a bloody good job done when they paid for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

And the jealousy, Mr. Speaker, of the Placentia puffball of poison is not going to detract at all from the reality of the situation, which is that the member is on a slippery political slope, he is

going down for the third time and, Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is go out and find a name on a headstone and the member will be defeated in the next election. All we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is get a good name off a headstone and he is gone.

MR. PATTERSON:

Here is The Canadian Lawyer, read that, boy!

MR. CALLAN:

Remember what Hopper said yesterday?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, that is a good point.

Talking about all the revenue we are going to get from the Hibernia, Wilbert Hopper says it would be very sensible, Mr. Speaker, for the Government of Canada to subsidize the production at Hibernia. Now, this is a man, the guy who is leaving Petro-Canada. One would assume he knows a little bit more about oil than the member for Placentia, who might have seen cod oil; he never got his feet wet, he never went out and did an honest days work fishing, he was a hangishore, Mr. Speaker, a hangishore who never went below the low water mark. The only time he saw salt water was when they flooded Placentia Beach. Mr. Speaker, that member might have known what cod liver oil was all about. If he was around the wharf when those people who were working for a living rolled up a tub of cod liver oil, a puncheon of cod liver oil, Mr. Speaker, then the member for Placentia might have experienced cod liver oil, but he is surely not in a position to criticize Wilbert Hopper who says that now we are talking about subsidizing production from Hibernia. What

does that mean? Instead of the taxpayers of Canada getting revenue, it means that the taxpayers' dollars have to go into it in order to get production.

MR. PATTERSON:

There is nothing new about subsidies, boy.

MR. BARRY:

There is nothing new about subsidies, because the member for Placentia, that is the only thing he survived on for the last seventy-five years. Ever since during the dirty thirties he has spent his time getting his scrip. He has existed on subsidies, he has been sucking on the public tit, Mr. Speaker, for a number of years.

MR. PATTERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PATTERSON:

This is The Canadian lawyer. 'Barry says his firm earned an estimated \$750,000 off fifteen clients.' Can you imagine that?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Fifteen poor widows.

MR. PATTERSON:

Fifteen poor widows. He does not know what to do now, because he has been censored by the Law Society, and that is a closed shop, so the decision they made has not come out.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

The scum is short down again.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, again the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) refers to a matter which was dealt with and which was dismissed.

MR. PATTERSON:

What did they do to you?

MR. BARRY:

They dismissed it. They dismissed it.

MR. PATTERSON:

You were tried by the Law Society. What was the verdict?

MR. BARRY:

They dismissed it, as was made public over a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, the heavyweights in the backbenches have been engaging in a tremendous, withering attack on me all afternoon and I have been told, Mr. Speaker, I only have five minutes left. I was about to crumple from that devastating attack by the Placentia puffball of poison, but now, Mr. Speaker, we hear something else coming up from the backbenches. Well, I will leave that, Mr. Speaker. I do not have my scooper here so I will leave that to be dealt with by other members. But I have just been informed as to where the Minister of Public Works is. The Minister of Public Works - now this should be good - is attending a two day meeting of the Canadian Committee on Procurement Standards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Is he addressing them?

MR. BARRY:

Well, I wonder if he is the keynote speaker? The Standards of

Procurement! And, following this meeting, he will also attend the Sixty-First Conference of the Purchasing Management Association of Canada, which is also being held in Ottawa and concludes on Friday. So the Minister of Public Works is out of the House for good, he is out of the House for the rest of the week.

Now, we can only assume that the Minister of Public Works is giving the keynote address as to the standards to apply in procuring the services of young men and women. But we would really like to know the standards of the employees. For example, do they have a set of membership cards for a Tory youth brigade? Does a young person have to go into the Department of Public Works and swear undying fealties to the Minister of Public Works, his complete works and beliefs, his political philosophy, the party doctrine, the party standards, the party policies? Is this what a person has to do?

MR. PEACH:

We are some lucky we got rid of you 'Leo'.

MR. BARRY:

Is he going to inform people in other provinces how to do this, how to weed out those young men and women looking for jobs and make sure that nobody gets a job in the Department of Public Works except somebody who is the son or daughter of one who has supported the minister?

Well, Mr. Speaker, we look forward to The Globe and Mail reporting on the minister's speech. I wonder if the minister would be kind enough, if members opposite would be kind enough to get a copy of the minister's speech for us so

we can understand just what standards -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) in the files in the Department of Fisheries on you.

MR. FUREY:

'Morgan', what files do you mean? You cannot even find your own files, boy.' Morgan' where are your files?

MR. W. CARTER:

(Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:

People who live in glass houses. Walter, I am telling you, old buddy.

MR. FUREY:

'Morgan', where are your files?

MR. MORGAN:

Walter, you do not believe in that trash anymore, do you?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Could we have silence while the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is debating?

MR. FUREY:

Trying to suck your way back in into the Cabinet are you 'Morgan'?

MR. MORGAN:

Explain to your Leader why (inaudible) then and not now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Could we have order please?

MR. FUREY:  
Trying to earn your way back into  
Cabinet, are you, 'Morgan'?

MR. MORGAN:  
We have the files to show that.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Name him. Name him.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am amazed! You would think the  
member, having been out of the  
House for awhile, would be able to  
control himself.

MR. TOBIN:  
He never missed as much of the  
House as you used to miss.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. FUREY:  
Get in your seat, gofer.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, we have an Atlantic  
Accord debate here where the  
Government House Leader stood in  
his place and attacked himself,  
attacked his Premier and then  
asked me to resign.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. BARRY:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe some

members opposite could explain why  
it is that I should resign when  
the minister attacked his own  
statements, attacked the  
statements of the Premier and has  
admitted that he has not yet  
overheated the economy nor flooded  
this Province with revenues from  
offshore oil and gas. Thank you  
very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FUREY:  
Trying to suck your way back into  
the Cabinet.

MR. MORGAN:  
Ask 'Walter Carter' about  
appointments.

MR. FUREY:  
Trying to salt your way into the  
Cabinet.

MR. MORGAN:  
Ask your leader about appointments  
of friends.

MR. CALLAN:  
I am asking you. I am asking you.

MR. MORGAN:  
I know a few fellows appointed by  
him who would tell you the  
difference.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

Could we have silence, please?

MR. MORGAN:  
Come on, boy, do not be  
hypocritical. You are losing  
support as a party leader around

the Province. You are being laughed at.

MR. BARRY:

Have you been following the debate on the Salfish Corporation?

MR. MORGAN:

I have read it all I have a (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

I am warning all members of the House that I want silence or I will name the members.

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FUREY:

You are a suck, 'Morgan'.

MR. MORGAN:

Ask your friend, 'Walter Carter', about appointments.

MR. FUREY:

Your nose is brown, boy.

MR. MORGAN:

Ask him. Ask him!

MR. CALLAN:

I am asking you.

MR. MORGAN:

I am not getting all the crap, you fellows are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Name him! Name Him!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is an historic debate and I would like to get a few comments in at the end here, just before we vote on it. I would like to put on the record the position that my

party has taken consistently since we have started. I have some extensive notes that I will be referring to here.

Anyone who tells you what is going to happen with offshore oil is a fool, or lying, or both. There is little that we can do in this Province to influence worldwide conditions in the industry, especially with regard to price. But even with everything going our way, with prices rising, with new oil fields, with plenty of development and exploration, we will still have a major problem providing work for all the people in our Province who want it. And it is once this fact sinks in that we will have to wake up and get back to the very mundane job of making this Province work.

Before addressing the future, I think I would like to examine the past. There is an historical maxim that says, 'He who ignores the past will repeat its mistakes'. It has been seven years since the discovery of oil in the Hibernia and Avalon structures. I think all of us thrilled to the smokey flare on a tiny platform that sent a column of smoke off over the horizon. Sitting there in the hard blue sea, it was a curiously smokey flame of hope. As that same image reappeared on our television screens, it came to represent good, decent jobs, high paying and demanding, providing our people with self-confidence and a feeling of worth. Slowly, ever so slowly, we began to believe that finally our turn had come.

