

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, AUGUST 10, 1979

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

We have some distinguished visitors to the galleries today and I am sure all hon. members would like to extend a warm welcome to people representing the Legion, Mr. Ed Coley, the Dominion President, Mr. Al Harvey, the Vice-President.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Dave Caperol, the Vice-President, Mr. Stan Walpole, Dominion Command, and Mr. Gordon Collins, the President of the Newfoundland Command.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, in the House yesterday in my statement I said that the Fisheries Loan Board had met on July 27th., when in fact the date of their meeting was - the date of the meeting of the board itself was Monday, August 6th. On July 27th. the Evaluation Committee of that board, which is a committee of the Fisheries Loan Board, met to consider a number of applications, and then on the 6th. of August the Loan Board met.

I apologize to my friends opposite, Mr. Speaker, the error was unfortunate. I think the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) phoned the secretary of the chairman of the board, who was on vacation and was not aware of the meeting on August 6th. But I think that matter has since been corrected between the matter of the conversation between the chairman and the member concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for clarifying the matter. For once he and I were both right and that sets a bit of a record in this House. It is usually one of us, and I will not

MR. SIMMONS: say which is right more than the other. But I am grateful to the chairman, Mr. George, who when he discovered the error did get in touch with me by telephone yesterday evening and explained the error which I now understand to be quite an innocent error, that I was getting information that in fact was wrong information but not deliberately so.

I thank the minister for bringing it to the House's attention.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro will be carrying out a small scale hydro development, or so called mini-hydro, for the Roddickton area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Roddickton is presently served by diesel generation through the Power Distribution District of Newfoundland and Labrador which operates some fifty-one isolated diesel generating plants throughout the Province.

The cost of electricity generated at these sites is quite high and the Hydro Corporation has been anxious to find a means of reducing these costs.

Mr. Barry: In early 1978, Hydro requested funding assistance from the federal government to investigate the potential for development of small scale hydro plants close to communities where power was generated using diesel fuel. Agreement was reached on an investigation of the small scale hydro potential at all sites, on the understanding that a demonstration project would be constructed if a suitable site were found. Funding was on a cost-shared basis with 90 per cent of the cost contributed by the federal government and 10 per cent by the Province. A maximum budget of approximately \$1.2 million was approved to cover the evaluation study costs as well as construction of a demonstration project.

Analysis of the small scale hydro potential was performed by Hydro for Shawmont Newfoundland Limited, and the results showed that there is some hydro potential at twenty-eight of the communities investigated. However, not all of the sites appear attractive. Out of the twenty-eight sites examined, it was estimated that only thirteen could be categorized as having some possibility for viable development.

These thirteen sites were then examined to determine their suitability for selection as a demonstration project. The main factors considered were the economic viability of the site, its likely environmental implications, and the size of the scheme, for while a relatively large project was preferred in order to maximize potential fuel savings, the scope of the project had to fit within the agreed budget of \$1.2 million.

After considering all relevant factors, we have decided that in conjunction with the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources that the demonstration project should be constructed at Roddickton. The site is considered to be reasonably representative of other potential sites, and it is typical of the kind of project that must be proven to be economic if small scale hydro is to make a contribution to rural electrification in the Province.

Mr. Barry: The small hyrdo plant which is to be considered at Roddickton will not eliminate the need for diesel generation in that area totally. Rather it will work in conjunction with the existing diesel plant to supply some of the load and hence save diesel fuel. The installed capacity of the plant will be approximately 360 kilowatts, and you must compare that with the 75,000 kilowatts at Hinds Lake, and it will be installed on Marble Brook which is approximately two kilometers from Roddickton. Energy generated from the plant is estimated to displace approximately 115,000 gallons of fuel oil per year resulting in an estimated saving of approximately \$74,000 a year.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long more?

MR. BARRY: I am almost finished.

Specifications for the turbine generator should be released for review by potential suppliers during

MR. BARRY: this coming week. Access road construction will commence in the Fall of 1979, with on-site construction commencing in the Spring of 1980 for an in-service date in the Fall of 1980.

The construction practices to be utilized for this project will differ somewhat from those utilized by Hydro on larger scale projects. Hydro intends to undertake the work involved by hiring a local labour force with the work being supervised by a construction superintendent and managed directly by Hydro's Engineering and Construction Division staff.

