

An Act to regulate interests in petroleum in relation to frontier lands, to amend the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act and to repeal the Canada Oil and Gas Act, be deemed to have been introduced, read the first time and ordered to be printed, read a second time, referred to and reported by a Legislative Committee with amendments, and ordered to stand on the Order Paper for consideration by the House at report stage on or after Tuesday, October 7, 1986 (Bill C-92);

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 and to make related and consequential amendments, be deemed to have been introduced, read the first time and ordered to be printed, read the second time and referred to a Legislative Committee (Bill C-94); and

An Act respecting the Archives of Canada and Records of government institutions of Canada and to amend the Copyright Act, be deemed to have been introduced, read the first time and ordered to be printed, read the second time and referred to a Legislative Committee (Bill C-95);

And that the evidence adduced and documents received by any Legislative Committee of this House in the First Session of the Thirty-third Parliament in relation to these Bills be deemed to have been referred to a Legislative Committee in this present Session.

Hon. Herb Gray (Windsor West): Mr. Speaker, what a contrast between this motion and the previous remarks of the Government House Leader (Mr. Mazankowski). With respect to this motion, there were consultations with his predecessor before the Hon. Member became the Government House Leader. We discussed it further with the Government House Leader when he assumed that position. There have been extensive discussions. This is quite a contrast, as I have said, with his unwarranted assertion with respect to the Question Period based on outmoded guidelines which were totally superseded by guidelines issues by the immediate predecessor of—

● (1220)

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sure the Hon. Member would want to address the particular matter that is before the Speaker. I can assure the Hon. Member that I got his point earlier.

Mr. Gray (Windsor West): In any event, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, there have been consultations with respect to this motion. I must say that, after listening to the Government House Leader on his point of order, I was having second thoughts about the way we should deal with his motion if he happened to present it. However, in the spirit of good will and co-operation, we will give unanimous consent to the motion.

Mr. Riis: Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of co-operation and in an effort to facilitate the business of the House, we agree.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council (Mr. Mazankowski) have the unanimous consent of the House to move his motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Address—Mr. John Turner

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

RESUMPTION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed from Thursday, October 2, consideration of the motion of Mrs. Collins for an Address to Her Excellency the Governor General in reply to her Speech at the opening of the Session.

Right Hon. John N. Turner (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, first, in keeping with the traditions of the House, may I congratulate the mover and seconder, the Member for Capilano (Mrs. Collins) and the Member for Restigouche (Mr. Girard), on their speeches in support of the Address yesterday. They were well delivered, full of verve and style, and I admired them even more because they had to defend a hopelessly empty document that is now before the House.

In rising to respond to the Speech from the Throne, first I would like to pay my respects to its author. Of course, we had expected a higher standard from Dalton Camp after reading his column for many years, first in the *Toronto Sun*, then in the *Toronto Star*. In those days we used to get it for 25 cents. Obviously Mr. Camp has had to surrender some of that style to the rigours of committee authorship. The rhetoric is attractive, the phrases are flowery. There is even a touch of humility here and there. It raises vagueness to an art form.

Of course, Canadians have one question to ask: was it really worth waiting one extra month for this document, this speech? I think citizens right across Canada will say no, it certainly was not worth the wait.

Nobody quarrels with the intent. There is a sentence, a phrase, and sometimes a paragraph for every group in the country, every interest and every region. But where is the plan? Where is the working agenda? There is nothing new.

It is a recycled speech from a recycled government that is two years old and already tired. The Government spent the last two years breaking its promises, and obviously, from this document, it will spend the next two years making new promises. It is an invitation to Canadian voters to embark on a second honeymoon when Canadians are already talking about a divorce. This explains why the Government had to call in the three puppeteers—Dalton Camp, Lowell Murray, and Norman Atkins—three powerful non-elected backroom boys who are now supposed to act as marriage counsellors to the Government and the Canadian people.

The Throne Speech is supposed to be the Government's new platform. We know what happened to the last one. The Conservatives tore it down so quickly and completely that there was only enough wood left to build a presidential style podium for the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney). That is the