'Brian Peckford' had become Premier barely six months before that first, great Hibernia strike. As a former Minister of Mines, he had a real claim to

credit for the policies in place when the discovery was made. As is usual with our Premier, he was not modest in claiming that credit. He stopped short of saying that he had actually put the marine animals out there millions of years ago that produced the oil, but just short of that.

Almost immediately, Ottawa and St. John's began asserting ownership of the resource, tugging back and forth in a struggle that would last until the Supreme Court of Canada cut the rope and, unfortunately, gave the long end to the federal government.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, it is a well known-parliamentary dictum that you are not to read speeches in the House, you are supposed to speak your own thoughts. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not particularly rising on that point of order. But there is even another point, that you are not supposed to read other people's speeches. It seems to me that the hon. member's words do not sound like his speech. I have heard him many times in this House, and the phrases are not the same. I suggest that the hon. member may be reading someone else's composition and I think that is quite out of order in the House.

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

I will be glad to produce a copy of the notes for the member opposite who has complained. I am not reading a speech, but I am using the notes copiously. I can assure him, given the resources that the House provides me, that these, indeed, are my own words and my own phrasing.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, it is accepted that one cannot read a speech, but I am not aware that the hon. member is reading a speech. There is no point of order.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Are you going to circulate them?

MR. FENWICK:

I will be glad to give a copy to members afterwards.

During this prolonged dispute, Mr. Speaker, the major political parties have covered all corners of the map. For example, in 1979 - 1980 the federal Tories, under what can only be described as the insipid leadership of Joe Clark, were being bullied by our Premier during an election campaign to acknowledge the Province's claim to the resource. Clark, the Prime Minister, seemed quite reluctant to acknowledge this. But once defeated and safely in Opposition, where he had no responsibility, he became much bolder. His successor, Mulroney, in his usual, principled way, sold the federal shop for support in the 1984 election. The result, Mr. Speaker, is this particular piece of legislation that we have before us today.

The Liberals, on the other hand, have been more consistent, at least at the federal level. You may not have liked Trudeau's insistence on hogging the oil, but you knew where he stood. It would have been refreshing to see the provincial Liberal Party just as consistent, but in support of the Province's position. Instead, we got a succession of leaders who vacillated under Trudeau's spell, betraying their own innate feelings that they indeed should stand up for our Province.

This vacillation on the part of the Liberals is in stark contrast to the early, firm and consistent stand taken by the New Democratic Party, both federally and provincially. In 1979, Fouse Faour, who at that time was a NDP, MP from this Province, prepared and proposed an offshore oil policy to the federal NDP caucus that called for offshore resources to be treated exactly as though they were on our shore. That policy was later supported by the provincial New Democratic Party and, Mr. Speaker, that policy has been our policy to this very day.

In the 1982 provincial election we restated that support, despite the almost incoherent ramblings of a Premier who declared, and I recall it vividly because he did it in my own college, 'all who are against me are traitors.' It was tempting, awfully tempting to turn on that kind of arrogance and oppose just for the sake of opposing but the principle was much too important to use politically.

Today we have finally arrived. Offshore oil is to be treated just as if it was onshore. We lost the legal battles but, from our perspective, we never had faith in

them first or last. Our argument was always that it was in the interest of fairness that we should have the oil, and it was that fairness argument that won in the end.

We, therefore, look upon the Atlantic Accord as a victory for the position that we as a party, both federally and provincially, took and have held consistently for the last seven years.

What, then, are the fruits of this victory? If current trends prevail, the fruits may be small and they may be bitter. In the Fall of 1980, The Economic Council of Canada estimated the cost of oil would be over \$40 per barrel in 1985 and 1986. It predicted, Mr. Speaker, that we would be in the second year of production of the Hibernia structure, and that provincial revenues would vary between \$150 million and \$584 million per year, depending upon which agreement was used and what the price of oil was at the time. Instead, the revenues from offshore oil are, in fact, a negative, not even covering our share, for example, of the development fund that is currently in place and the best estimate to see oil flowing is 1992, if not later, a full six years behind the schedule estimated by The Economic Council.

If that were not enough, the price of oil has slipped down at an alarming rate. The cash flow and tax write-offs that Mobil and others were counting on to finance their \$5 billion concrete tower are just not there, choked off by the collapsing price of oil. Mobil and friends may still be willing to proceed on the construction of this modern day Tower of Babel, but it will



require courage to pour billions of dollars into a concrete platform when the price of oil is as low as it is today. But, even if production does proceed, oil prices have crippled further exploration. The loss of PIP grants has stopped the independent Canadians in their tracks and the low price of oil is even drying up funds to the big multi-nationals. Although PIP grants are not strictly part of this debate, this House must soon address the problem of how to deal with the immediate future of the industry. It is my opinion that incentive grants are now needed to restart this critical exploration process and, quite frankly, it is a shame that the harvest has not been more bountiful.

Six years ago, the Council estimated oil revenues of \$584 million for this year. Think of that! That would be enough to pay for our entire health system in the last year, with enough left over to pay for virtually all the building being built by the Department of Public Works and Services. On the revenue side it could have eliminated entirely our 12 per cent sales tax, and provided enough additional monies to knock out three quarters of our income tax. In job creation it could have created good paying jobs for perhaps as many as 30,000 people. Whether this harvest of jobs, services and revenues will ever come is now in question, so much depends upon the price of oil, and, as I said at the start, we do not control that. What if it does turn out to be a bitter harvest, indeed? Then we will have to turn to the other trees in the orchard, to continue that analogy, fishing, agriculture, mining, manufacturing and our service industries. There is an

axiom that the time you spend pruning, fertilizing and nurturing one tree can never be used upon another. This present government, to give them credit, has worked hard on the offshore oil industry, devoting thousands of hours in negotiating, fighting with the federal government and in litigation, time, unfortunately, that can never be recaptured to develop our fishery, forestry and other industries, and these, Mr. Speaker, are the industries that can and must provide the jobs that our people so clearly deserve.

I say to the government opposite, with the passing of this Bill into law, you have done all you now can do with offshore oil. It is now time to turn your attention to the hard, mundane task of creating an economy with work and jobs for all of us. As long as we sit in opposition, you will have our support in that task just as we expect your support for our efforts when you are in opposition. The Accord is signed. We are now enacting it into law and it will do what it will do. Let us now leave it, for it is time to solve our problems the hard way, with honest work in our old industries.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. the President of the Council speaks now he will close the debate.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I shall not be long in closing the debate because

there is not really that much to say. The closing of debate is for the purpose of rebutting certain arguments that have been made against the legislation or the motion that you brought before the floor of the House. Quite frankly, there has been very, very little of substance said by the hon. gentlemen there opposite with respect to the principle of this bill itself.

The principle of that bill is quite clearly, obviously, a matter of joint management of the offshore resources where this Province has gained as full and complete control over the resource insofar as it would want control within the Canadian Confederation. I can touch on that in a moment. The other principle of the bill, of course, is the matter of revenue sharing and the fact that we are entitled to assess revenues on the offshore resource the same way as if on land. I note that it was quite pointed that the hon. gentlemen there opposite really steered away as much as they could from those particular issues which are the real principle of the bill and represent the real victory in the bill itself.

The Leader of the Opposition particularly, as the predecessor in this portfolio, I was very disappointed with his speech. He really did not get into the substance and lock issue in the debate in the way that I thought that he might have. He was given plenty of opportunity to because when I spoke I referred to and joined issue with the five or six points he had made last February when the bill had been debated at that particular time. His reasons for not locking issue in a substantive way are known to him

and I do not necessarily need to go into them.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this - I will just touch on a few of the arguments - the matter of refining is about the only thing that the official Opposition can talk about in connection with this bill.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
The back-in.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Well, there was no mention made that I recall. I was not in the House for the whole of the speech of the Leader of the Opposition but I will deal with the back-in. I already have, in fact.