This undertaking at Roddickton I consider to be a positive step in the process of evaluating the potential of small scale hydro plants to displace expensive diesel fuel in the generation of electricity. The economic attractiveness obviously of this particular demonstration project was enhanced significantly through the federal government's contribution of ninety per cent of the plant's capital cost. The experience gained in this venture should make clear whether or not similar undertakings may be justified in the future at other locations. I have just to add the qualification that it is unlikely that the bottom line in terms of mills per kilowatt hour of this project would in itself have justified the Province undertaking it without the federal intervention because it looks like this and the other small sites are going to be fairly expensive power. But we will have the demonstration project and hopefully we will be able to utilize wherever possible future sites in the coming years.

This will all be looked at.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
Bay Verte-White Bay.

The hon. member for

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I certainly welcome the announcement made by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) this morning for two reasons.

MR. RIDEOUT:

One, because of the concept and I have been waiting for some time to find out the result of the study that was undertaken under a DREE agreement, I believe, between the Province and Ottawa on this kind of power generation, I think the concept is an excellent one so I am happy to hear the news for that reason. And also, of course, I am delighted to hear that Roddickton has been chosen as the site for this particular development because it is in my constituency, and I am delighted that Roddickton has been chosen as the site for the development for a couple of reasons also. As most members of this House, I am sure, are aware, Roddickton is still fumbling along, I suppose is as good a way as any to put it, with a serious economic problem. Although the problem has somewhat brightened from the state it was a number of months ago, there is still a serious economic problem in the Roddickton area and this project will certainly have some benefit for people who are still unemployed in the area. So for those reasons I am very happy that Roddickton has been chosen as the site for this new project.

MR. RIDEOUT: The minister did not make any reference in his Ministerial Statement as to whether or not, as a result of this project coming on stream, electricity rates to the consumer in the Roddickton area will be lowered. As the minister and the House are aware, those people are now on diesel generated electricity and they are paying a higher price per kilowatt hour than those of us who are receiving electricity from hydro sources. So I would be interested in knowing whether or not as a result of this project, this bringing on stream to supplement the diesel power in the - Roddickton, Conche, Bide Arm and Englee, I think, are the communities served by the Roddickton P.D.D. I would be interested in knowing whether or not as a result of bringing this project on stream in a year or so's time, whether the consumer in that area can expect to see some reduction in the cost per kilowatt hour over what they are paying now for the diesel generated power.

Sir, I am very happy that Roddickton has been chosen, and I am sure the people in the area will appreciate very much that the project is going ahead there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: I rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to your attention and to the attention of members of this House, a headline which appeared in this morning's Daily News. The headline cries out, "It's Corner Brook again Claim Mounties 'hustling' women drivers". And then the story in this morning's Daily News attributes this to me: "Les Thoms (L, Grand Bank) said he has heard that 'young unattached women' have been stopped as often as three times in one night by the same officer." And it goes on to talk about the fact that I accused the RCMP of 'hustling' women.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke yesterday in reply to the statement by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer),

MR. THOMS: at which time I had a great deal of praise for the police in this city.

A reading of Hansard will clearly show that at no time did I accuse the RCMP of hustling women drivers. As a matter of fact, at no time during my remarks in reply to the minister's statement did I even mention in any way, shape or form, the RCMP operating in this Province. And I have the same respect for the RCMP that I have for the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on over! Come on over!

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, this article -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS:

- shows clearly how irresponsible sometimes the press can be and in particular the particular reporter who reported the story. As a matter of fact, the article is defamatory. Anybody reading it with any legal training, of course, would realize that the article is defamatory. I will accept - and I will be following this up, of course, outside the House - nothing less than a full apology and that apology placed prominently where the story is placed this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. L. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, I feel there is a point of privilege. I realize that Your Honour might want to take this matter under advisement. Your Honour may want to look at the story, Your Honour may wish to read Hansard and to read what I said in the House yesterday; as I said, you may want to take it under advisement. However, if Your Honour is prepared at this time to rule that there is a point of privilege, I could, of course, make the appropriate motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would wish to take the matter under advisement at this point in time so I can check the story to which the hon. member refers and I will give a ruling later on today.

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement on the subject of Grade XI examination marks.

Final Grade XI examination marks are being mailed by the Department of Education to students throughout the Province starting today.