MR. MATTHEWS:  
The back-in was mentioned by the member for Stephenville (MR. K. Aylward).

MR. MARSHALL:  
Yes, the back-in by the member for Stephenville. We remember when he said that. But let us deal with the refining first.

As I said, the main elements of this bill is a matter of management and revenue sharing. Indeed, that was the main issue that was addressed by the Leader of the Opposition when he choose to resign his portfolio as Minister of Mines and Energy. At the time, and I will just quote him again, he said to the Premier as the reason for his resignation, "Frankly, I do not think your approach will achieve that which is crucially important for our Province to achieve, namely, a fair division of revenue and a substantial degree of control in any joint management scheme for the offshore resources." Now having taken that serious step,

the hon. gentleman has not even, in his speech, really addressed the basis of that resignation. When he gave those reasons for his resignation, he, in effect, was conceding at the time that the main issues confronting the Province on this offshore issue were management and revenue sharing. All and any other matters related to the Accord and to the legislation that is before this House today, with the exception of the local preference policy that is going to give young Newfoundlanders for generations to come the right for a fair chance at the jobs offshore when these jobs materialize, all other elements are really collateral. They are important in their way but they are collateral, these matters of not changing the legislation without mutual consent, the equalization provisions and, of course, the provisions with respect to the refinery.

Now, the real power with respect to that Accord and this legislation, with respect to refinery itself, obviously lies in the power which the government of this Province has achieved to assess revenues as if it were on land. We can use that particular power, Mr. Speaker, and exercise that power for the benefit of the people of this Province that we wish. We now have it within our powers, with respect to that one element of the agreement alone, to preclude any agreement from taking place, because we have, for instance, the right to assess royalties, and only the Province of Newfoundland can assess royalties, and we have the right to assess provincial corporate income tax, etc. So we can use that power in all areas, including the refining area if we wish to,

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of preserving any rights with respect to the refinery itself. Now, the fact of the matter is whether you use that power and how you use that power will be a matter of concern of governments in years to come as they tackle, as we are presently tackling, Hibernia, and as future governments negotiate with companies with respect to the development of other structures. The thing that I think must to remember when you are dealing with this, in all fairness and reasonableness and rationality, is that oil is no different, really, than any other commodity. Really, you cannot sell it outright any more than you can, as much as you would like to, sell the iron ore from Western Labrador, sell it outright and necessarily make the absolute condition that the purchaser must use it in the way in which you define it to be used. Otherwise, of course, if we possible could, the iron ore of Labrador West would not be exported in its form but would be used for the purpose of manufacturing steel in the Province. Indeed, if you wanted to really press the analogy to the petrochemical area, the refining of crude would be done in our petrochemical complexes, and the iron ore of Labrador would go to our car factories and what have you. You have to deal with the world not as you would like it to be, nor with the world as you might in all sorts of theory address it, but you have to deal with the world as it is and you cannot really sell it twice.

Now, in this particular time, if you tried to make that condition, you very likely would have a very, very difficult time in seeing the development of any structure outside this Province. At the

present time, for instance, in Saint John, New Brunswick, Irving Oil has a refinery that is only operating at 25 per cent of its capacity. That other 75 per cent could be operated with substantially the same costs as are involved at the present time. The operator of Hibernia would tend to put crude first through that refinery in the immediate proximity because it could do it at a much lesser cost than if a new refinery were built here in this Province or even a refurbished refinery.

So those then really are the facts of life. We have really given up absolutely nothing. As a matter of fact, in Clause 41 of the legislation we have preserved to the greatest degree possible, insofar as government in the future will be able to direct crude to come to the Province of Newfoundland, it is there crystal clear that Come By Chance, or any replacement for Come By Chance, will get first preferance and then, after the needs of Atlantic Canada have been satisfied, we will get preferance again. But, as I say, members should only regard that really, if you are looking at it seriously, as a collateral right, something that you can hang your peg on some time in the future, something for protection of future generations, but at the present time, in the present economy and the present state of organization of our society, the immediate application of that particular power is not one that we can utilize.

Our main power under that agreement counts in respect to the refinery, obviously, with respect to that right that has been conferred upon us, and this was the key and this was the clue, Mr.

Speaker, in negotiating the Accord with respect to that, and it comes right down to the fact that it is the Province of Newfoundland, the Government of Newfoundland, not even that joint board that I will get to in a moment, that has the power to assess royalties and taxes, and through that the government has whatever powers may be necessary.

I hope to see refineries emanating from this agreement in years to come, in the future. I have no doubt that they will in the future, but I mean you cannot look to clause 54 or clause 41 as being any weakness and logically sustain it. The only reason, Mr. Speaker, why they are doing it and I think it is very evident by the way the official Opposition is tackling and emphasizing Clause 54 is because they have nothing really of substance to say about the principle of that bill, which is a principle which gained us management and the right to assess revenues as if they were on land.

We got those rights, do not forget, at a time when the Supreme Court of Canada indicated that the complete and absolute fee simple ownership, freehold ownership or what have you, was vested in the Government of Canada. So we regard that as being a considerable accomplishment and one which is going to endure to the benefit of generations of Newfoundlanders for years yet to come.

Now with respect to the management, some of the members alluded to it, and I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition did today or not, but he has in the past, but certainly members of the official Opposition talk about who has the management

rights. Now, the management rights, as we know, are in a joint board, but the ultimate responsibility, the ultimate powers rest in the federal government and the provincial government. With respect to revenue which I have already dealt with that, we have the ultimate, right from the first, complete and absolutely control there.

With respect to the management, we have the right to select at all times. The main concern to the people of this Province about management is how is any development that is going to occur going to be developed, the mode or manner or development, specifically, as we know from the debates, whether a developer opts for concrete platforms or floating platforms. Now we have forever and a day gained that right, that the Province of Newfoundland will be the ultimate arbiter of that. The only element that we have given up in any kind of control at all - if giving up is the word and I do not accept it as giving up - is we have said we will not exercise that control with respect to the rate of exploration and the rate of development until such time as Canada gets energy self-sufficiency and security of supply. That is the one exception and we have all the other controls.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

The minister is saying something completely outrageous. The minister has now made the declaration that there is not

going to be any refining in the Province. Should the minister not wait until the Dor Chemical proposal has been received until they have completed their review? Or is the minister aware of something that he has not yet told the House? Is he undermining the attempt of this company to start up that refinery, or is he dismissing their intentions and saying that they are going to come to nothing?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only one that has undermined the interest of the people of this Province has been the hon. gentleman there opposite, in the way in which the hon. gentleman has treated this whole issue. I have said absolutely nothing of that kind. I am explaining the import of that particular provision and the lack of any credibility of the argument that has been advanced by the Opposition from time to time with respect to refining capacity emanating from any development that occurs out there.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

With respect to management, Mr. Speaker, we have all the management rights with only one exception, as I indicated, and we have said, with respect to the

rate of development and the rate and manner of exploration, until Canada gets energy self-sufficient and security of supply we will accept whatever rate is necessary to attain it. What possible right have we given up there? We are a part of the Canadian nation. One would expect any province of Canada to willingly concede that particular right, if concede is the right word, even if you owned it outright. If you are going to be part of a country you are not going to have people in Saint John, New Brunswick, or in Montreal or in Charlottetown needing the means for warmth in their houses, the means to drive the engines of their industry and us being able to withhold it here in this Province.