Since 1972, most final Grade XI marks have been determined by a system of shared evaluation. Under shared evaluation, half the mark is set by a student's own school,

MS. L. VERGE: with an adjustment made by the Department of Education to make standards more consistent among schools across the Province. The other half of the mark is based on the score of the public examinations administered by the Department of Education throughout the Province. In some cases, the final Grade XI marks have been based entirely on the assessment made by the school.

In June 1979 complete sets of public examinations were written by 7,568 students. In addition to full-time students, 549 partial students wrote public examinations in one or more subjects.

Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks, at the request of the Department of Education, the Civil Investigation Division of the

MRS. L. VERGE:

Royal Newfoundland Constabulary has been conducting an investigation into allegations that some public examination papers were circulated among students prior to their writing the examinations. Yesterday the police gave an interim report to me indicating that they have evidence that a significant number of students in certain St. John's high schools had improper access to two of the examinations. Acting on a police report, I have decided to base the final marks for these subjects for all students in the schools named by the police on the school assessment as modified by the Department of Education to make standards more consistent among all schools in the Province. These marks will not be mailed to the students until next week. In taking this action, I will be consulting with the Board Superintendents and school principals whose schools are involved. The two guiding principles in this division are, number one; fair treatment of those students who acted properly and did not have an unfair advantage in writing the public examinations. And two -

MR. J. HODDER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) A point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: I am trying to follow the hon. member but I just cannot hear her at all. As a matter of fact, I have not heard the last couple of paragraphs, couple of minutes of what she has been saying.

MR. SPEAKER: I would not rule that it is a point of order but I would ask the hon. minister if she would accede to the member's request.

MRS. L. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will start at the beginning of the last part.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member could supply a copy of her statement perhaps my colleague would -

MRS. L. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a copy of this statement will be distributed in a few minutes.

MR. E. ROBERTS: As the hon. member would understand the whole point of my colleague listening so extra attentively is that he would to respond, as is our right under. And I wonder, maybe that brings up another one where a minister is to make a statement as a courtesy could there be done here what is done in Ottawa, a few minutes in advance copies be supplied. Maybe to solve this dilemma, if we could allow my friend for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) perhaps to make a comment at the end of the Question Period, say, when he has had an opportunity to read what the hon. minister has had to say. We are having difficulty hearing her but that is not her fault; we are just having difficulty hearing her.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: On that point, Mr. Speaker, let me just indicate that the reason why the copies were not up before was because the decision had just been made about 9:20 A.M. or 9:25 A.M. and the Minister of Education (Mrs. Verge) and myself consulted. And in order to inform the House, so that we not do it after the House closed at 1:00 P.M. which would then be a real breach of trying to provide the information to the House, we decided to rush up a statement now. If the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Roberts) would notice, the Minister of Education did not get here until 10:06 A.M. because the statement was still be typed and that is the reason why copies were not available in advance so that the Opposition would even be in a better position than they are now to respond in a meaningful way.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the Premier, and I wonder if perhaps members opposite would agree on this occasion for these unique circumstances to allow my colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder), to respond, using his right to respond, perhaps after a ten or fifteen minute interval. Would that be in order?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MRS. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, apparently my microphone here is not working. I will just go back over the last part of the statement for the benefit of the hon. member for Port au Port.

Over the past several weeks, at the request of the Department of Education, the Civil Investigation Division of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary has been conducting an investigation into allegations that some public examination papers were circulated among students prior to their writing the examinations. Yesterday the police gave an interim report to me indicating that they have evidence that a significant number of students in certain St. John's high schools had improper access to two of the examinations. Acting on the police report, I have decided to base the final marks for these subjects for all students in the schools named by the police on the school assessment as modified by the Department of Education to make standards more consistent among all schools in the Province. These marks will not be mailed to the students until next week.

In taking this action, I will be consulting with the board superintendents and school principals whose schools are involved.

MRS. VERGE: The two guiding principles in this decision are: (1) fair treatment of those students who acted properly and did not have an unfair advantage in writing the public examinations, and (2) maintaining the integrity of public examinations and student assessment.

The police investigation is continuing. Stern action will be taken against those identified as having taken leading parts in the abuse of the public examination system. Also, I undertake to take definite action to tighten public examination security and to minimize the possibility of abuse in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port is prepared to respond now, I understand.

MR. J. HODDER: Yes. Mr. Speaker, I must say that when I did stand I could not hear the minister the first time. Actually, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I suppose, the first part of her statement that the marks are going out to students I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate all students who have been successful in their examinations across the Province. As far as the unfortunate incident that has been filling the newspapers in the past days of the exams,

Mr. Hodder: It is too bad that it happened, but I suppose it has happened in other provinces before. But we hope that it will not happen in this Province again. And I noted that the minister indicated that she would be tightening up the regulations as far as the examination procedures go, and I feel that step must be taken.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it says something for the shared evaluation system that we now have in the Province, because if we look back we would have really had a problem had we not had a shared evaluation system whereby the school evaluates part of the students performance and the public exams the other part. But in this case, I think the minister has taken the correct action and, as I understood what she said, in those schools that have been identified the students will be evaluated on the school part of their examination. I think this is the correct move and I feel that in this way, and from looking at the correlations between what the school usually gives and what the public exams usually give I do not think that there will be a great deal of harm to the students who were innocent in this case.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, in view of all of the comments about the incorrectness of headlines etc. in the papers, I almost hesitate to ask, but I would like to ask the hon. the Premier, in view of a headline saying, "Levesque looking forward to talks with Peckford", and it makes reference to the Lower Churchill, I just wonder if the hon. the Premier has - is it just informal talks or is there some kind of a basic proposition being discussed? Any information that the hon. Premier can give us?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was as interested in the headline and the story as the Leader of the Opposition. It is the first that I heard of it, but undoubtedly the Premier of Quebec is referring to the Premiers' meeting in the Province of Quebec next week, and I guess his desire to sit down and talk generally about the whole question of our relationships as it relates to the Labrador power development. So until I get further information or get in touch with the Province of Quebec that is the only thing I can assume from the column in the paper this morning.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for Consumer Affairs and the Environment. I wonder would the minister care to comment on the reports that a couple of hundred birds, which is described as a sorry sight, have been found dead in the Cape St. Mary's bird's sanctuary as a result of oil pollution in the water around that area?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Hon. Minister of Consumer
Affairs and Environment.

MRS NEWHOOK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have received a report from a Wildlife worker in the bird sanctuary there. He has counted 100 birds on one of the beaches and also another 100 birds, I think, on Bird Rock. He has confirmed that there is an indication of oil on these birds. As far as I know these birds are the young birds leaving the nest this year and are probably the inexperienced birds who really have to light on the water more often than the more experienced flyers and these are the birds that they have been sighting on the beaches and on the rocks down there. We really do not know as yet just how serious this problem is and Wildlife now are checking it out. But there is no doubt that it is due to the oil that these birds are now found dead along the beaches. There will be a further report as we get more information.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary. The
hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. lady indicate whether or not her department is monitoring the investigation for oil pollution along the Southwest Coast and in St. Mary's Bay, if her department is working with the Coast Guard or monitoring the activities of the Coast Guard to determine just how serious the oil pollution is and if it is being down-played by the Coast Guard and by the people who are responsible for creating this mess?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do have monitors all along the South Coast. We have one monitor down there who co-ordinates the disposal of the oil collected. We have another person there operating a boat and he is canvassing the South Coast watching out for oil spills coming ashore. We do have another

MRS NEWHOOK: person down there who sets
the priorities with the Coast Guard as to which areas they clean,
which are the most important ones and which have to be done first.

There has been quite an
indication of oil spills all summer, of course, but to my knowledge these
are being cleaned up and the more important ones have been done first.
The Coast Guard is doing the clean-up.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr.
Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary for the hon. the Premier, Sir. Would the hon. the Premier indicate if he has been following the events and the activities along the Southwest coast and, in the hon. gentleman's opinion, does the hon. gentleman feel - we have discussed this before, that is why I am directing my question to the Premier, not to the hon. minister; it is not a slight. The hon. the Premier and I had a go at it in Question Period before the House was dissolved before the provincial general election. We both came to the conclusion, I believe the hon. gentleman agreed with me, that we do not have the technology to clean up major oil spills or blowouts off our coast. That fact has been determined.