So in effect what we have, Mr. Speaker, in this particular bill is we have as full control as we need in the Canadian Confederation, complete control with respect to the assessment of revenues as if they are on land. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not only the best agreement that could be obtained, but the best that could possibly be conceived within Confederation. That is why, Mr. Speaker, the Government of British Columbia has asked for this particular agreement. It is why the Northwest and Yukon Territories have asked for this agreement. It is why the Government of Nova Scotia is presently negotiating with a view to getting this agreement, and it is why a companion bill that went up before the House of Commons passed unanimously in the House of Commons with all parties voting unanimously in favour of and agreeing with it in principle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, that is the situation.

Now I have already dealt with the Leader of the Opposition and the position with respect to the Leader of the Opposition, but I really want to say this to him seriously. Now the hon. the Leader of the Opposition resigned on this particular issue. A resignation from the government at any time is a very serious step for any person to take, and it was particularly serious, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, when one has the responsibility for this portfolio at a time when the situation was so volatile as it was and we were having such difficulties in gaining any measure of control with respect to the offshore.

So I know that the Leader of the Opposition would not have addressed that resignation without addressing it very, very seriously and weighing it. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, about the Leader of the Opposition, that you have to look at the reasons for that resignation. The only reason that we can take for that resignation is what the hon. gentleman put in his letter, and I quote once again, and he said to the Premier as a reason, "Frankly, I do not think your approach will achieve that which is crucially important for our Province to achieve, namely, a fair division of revenue and a substantial degree of control in any joint management scheme for the offshore resources".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

Now the Leader of the Opposition - as I say, B.C., the Yukon, and all parties in the House of Commons have accented it - but he, in this

debate today, Mr. Speaker, has not even addressed those two elements which were the main reasons for his resignation.

MR. BARRY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Just for the record, you know, when students of history and so forth come back and listen to the misleading statements of the Government House Leader, I would like for the Government House Leader to keep in mind that I gave my primary speech on the Accord debate on February 21, 1986, Volume XL, Number 87, Page 4955 to 4968 of our Hansard, and the matters that the Government House Leader refers to were dealt with there in detail. The fact that I did not deal with some of these points here today was just to save the time of the House, as we said we would, to help expedite the passage of the bill, that the points that were raised by the Government House Leader, I used his own words and the Premier's words today, to rebut.

With respect to my resignation, the minister must have been out of the House. Because I pointed out today that the procedure was changed within four months after I left Cabinet, and the minister has to admit this, that he had to negotiate face to face with the federal Energy Minister. The procedure was changed, but apart from that, Mr. Speaker, we have very legitimate concerns as to whether there is a substantial degree of control and revenue as though the resource were on land. We have mentioned this to him time

after time and we will be proposing amendments at the Committee stage to deal with these points. So let us not waste the time of the House.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is not a point of order.

MR. BARRY:

There was a five year delay.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must rule there is no point of order. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition took the opportunity of explaining his actions.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is I responded to those points point by point, and the hon. gentleman in debate today has not joined issue, but I am not going to continue on that. The hon. gentleman is not going to resign. I withdraw, anyway, my request for him to resign. As a person who is interested in the furtherance of the Tory Party in government in this Province for a long period of time, I think the hon. gentleman should stay in the Opposition as Leader for an appreciable period of time.

Mr. Speaker, the other keynote speaker - I am not going to deal with all the hon. gentlemen - but I do want to deal with the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker), who was the official person to respond to the introduction of the bill itself. The only thing I will just quote is that the words 'not' and 'no' and 'it will not happen' are so engrained into the vocabulary of the Opposition that it is quite obvious that the only thing they are concerned with is that they hope that things do not happen.

First of all, to quote him, 'When that was shown by the courts not to be so, we got to the stage, well, at least we might be able to manage it as if we owned it. If we control what is happening out there, if we are to get all the money from it, then I would not want anything else. You know, what more can we want? What are we complaining about? We have control, we have all the money. The word 'not' appears in just about every sentence, and the hon. gentleman opposite represents the official position of the official Opposition because they have really a death wish for this Province and really, in the final analysis, they hope that nothing will, in fact, happen.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered everything. I should be able to speak longer in rebuttal of the debate. I just say it is rather disappointing that the Leader of the Opposition, who put such a stake in this particular bill, when he got up to speak, spoke the way he did. He did not address the matters which are joint management, revenue control, the rights to Newfoundlanders for jobs, equalization protection, the fact that this agreement is ingrained in the Statutes of Canada and the Statutes of Newfoundland, the protection with respect to secondary processing. None of these were mentioned. He just tried to skirt over them and really hopes that they will be overlooked. But they will not be overlooked, Mr. Speaker, because this is a bill which, as I said, is good for Newfoundland, it is good for Canada, and it will redound to the benefit of Newfoundlanders for years to come. I move second reading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the pleasure of the House that the bill be now read a second time? Those in favour 'aye'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division.

MR. MARSHALL:

Call in the members, Mr. Speaker. We want a standing vote.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

### Division

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell), the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), Mr. Baird, Mr. Greening,



Mr. Patterson, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Peach, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Warren, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Woodford, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

- Mr. Flight, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Callan, Mr. Lush, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Efford, Mr. Baker, Mr. Furey, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Fenwick.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The motion is carried unanimously.

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

The hon. gentleman over there I think is carrying on some proceeding. We cannot hear because of that crowd over there. Could you keep the maw mouth from Bonavista South quiet?

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Implement An Agreement Between The Government Of Canada And The Government Of Newfoundland And Labrador On Offshore Petroleum Resource Management And Revenue Sharing", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, presently. (Bill No. 1).

MR. MARSHALL:  
Order 22, Bill No. 39.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1983." (Bill No. 39).

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Debate on this bill was adjourned yesterday by the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure to speak to this bill today. I want to express some of the concerns that I have with the Workers' Compensation Act itself and the Workers' Compensation Board.

I was looking through the annual report and one of the things that was pointed out in the report is that they are concentrating a lot on rehabilitation. I am very pleased to see that but I think that not enough effort is being put into the rehabilitating of people who, for very good reasons, cannot continue to work in the work force. I think it is an emphasis that we have to put into the Workers Compensation Board, an emphasis that has to be carried forth.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Ask the hon. gentleman to -

MR. FUREY:

Kick that big goof out.

MR. TULK:

— (inaudible), and if he does not take it out, will you remove the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would you have that removed? Thank you.

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring up certain cases of people whom I have dealt with over the last number of months where they have a limited disability. There is no way that they can go back to work because they cannot get a doctor's certificate. They could probably do a certain type of work but they are not trained for it. I think that there is not enough emphasis being put on this because these people feel very left out, in between a hard and a hard place in the sense that they cannot pursue a living because the act or the Compensation Board does not recognize or is not flexible enough to provide an opportunity for these people.

I can think of a specific case where a gentleman used to be a heavy equipment operator and he hurt his legs. They say that he cannot get a licence because he has a certain disability, yet he could possibly perform the work but he is not allowed to get a licence because of this disability. He is not a trained individual in any other type of work so he is now left out in the cold in a lot of ways. He cannot pursue other work and so he is making a very meagre living. He has tried for many years to get

through the Workers' Compensation Board's head that, "I want to pursue other types of work and I want to work." I think that we have to place an emphasis at the Workers' Compensation Board on that type of retraining for people. It needs to be done. Just because somebody has a limited disability does not mean that they cannot work and cannot contribute to this Province's economic activity.

So I think that the board itself, while I read their annual report and it is quite glossy and nice, I hear so much about these cases of people who were on a limited disability that an emphasis should be placed on that by the board. I was also reading the annual report and it was saying how the work ethic is affected by people who feel very low in society. They feel that they cannot contribute any more and I think it is very damaging to the whole spirit of people in this Province who, through no fault of their own in the work place, have had an injury which has limited them in their abilities to earn a living for themselves.

So, as I was going through the report and going through the legislation, that is one factor that I must say I was taken aback by. It also brought the realization home that we have to do more for these people because I think everybody out there who has been hurt and is trying to get Workers' Compensation, in 99.9 per cent of all the cases, they are people who are legitimately trying to work. For some reason they cannot work but need some type of income to help them pursue a good life in this Province. Again, I express the concern that we should do more. I must say that I was

very happy again to see in the report that there was an emphasis being put on it.

Also, there was a very positive note in that report that people who have been retrained, people who have taken advantage of that course of action to retrain and to get into a different occupation for the future, have done very well. The success rate has been very good. So that is a positive note that I think should be noted and that should be pushed by all government members, that this type of emphasis on the retraining of individuals to give them other options for their future work should be pushed as much as possible. It is the sense of people who have been injured and feel as if they have no hope for the future that we have to try to dispel. We have to try to get rid of that as much as possible because it is the furthest thing from the fact. Again, from the cases that I have seen and have had to deal with, I find that many of these people could be trained in different areas for the future. We have a community college system that is pushing retraining.

I think it brings out an issue that has been coming to the forefront in the last number of years about adult education and retraining. There are people who have been in the work force for twenty-five to thirty years and who have found themselves, in a sense, disabled because their type of work is not demanded as much. In that sense, they have a disability in the sense of not being able to contribute to the economy. I think that we have to put more of an emphasis on adult retraining for those individuals who have been trained but now find

themselves, especially when it comes to a labour intensive type of work, not able to pursue this work. We should not be holding them down. We should not be holding them back from pursuing a career or an opportunity that can see them produce for Newfoundland and Labrador. It is special emphasis that I would like to put in this debate.

With regards to the bill, I also notice that in the bill itself the Emergency Measures Organization was also being put under the act and I think that is a very good move. I think these people who volunteer their services for the protection of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have been for far too long, I believe, a little bit neglected in the sense of being provided with the proper equipment and with the proper services to do the work. They perform very dangerous work on many occasions. I am happy to see that it is being put under the Workers' Compensation Act so these people will be covered. I think they are going to feel much better about the work they perform knowing that they will be compensated somewhat for their efforts, which are totally voluntary and which should be appreciated more and more. I think that is a positive move.

When it comes to the other part of the Bill, I am taking about compensation, the retraining and so on of people who have been injured and so on and who do not see a future, I think that emphasis should be placed as much as possible on this because I think we have to look to the future. Workers' Compensation is a thing that has to be dealt with, it has to be there for a helping hand and sometimes a full income.

Again, I think the emphasis on the work ethic and getting people to improve themselves is something that should be pushed as much as possible. I wanted to bring this to the minister's attention because I do not think it is being done enough and I want to see it done more.

On that note, Mr. Speaker, I would like to end.

Thank you.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to address the Bill for a few moments. I can only say that I suppose of all the departments, agencies or whatever in government, it is the Workers' Compensation that has caused more problems than any other for all members.

I can only hope and wish that the amendments that we are dealing with today in this particular Bill will certainly help to solve some of the problems that all of us had to deal with and some of the weaknesses and some of the inadequacies that were so glaringly present in the previous system. We certainly hope that the structuring we see today, although they are administrative matters, that they will solve some of the problems that we all had to deal with from time to time on behalf of our constituents.

Certainly we agree with the Tribunal Appeals Committee. I believe that this certainly should

help alleviate a lot of the problems that we previously had to deal with and we hope that present in the Bill will be some sensitivity and some real concern for the problems that many of the workers experience who are unfortunate enough to have to deal with the Workers' Compensation Board.

All hon. members know that we have had some real sad cases that have not been dealt with in the expeditious manner or in the humane manner that we would all like to have seen. Again, I am sure that all of us can go over, rehash and reiterate case after case of people who have not been treated with the degree of sensitivity, with the degree of consideration that they should have been given under the unfortunate circumstances under which they found themselves.

Again, we can only hope that the measures that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) is so sincerely introducing in this particular Bill will take care of these matters and that we shall see workers throughout the Province, workers who through the unfortunate circumstances of receiving serious injuries in the work place, will be dealt with with every consideration, with every kind of sensitivity that is humanly possible. So we hope that the structure will prove to be a good one and if there is any part of the structure that I personally support, it certainly is the appeal process. That is something that all hon. members have from time to time addressed and we are glad to see the present structure at this point in time.

The director system, we can only hope, as I say, that that will

prove to be more satisfactory than what was the previous arrangement. A lot of that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure will depend on the kinds of people who work there. That is not to suggest that we ever had the wrong kinds of people there because the Workers' Compensation I found to be a strange situation. I have never dealt with anybody on the commission or anybody within the Workers' Compensation that I did not find to be sincere, that I did not find to be people with sensitivity. There just seemed to be something wrong within the system somehow that did not allow these outward actions of sincerity to be displayed in the total dealings with the workers. Maybe it was the system. Maybe it was cumbersome. Maybe the kind of system it was did not allow for that free flow and for that line of communication and the line of sensitivity that one would want to see exercised in this very sensitive division of the Department of Labour.

When we are dealing with a person who has become incapacitated, I think it takes a lot of understanding and a lot psychology to be able to deal with somebody who for all intents and purposes possibly will not be able to work again or, if they work again, will not have the full capacity, will not have the full potential that they once had. So to just deal with that kind of a situation itself is a very difficult situation. It takes trained people to be able to deal with that kind of person who now is reduced, if you will, their total person has been reduced because when you cannot work and cannot produce to your full potential, we are dealing with a problem of a serious nature. When we are

dealing with a problem of that nature, we certainly have to have people who understand.

I would hope then, Mr. Speaker, as a final conclusion to these remarks, that the structure that the minister is now bringing in will be able to relieve and alleviate these kinds of problems that all of us have had to deal with and I would hope that above all it will result in a better mechanism for the worker because that is what it is all about. That is why we are doing it.

It is irrelevant really whether the structure makes it any better for the people working there. If people do not have the proper structure, if the system is not effective, that is one thing. I believe the minister in introducing the bill said that one of the reasons for doing this was to streamline the Workers' Compensation and to bring it more in line with advances in technology that have taken place in recent years, to update and to fine tune and to make it more in tune with the demands of today. So, Mr. Speaker, even though, these reasons are laudible reasons, they are plausible reasons, and certainly reasons for suggesting a structural change. We agree with all of that. The reasons that the minister gave make all good sense for a structural change.

But we would hope that it results in more than a structural change. We would hope that it is not only conducive to a better structure for the people who will work there, the directors and other staff members, and certainly we must have that, but we would hope that this structure will result in better treatment and in better

service to the workers of this Province. That is the key purpose, that this structure will now serve the workers of this Province in a more efficient—and in a more effective way, in a more sensitive manner and in a more humane manner. That is what we hope this bill will achieve, Mr. Speaker.

I would hope that the minister will address these two concerns, not only the need for a structural change, but also that this structural change, in addition to making the Workers' Compensation a more efficient and effective place for the people who will run the Workers' Compensation for all of the people working there, for all of the staff, but it will also result in a vast improvement for the workers of this Province, for the people who are unfortunate enough to have, as I say, to go to the Workers' Compensation to get what is rightfully theirs and to avail of the protection that they paid for.

MR. TOBIN:

Lovely speech but you said it 10 times.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I will just clarify some of the reasons why any good speaker should be repetitious.

One of the greatest French playwrights of all time was Molière, one of the most successful playwrights in the world, I suppose. Somebody asked Molière why it was that he was so successful? To what did he attribute his success? Molière said, it was through repetition.

Molière went on to say that if there was some point in his play, be it an ironical point or be it a

point of parody, but if there was some point that he wanted his audience to get, he repeated that three times, he repeated it three times, three times, using as his rationale for the three times, the repetition, the first time the very brilliant got it, the second time the average got it, and the third time the dodoes got it.