But the hon. gentleman told me he was going to meet with, I believe, the new Prime Minister or the Government of Canada to discuss this whole matter of movement of oil tankers along our coast and the clean-up technology that is available at the present time. Has the hon. gentleman had these meetings yet? Is the hon. gentleman planning any meetings in connection with the threat to our environment and the possible extinction of the fishery in this Province if we have a major blowout of one of the offshore wells or if we have a major spill off our coast? It is a very serious matter; the whole fishing industry is in jeopardy because of this. And would the hon. gentleman tell me what steps his government has taken to hold these meetings with the Government of Canada to try to prevent such a disaster occurring in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. member mentioned, we talked about this very important subject before. The Minister of the Environment (Mrs. H. Newhook) in a statement yesterday

PREMIER PECKFORD: indicated that we have already, as a government, communicated to the Federal Government, the Minister of the Environment to the minister in Ottawa, about our concerns on this matter. Last night, as a matter of fact, a number of ministers and myself were discussing the same issue again as it relates to the whole question of tanker traffic, boat traffic around the Province because, as the hon. member knows, there is a fair amount of it. A lot of the larger communities around the coast have the Irving oil or the ESSO or the Shell or whoever tanks for domestic oil for the winter time, and so the smaller tankers are going into a lot of different bays and harbour and coves around the Province and it could be a very serious matter. And I noticed this morning a newsitem relating to a statement by somebody in C-Core about the underwater kind of pollution which is very difficult to manage and I guess this has been heightened by the Kurdistan, by the blowout or the uncontrolled flow down in the Gulf of Mexico and so on.

We intend to pursue this with the Ministry of Transport as it relates to tanker traffic as well as with the environment people to see whether,

PREMIER PECKFORD:

in fact, the rules and regulations that are now in effect are the best that are available, and is there any improved technology, for example, as it relates to Come By Chance. We will have to discuss this with the federal government as well.

The methodology used for tanker traffic in Placentia Bay when the refinery was opened initially, is there any new technology now which would even improve, are there stricter regulations to govern it and so on? But I think the important point is that it is not only for Come By Chance, albeit that will be, if the refinery gets reactivated, a busier bay, but in all the bays and harbours around the Province there is a lot of tanker traffic in the Fall and in the Spring. And in the Fall especially when these smaller tankers are going around to fill up the small tanks that the local distributors have for distributing domestic oil during the Wintertime. So it is an extremely serious matter. The Minister of the Environment has already communicated by letter to her counterpart, and I will be pursuing the matter with the Ministry of Transport and Environment people in Ottawa in the next two to three weeks, whenever I can get an opportunity, when the Prime Minister comes back especially, but with the appropriate ministries in Ottawa. And it might be a matter which I should raise at the Premiers' Conference next week.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. NEARY:

I am glad that the hon. gentleman acknowledges the fact that this is a very serious matter indeed. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he does not feel that this could be a major threat to the fishery in this Province if we have a recurrence

MR. NEARY: of the Kurdistan situation and the prevailing wind happened to be towards Newfoundland instead of towards Nova Scotia, and the tides were running towards this Province, that whole spill would have - we are just getting the tail end of it now, fortunately at the time. But we cannot afford to have a recurrence of the Kurdistan situation. And would the hon. gentleman confirm for me that in this Province - or in any other Province for that matter, but I am thinking about our Province more than any other part of Canada - that there is not, the technology is not available to take care of a major blow out or a major oil spill off our Coast, despite the fact that the oil companies have spent millions of dollars and have the latest technology that they pawned off on the Coast Guard, that there is no technology on the face of the earth that can handle a major oil spill off our Coast. So therefore would the hon. gentleman not consider asking the Government of Canada to restrict the movement of tankers in the Wintertime when there is ice in the Gulf, because not only are we talking about tankers that replenish the supply of fuel in the local oil tanks, we are talking about movement of tankers to oil refineries in Nova Scotia, and moving into the Gulf of St. Lawrence. And I believe there should be some kind of a restriction placed on these tankers moving in ice because that is what happened in the case of the Kurdistan. I will ask the hon. gentleman if he will give me his reaction to that proposal.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that might be one way of handling that international, perhaps, traffic in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and it might be that strict regulations have to be used. I do not know what the ramifications for such a policy would be as it relates to the delivery of product to other places which are depending upon it, but I think the point is well taken. I think we should, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of course, and Question Period perhaps is not the right place

PREMIER PECKFORD: to do it, but while we are on the subject I think we should acknowledge right off, we should acknowledge that we are, as a Province, and I do not want to be overly dramatic in this, but we are as a Province at the crossroads on a number of major issues dealing with the environment. I think we should acknowledge that and understand it and appreciate it, one, as it relates to the increase in normal, small tanker traffic around our Province as we develop, that is number one, which is increasing at an alarming rate. Two, the Come by Chance oil refinery, its possible, probable reactivation, and frequent large tanker traffic in the Placentia Bay. And thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, is the ongoing offshore oil and gas exploration which are on a lot of our very sensitive fish banks off the East and Northeast Coast.

Now we are at the crossroads on a lot of those and we have to be extremely careful how we move and that is why this government has taken such pains on the environment side as it relates to the Come by Chance oil refinery and why we must, and the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) is correct, be very, very sensitive to and careful as we move now on the offshore. Because, I mean, the Gulf of Mexico - there is not the technology to handle every single kind of blow-out that can occur depending upon the flow that is coming out of that well

PREMIER PECKFORD: and so on, how quickly you can get to it, and whether it is off Labrador or the Island because of the ice situation. So we are really at the crossroads on a number of issues which deal, a number of possible, probably developments as it relates to the environment. And we must insist with the federal people that the latest technology is used and weigh it very carefully and any green light or red light that might be given as it relates to those developments. And I think that should be acknowledged and put on the record right now and some real good debate in this hon. House is going to ensue over the next number years, may I add, may I predict in the next twelve months there will be some very, hopefully stimulating and interesting and substantial debate as it relates to this whole issue because I predict, as we move down the road of deciding upon developments, sooner rather than later, may I add, these matters are going to have to be fully addressed and this House is going to have to get into a major debate on it.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development - agriculture comes under his portfolio. Would the minister care to comment or give the House some idea of just how serious the threat to the farmers in Bonavista and Lethbridge and the warnings coming to the Avalon Peninsula with regards to the infestation of the night feeders? Would the minister bring the House up to date on - army worms as referred to in the paper - the amount of damage done to date, the threat and where this threat originated?

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

MR. J. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question takes in two or three areas of concern. Number one, this is not the first infestation of what is referred to commonly as the army worm. The areas affected, at least from our research and research done

MR. J. GOUDIE: by federal agricultural officials to date, is in the Lethbridge/Charleston areas of Bonavista Bay and St. Phillips in Conception Bay, just outside of St. John's here. They were first spotted this year a few days ago by an agricultural representative with my department at Clarenville and confirmed by Mr. Ray Moores of the Agricultural Research Station on Brookfield Road. The last infestation in this Province was ten years ago but it was not of a serious nature then and we do not expect it is going to be of a serious nature now. One of the factors, I suppose, which would suggest that it is not going to be of a serious nature is that the life cycle of this particular army worm is two weeks. The officials in the department are analyzing the affects of the army worm to date in the two areas mentioned. I do not have a report at this point in time on exactly how much damage was done. We do not expect that there is going to be very much, we do not expect that this army worm, as it is called, is going to be present in the Province for any great period of time.

I might also point out for the hon. member's information that the worm is a problem in Ontario and in Nova Scotia - or has been over the last couple of years. But to this date it has not been of any prominent nature in this Province with the exception of a very short span ten years ago in the Province and again now presently.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in view that the minister indicated that this threat originated, in, I think, Nova Scotia and Ontario, it has always mystified me, I have never been able to understand why it is that Newfoundlanders have to have our cars disinfected going across the Gulf to protect the mainland market, the cattle industry and the potato/vegetable industry, their agricultural

MR. FLIGHT: per se against any threats or any diseases that we might have in this Province. Yet it is not a reciprocal thing. They do not have to spray on the way back, they can come back and bring in everything that is on the mainland by way of threat to our cattle industry and our agricultural industry. I have never heard a question as to why this should be. I am wondering if in view of this, and in view of other things that has happened in this Province, is the minister prepared to put into effect now a programme that would give us the same protection that we are apparently being demanded of by our counterparts on the mainland?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. minister.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, to address the first part of the hon. member's question, he suggested that this infestation originated in Ontario and Nova Scotia. I am not sure if that is actually true; there is a problem in Ontario and Nova Scotia, so it is quite possible with people travelling back and forth that the army worm did come from there to this part of the Province.