So now, Mr. Speaker, that is the principle I use and as a public speaker you must do that. I would expect now that I am at the stage where just the very brilliant got the essence of what I was saying. I would say I am at that stage. But, Mr. Speaker, I will leave the parts that are not understood probably to some other member to clarify, but I could go on and I could communicate with these other two levels if I wanted, but I believe that it is suffice it to say, I think I have communicated with the first group, the very intelligent, the bright, those at the higher end of the I.Q. scale. I think I have communicated with these and today I shall do what I do not normally do, I shall leave the other two groups alone, wallowing in their misunderstanding.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I just have a few comments on this bill. I welcome the opportunity to speak on it for a few minutes. I guess it really is kind of difficult to understand why it has taken government so long to understand that when there is a problem with Workers'

Compensation, when there is a decision made by that particular board that the constituent is unhappy with - and God knows, all fifty-two members have had problem across this Province whereby clients have been upset by a decision by Workers' Compensation - it is absolutely amazing that it has taken so long to understand the concept that when there is a problem with Workers' Compensation, the only recourse was to go back to the same people who made the initial decision and these were the people you had to go to appeal to, Mr. Speaker. So we welcome the minister's piece of legislation which will address that particular issue and give us an Appeals Tribunal - I think the minister called it. Is that correct, an Appeals Tribunal?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes.

MR. FUREY:

- whereby these clients who now get a decision from Workers' Compensation do not have to go back to the people who made the initial decision to appeal it to the same people, who are going to obviously come back with the same decision because they are not going to want to admit that they were not right the first time around, so why should they admit on the second time around that they were not right?

So we welcome this tribunal. We just add this one caveat to the minister's piece of legislation. We worry, Mr. Speaker, about how this tribunal will be put in place. Will this tribunal open itself to patronage? We hope not. We do not think that the minister, knowing that minister and his good ways in the past and his own track record since he has been in the

Assembly for fourteen or fifteen months has not engaged in that kind of nonsense yet.

So we do welcome the tribunal and we will be watching very carefully for him to do the honourable thing and to distance himself from this tribunal and Workers' Compensation Board from the tribunal and to ensure that good and solid and sensible decisions are made with respect to the appointments. Now I understand these appointments will be made by Cabinet but we hope that the minister will not engage in the kind of petty patronage that we have seen happen previously when there were appointments, for example, of defeated candidates and this sort of nonsense.

We welcome this tribunal. We look forward to it and we will be watching and monitoring the minister's appointments. We hope and we think and we can almost say confidentially that he will be above board and do the honourable thing and appoint people who, regardless of party affiliations, will be the best people for those jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the minister to one problem in particular, which arises from my riding. I am not briefed completely on Workers' Compensation and how it works so I wonder if the minister would not mind addressing it for me. If not here, maybe later in a private moment or something. It deals with the paternalistic view of Workers' Compensation in relation to people not being in a position to sue a private company. For example, when an accident happens, if that company, as I understand it, pays into the Workers' Compensation, it frees that

company from ever being sued in this country. Is that correct, Mr. Minister?

I have a case in my own riding of a family who lost a son a number of years ago. This son was killed on the job. To this date this particular family have gotten absolutely no satisfaction for the death of this nineteen year old boy from either that particular private company, where there may have been negligence involved, or from Workers' Compensation when they went to try to get some from help from Workers' Compensation. I am told by the father that the only thing that Workers' Compensation would do was give, I think, and I am just trying to remember from memory because it was some nine months we discussed this with the parents, \$900 or \$1,000 to help with the funeral or something like that and closed the case.

So I would not mind if the minister could perhaps in his closing remarks on this bill discuss this whole paternal issue. Are we being too paternalistic with Workers' Compensation whereby we free up companies to sneak by without ever having to be challenged in court for these kinds of things, such as this young boy who was killed in Hawke's Bay working for a private company and there was no recourse for the family for this nineteen year old? He could not take the company to court and sue them because this company paid into Workers' Compensation. When he went to Workers' Compensation, they had to make a decision on what they had to do and so they offered a lump sum to close it out of \$1,000 or something like that.

So, these are kinds of things I

would not mind just very briefly if the minister would address himself to: (a) The patronage factor in this arms-length tribunal -from Workers' Compensation; and (b) the whole business of where does a family turn in the event of a serious accident, in the event, as in the case I have outlined, of a death of a nineteen year old boy some years ago in Hawke's Bay. Where does a family turn to get compensated if not from the company because it can move aside under the Workers' Compensation guidelines and he goes to Workers' Compensation and he cannot get a fair compensation hearing from them, they want to close it out by offering a lump sum and have that case closed forever on the books?

So if the minister would address those two points, I would be most grateful.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I only have, I think, one question I wanted to ask the minister. I have made my position known on this bill in previous debate. When the appeal tribunal has been established and functioning, will they have the authority, for example, to rule on past cases? Will there be any retroactivity involved in this? For example, if there is a case, as I indicated to the minister a couple of days ago, in my district

-

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate has already spoke on



the debate. He may ask a question if leave is granted.

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Will this appeal tribunal have the authority to deal retroactively with cases that have been dealt with the existing board, dealt with unfairly and, if so, what is the mechanism, for example, that must be followed by the appellant, by the people who were treated unfairly with respect to having their case heard now by the new tribunal?

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, it will not surprise the minister that I want to follow that particular question on the rights of the tribunal because I have, myself, in this particular instance, represented three constituents of mine at appeals heard by members, by an individual, by one of the board and in each case the appeal was rejected and the worker lost the appeal.

I am not aware, in my experience of an appeal that has ever been ill because nothing, in my opinion also, is more ridiculous than having a worker appeal a decision made by the board and the person hearing the appeal is the

individual who made the decision in the first place. He has got to do it twice. So my question is, to follow on the hon. member for Twillingate's (Mr. W. Carter) point, will they have the authority to do that but, not only that, is the minister prepared to take it a little further and notify people who have had appeals heard. We may have to pick a time. we may have to say in the past two years, or the past five years, or this past month, but one of the complaints of the individuals who have lost out in appeals is that they were discouraged from the word go because they knew that they were taking their appeal to one of the people who had made the decision in the first instance. They felt they were being interrogated by somebody who had vested interest, somebody who was out to defend a decision that he had already made. Nobody wants to make themselves appear a goat.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if he would indicate to the House if this tribunal is going to have the authority to rehear, to have appeals that have been turned down and rejected and heard again? Is the minister prepared to institute a procedure whereby such workers who have had their appeals rejected or turned down fully apprised of the fact that they now have an opportunity to bring their case back to the tribunal and have the case heard in a fair, non-partisan way by people. I would presume the tribunal will have no particular brief for the Workers' Compensation Board or no particular brief for the worker, they will judge the case on its merits and rule.

I submit to the minister that none

of the appeals that are taking place up to now under the process that we have, that that was indeed the fact, that everybody felt that they were sitting before an impartial, unbiased tribunal or individual for that matter. I am not attacking the individual or the members of the board, but the very fact that the person hearing the appeal was a member of the board who made the decision immediately casts a doubt and hints at partisanship.

MR. HODDER:  
Boring. Boring.

MR. FLIGHT:  
So, Mr. Speaker, I would want the minister to indicate that now and as far as the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) there shouting "boring", we will wait now. The House sits with bated breath, Mr. Speaker, waiting every time the member for Port au Port stands up to make a speech. He is so entertaining and he is so forceful, Mr. Speaker, and so in control of the subject that he is debating, so knowledgeable. Mr. Speaker, we will look forward to the hon. member for Port au Port's submission. But, in the meantime, I do want to hear the minister address himself to that. If it is not addressed to our satisfaction, the hon. member for Twillingate's (Mr. W. Carter) satisfaction and mine, then, of course, we can always raise the issue in Committee and insist that this indeed the case.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken on this bill but I would like to have leave to ask one question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Does the hon. member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I understand the hon. member has leave.

MR. HISCOCK:  
The question I want to ask is about age benefits in Workers' Compensation. Benefits are now payable up to the age of sixty-five only and minor exemptions cover the workers at the age of sixty-five at the time of the injury so benefits may come for up to two years. A fund was supposed to be set up. My question to the minister is is this fund now set up and what happens if a person of sixty-three, sixty-four or sixty-five who has a permanent disability to the arms or limbs, etc.? If that fund is set up after the age of sixty-five, is the government basically saying to our senior citizens in the Province that you have to rely on your Canada Pension and any private pensions but the Workers' Compensation will not be giving any benefits? That is the question, why does it only go up to sixty-five?

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, will you instruct the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) to take that gum out of his mouth or swallow it?

MR. SPEAKER:  
If the hon. the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close debate on this Bill on second reading. I admit that there has been some very good remarks made about the Bill and there has been some good questions asked about the Bill, timely questions. I think the main two items in this Bill, the main matters dealt with is the streamlining of the administration of the Commission and, of course, the very important question of the establishment of an external appeals system.

I believe it was the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) that referred to the fact that he had found that the people there always seemed to be good and easy people to deal with but yet some of the people did not seem to get the kind of a decision that you would expect from caring people. He referred to the fact, and I must say he put it well, that perhaps the streamlining of the Bill and improving the administration of the Commission would probably rectify this kind of thing.

I think he hit the thing dead on, Mr. Speaker, because while I would not want to be interpreted as referring to any of the present or past commissioners for that matter, of causing real problems, there is obviously a built-in kind of a problem where you have confusion over who is boss in a situation like that. I really think that going to a board of directors, Mr. Speaker, will improve the administration of the activities of the commission and will correct many of the problems that we have heretofore seen.

Mr. Speaker, I must, I guess, address some of the matters that were raised. One of the matters that was raised by a number of the members opposite yesterday was the

question of the appointment of the members. They agree with the idea. I think the Opposition House Leader said he agreed with the Bill primarily and he agreed not 100 per cent but 200 per cent with the establishment of an external appeal but he did not like the way that the members were going to be appointed. He thought Cabinet was going to appoint them but, obviously, Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will be appointing the members of the board of directors. I thought I said to him across the House at the time, I would say with relative certainty that we will do as we do with most other boards of this nature, we will seek nominations from the effected parties. There is going to be an equal representation of employees and employers and representation from the public. Obviously, we will seek nominations and try to select the best possible people to appoint on both the Board of Directors and the Tribunal.

There seemed to have been some confusion, Mr. Speaker, over the appointment of panels and -

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, he is doing a very good job and I do not want to delay this bill, but he may very well not have understood what I said. I think there is a misunderstanding. I recognized that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, the Cabinet, has to have final say on the approval of the people who sat on the Appeals Tribunal. There is no argument.

It has to be appointed by government. But, to guard against the kind of political patronage that we have seen from some of his other colleagues, I suspect if the minister does not do it - I asked him would it not be the proper thing to do to say that nominations should be received and put that into legislation - rather than leaving it to the good will of the minister at the time, because I tell the hon. gentleman that while he is Minister of Labour this year and while we have seen very little evidence of him involved in political patronage and appointments and so on, that I suspect if he moves out of Cabinet, there are people like the Minister of Public Works and Services who would just love to have the chance to have sixteen more Tories appointed to a board.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

The hon. the Minister of Labour may want to comment on that.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I can only tell the hon. gentleman that in cases where we appoint members to boards now, we have a Labour Relations Board where we consult with labour and management, and by and large -

MR. TULK:

You are not (inaudible.)

MR. BLANCHARD:

No, well it has been done over the years, not just me. My predecessor consulted with labour and management. It has been done over the years, certainly for the last twelve or fourteen years. It was done for a very short period when the Liberal Government was in power. Then, after the IWA

conflict, the government said no more consultations with labour, consult with management perhaps, but no more consultations with labour. And we went for years where the government just appointed members to the Labour Relations Board and the Labour Standards Board.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we intend to do the right thing here. We are doing the right thing by streamlining and modernizing the administration of the Commission. We intend to follow through with that and also with the establishment of the external appeal. We intend to do the right thing.

I was saying when the hon. Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) rose on the point of order that there seemed to have been some confusion over the establishment of panels. There is provision for the establishment of panels. There is a provision for a Chairman of the Tribunal, and a vice-president or vice-presidents, one or more. The reason for that is that there may be a number of cases to be heard. Each panel will consist of three people, a Chairperson and two others, one representative of the employees and one representative of employers. There may be sufficient cases, Mr. Speaker, that you would have a number of panels dealing with cases concurrently in order not to hold up the system and to do justice to those people who feel that they have not received the proper decision on their claim from the staff at the Commission. We would want to proceed in a very efficient manner and to have, perhaps, several panels operating at the same time.

So the question on it yesterday was, I think, why would not a panel be permanent? Well, the same members of one panel would go on to another panel dealing with a different case. There would be no such thing as permanency of panels. They would rotate.

Mr. Speaker, I have been a great believer in the process of consultation. I know when we did some bills last year there was some question from an employer's group that there was a lack of consultation. I will not get back into that. But the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) yesterday raised the question of consultation.

Now, for a year or so there have been discussions about correcting some matters relating to Workers' Compensation and the difficulties experienced by claimants. The question, of course, of external appeals has been raised. The question of a board has been raised. When I say that these two matters, going to a Board of Directors and the establishment of a panel, is really the guts of this bill, the rest of it, I think, is more housekeeping than anything else.

I do not think it is a fair accusation to say that we have not consulted because I, in fact -

MR. FENWICK:

On the final Bill (inaudible).

MR. BLANCHARD:

Well we have, Mr. Speaker, had consultation. We have had consultation with an employers group and I have sat down with labour and been receptive to any suggestions with respect to this bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there have been some questions raised this afternoon about rehabilitation. Rehabilitation, of course, is a two-way street. First and foremost I think we would be properly taken to task if we were to force people to submit to rehabilitation measures to which they would not want to submit. First and foremost I think the injured worker has to be content or feel that he has a place in the rehabilitative process, that his basic educational standard will allow him to absorb the kind of training that he is going to get. He is offered various kinds of rehabilitation. Now, particularly among older workers, Mr. Speaker, there is not a lot of older workers who want to submit to rehabilitation. Younger injured workers, Mr. Speaker, have caught on to the board's policy of being rehabilitated back into the work force and it is working well.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) referred to the question of retroactivity just very recently and I think that was raised by a number of other members opposite. Obviously there is going to have to be regulations for the better administration of any legislation and obviously you are not going to write everything into a bill with respect to administering the piece of legislation. That has to come from living with it and the day to day operation of it. Of course there will be a retroactive process for dealing with some claims but where the cut off point will be right at this moment, Mr. Speaker, I do not know. I do not know if there is good reason to go back to 1953 I think it was when the Workers' Compensation legislation was brought into being but, Mr. Speaker, we will be

giving very careful consideration to that.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to belabour this discussion any further. I respectfully propose this bill for second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act, 1983", read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

On motion, the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

#### Committee Of The Whole

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act." (Bill No. 17)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Social Assistance Act, 1977." (Bill No. 16)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Marine Institute Act." (Bill No. 19)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to call Order 6 but there is an amendment which I do not believe is ready yet.

MR. POWER:

It is.

MR. MARSHALL:

It is? We will call it.

A bill, "An Act To Provide For Payment Of Financial Assistance For Students Attending Post-Secondary Educational Institutions." (Bill No. 2)

On motion Clauses 1 and 2 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall Clause 3 carry?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I move that sub-clause 3 of Clause 3 of Bill No. 2 be struck out and the following substituted: "Regulations may be made under this section with retroactive effect to September 1, 1982 so long as they are made not later than twelve months after this act is assented to." The minister will explain it.

MR. POWER:

If you will remember in the discussion primarily with the Leader of the Opposition, in that regulation we had that 'regulations could be made with retroactive effect' and, obviously, that was not government's intention, to give carte blanche, to have retroactive regulations passed at any time. Basically, all we wanted, which is what the amendment says, is that we make regulations retroactive until September 1, 1982 provided that those regulations are made not later than twelve months after the act is assented to. So it basically gives us permission to put in regulations now back to 1982 and the reason we are doing that, of course, is so that students in all post-secondary

systems can get student aid legitimately, which they have been doing since September 1, 1982.

MR. TULK:  
Why 1982?

MR. POWER:  
Because that is when it came in. That is when we went from Memorial University Student Act to Post-Secondary Student Act, to take in everyone.

MR. TULK:  
So the retroactivity is designed to cover that one thing.

MR. POWER:  
Yes.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 3 as amended, carried.

On motion, clauses 4 to 14, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Greening):  
Shall clause 15 carry?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment to clause 15. Clause 15 of Bill 2 be amended by striking out the figures '1983' and substituting the figures '1982'. That is the date, as the minister has already explained, when the bill came into effect.

On motion, amendment carried.

On motion, clause 15 as amended, carried.

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill with amendments, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Prisons Act, The Royal

Newfoundland Constabulary Act And The St. John's Fire Department Act, 1972." (Bill No. 12).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

MR. MARSHALL:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL:  
It will just take about five to ten minutes, provided we come into no trouble, to run through the others, so why do we not just stop the clock at six and see if we can get through them.

MR. TULK:  
Until we get to where?

MR. MARSHALL:  
Until we get to Order 16. It will only take a minute. We will try it anyway. How about we try it.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Income Tax Act." (Bill No. 4).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Implement The Convention Between Canada And The United Kingdom Of Great Britain And Northern Ireland Providing For The Reciprocal Recognition And Enforcement Of Judgements In Civil And Commercial Matters." (Bill No. 26).

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Power To Approve By-Laws And

Regulations Passed By Various Associations Of Professionals." (Bill No. 34)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Pensions) Act." (Bill No. 35)

Motion, that the Committee report having passed the bill without amendment, carried.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Pippy Park Commission Act." (Bill No. 40).

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Shall Clause 1 carry?

MR. BARRY:  
One second now, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Chairman, we would like to have a few questions answered with respect to the procedure employed by the Pippy Park Commission in exempting certain lands from Pippy Park.

DR. COLLINS:  
That is all in Hansard.

MR. BARRY:  
It is all cancelled?

DR. COLLINS:  
It is all in Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
We would like, Mr. Chairman, to find out why it is that certain

land, which just coincidentally happens to be land along the route of a public highway going through the park, the Outer Ring Road, and which just coincidentally happens to be land on behalf of which the Government House Leader's (Mr. Marshall) law firm made representation, we would like to ask how is it that it was only these pieces of land that were exempted from the Pippy Park Commission and not any of the land of long-time residents who have had their land frozen for years, in some cases ten, twelve, fifteen years, whose children are unable to obtain permits to build, who are frozen by the Pippy Park regulations. We would like to get a statement from the Government House Leader or some other minister. In the absence of the corrupt Minister of Public Works, we would like to know why this was done.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was inadvertently absent from the House when this question was asked by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), and I think the explanation is in Hansard.

Very briefly, these were lands on the periphery of the park for which there was a grievance entered by the owners, the grievance being that they should either get paid for them or that they should be allowed to develop them, and it was determined that the Pippy Park had not the funds to give compensation for them, nor



was there any likelihood in the foreseeable future that they should, nor were there any plans for the Pippy Park Commission to utilize these lands. So it was an inequitable situation and the decision was made to revert to a previous situation, i.e., to take them out of the park, bearing in mind that the lands had never been in the park proper previously, they had only been in the control area, and, indeed, part of them had been totally outside the control area and had been totally private lands.

These lands were on the periphery of the park. They were not in the park. I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) is referring to homes not on the periphery of the park but in an integral part of the park itself and, to my knowledge, none of these homeowners have asked to be taken out of the park.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Chairman, I have a question on this bill, as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

It is my understanding that the Chairman of the Board of Regents at Memorial University asked that certain lands be excluded from Pippy Park when, in actual fact, one would think that Memorial University would have an interest in holding on and seeing that those lands were kept within the Pippy Park Commission. I understand that the Chairman of the Board of Regents, who happens to be a law partner of the Government House Leader, I believe, made that request, that certain lands be excluded.

MR. BARRY:

Not as chairman.

MR. TULK:

No, not as chairman. I wonder if the Minister of Finance might comment on just what happened there, since he seems to be answering those questions for the President of the Council. Perhaps he would like to comment on it himself, but he is the Acting Premier right now, as I understand the Premier has flown the coop. Perhaps one of those hon. gentlemen might like to tell us why indeed that took place and what kind of conflict is involved there, since the Chairman of the Board of Regents also happens to be a law partner in a certain law firm in the city. Perhaps he might like to answer that question.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Chairman, I am not answering any questions for the President of the Council. I am merely answering this because the question was asked of me in the debate on second reading, and I am just adding to the comments I made then. The comments I am making now are really a repetition of what is in Hansard, my response to points raised by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) at the time. I am not answering for anyone, I am just following on from what was done previously.

With regard to the particular question, the Pippy Park Commission requested of government to exclude these lands. It was not Memorial University, it was the Pippy Park Commission when they determined that government was not in a position to give them funds, which was a very large amount of money, to purchase these lands which had been taken into

the park and for which, as I say, no use was found for very many years to come. It was the Commission itself which said, if government could not provide them with the millions of dollars to purchase these lands, and to overcome this legitimate grievance that the owners had, 'In the absence of funding of that nature, we would request that the lands be returned outside the park' and that was done.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the lawyer, in this particular case Mr. White, who, as I said before, is a member of the Government House Leader's law firm, acting for two companies, I believe one Acharya and one owned by Garland Clarke, wrote as a lawyer, when he, in fact, is the Chairman of the Board of Regents of Memorial University, to the Pippy Park Commission asking that certain lands be exempt. At the same time, since he is Chairman of the Board of Regents at Memorial University, you would think that Memorial University itself would have a vested interest in keeping that land in place. Perhaps the President of the Council might like to comment upon the propriety of this action: A lawyer writes the Pippy Park Commission, on the one hand, as a representative of a law firm asking that certain lands be exempt, yet, he is also Chairman of the Board of Regents of an institution which has a vested interest in keeping that land. Is there any possible conflict of interest that the hon. gentleman would be involved in?

Is anybody going to answer that over there?

DR. COLLINS:  
There is no conflict.

MR. TULK:  
There must be. It is obvious! The conflict is there!

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

DR. COLLINS:  
I think the hon. member may be misinformed. This matter goes back at least, and I am speaking from memory now, to 1981. It might be 1980 for all I know, but I know it at least goes back to 1981. I believe the gentleman the hon. member referred to, Mr. White, was not the Chairman of the Board of Regents then. If my memory serves me, Mr. Fred Russell was the Chairman of the Board of Regents up until 1983, I think, or sometime like that. But this matter goes back a considerable period of time before Mr. White had any connection with the Board. Indeed, as far as I can remember, he was not even on the Board of Regents, and he certainly was not Chairman of it. I do not know if he was even on it. He might have been on it, but he certainly was not Chairman.

MR. TULK:  
On a point of order.

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

MR. TULK:  
The hon. gentleman says he is speaking from memory, and we, of course, would like to check out what he just said, and I am sure he would. I would suggest to the Government House Leader that we have certain questions that we

want to ask about this bill and perhaps it might be wise for us to adjourn the House at this point.

MR. MARSHALL:

If that is their wish, Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

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

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill Nos. 17, 16, 19, 12, 4, 26, 34 and 35 without amendment, Bill No. 2, with amendments and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Bills ordered read a third time, on tomorrow, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion, amendments read a first and second time, Bill No. 2, a bill, "An Act To Provide For Payment Of Financial Assistance For Students Attending Post-Secondary Educational Institutions", ordered read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11 at 3:00 p.m.