MR. GOUDIE: In relation to his suggestion on not only the inspection but the washing or purifying-or whatever process you want to call it - of vehicles and other commodities travelling back and forth, yes, we are looking at some improvements in the present system. I think there also has to be some improvements in the present system as it relates between the Island part of the Province and Labrador. There are some problems in that area as well, or could be some problems. There are not presently some problems with the shipment of vegetables, meat and so on. So that whole area is being examined, and if it is necessary to bring in some stricter restraints on some of the activities than in the past, then I am certainly prepared to do so.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: I want to get the minister on record and to ask point-blank, Is he prepared to insist that cars coming from the Mainland as of now will go through the same procedure as cars going to the Mainland from Newfoundland? In other words, bluntly, Will he insist that the cars coming in will be disinfected the same way that the cars going out must be disinfected?

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, we are looking at exactly that now. How soon we could bring this into effect, I am not sure, but if it can be instituted quickly then I am prepared to do that, but there has to be some analysis first, I think, of costs and budgetary allowances right now. Certainly, the safety factor is the largest consideration here, I think. As I say, we are analysing the situation and if it has to be done, it will be done as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) concerning the harvesting of burnt-over timber in Central Newfoundland. The hon. minister undoubtedly is aware that we have a considerable amount of unemployment, so my question, Sir, is, Could you give some ballpark date for harvesting to start on the burnt-over area? And will small, portable sawmills be encouraged to participate?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, we are presently reviewing all possible means of salvaging not only the timber damaged by fire but also timber stands damaged by the budworm, and I am hoping to be in a position to announce to the House, possibly next week, the plans we have in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor), but since he is out, again I will direct it to the Premier.

I would like to thank the Premier very much for getting process of applications underway.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

(Inaudible).

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you very much, because one of my constituents yesterday was given an application and I know it was the Premier's intervention that did it. But does the Premier know - and I want to give him a chance to respond - does the Premier know that applications are being refused to members of the House of Assembly? We have to get the name of the person and refer the name to the housing group and then the application goes back. Is the Premier aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, number one, I was not aware of that at all and I will address myself to that in a second.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

The day before yesterday,

700 information packages were mailed out to the 700 people who had left their names or who had inquired or wanted application forms; so every one of the 700 should either have it already or it is in the mail to them. And the application forms have gone to the Gander, Marystown, Goose Bay, Grand Falls, Stephenville, Corner Brook and Labrador City offices so that the people in those areas who are served by those offices can get their application forms from those regional offices so they do not have to do everything through the members and the great St. John's office, they can get it from the regional offices out around. We are trying to respond as quickly as we can, so all that is in hand and all the application forms are ready to go.

I was not aware that members of the House of Assembly cannot get application forms. In other words, members of the House of Assembly would get some forms in case constituents came to their offices or whatever and then they would give it out from there. And if that is the case, we will see if we can change that within the next few hours.

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you very much. A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

A supplementary. The hon.

member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

I am sure the Premier cannot

be aware of a couple of other things in these regulations that he might want to change. Is he aware, for example, that one of the requirements is that it must be sixty-five per cent completed and occupied, and yet another regulation says that the applicant must reside in the home for a period of two years to be entitled to the full amount of assistance? I had the impression that the full amount of assistance is going to be available up front. Does this indicate that you will give the person the full amount of assistance and then if the person sells two years later you are going to try and recover it? Because it indicates that if the House were sold it would be prorated so there is some indication that he is going to be able to get the full amount but then not allowed to get the full amount.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, with all due

respect to the hon. member, and I know he is serious and genuine in asking his question, I think the detail like that, the hon. member should either see me personally about it or write and make a case for changing that kind of requirement that is in the application or whatever. But I do not think it is necessarily the subject matter of the Question Period, but I would be willing to discuss it with the hon. member afterwards or if he wants to drop me a note on it today or Monday and make a case for changing that kind of a rule for whatever reasons, then I would be only too happy to investigate and look into it and see whether, in fact, such changes were legitimate and should be made.

MR. STIRLING:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

I am sure the Premier is

aware that many of the people they want to apply this too, the people earning under \$10,000, cannot get the full kind of mortgage that is

MR. STIRLING: available. Would he give some consideration, because it is a very real hardship - the traditional way that Newfoundlanders have built houses is to build as you go and a lot of people that he wants to help, the under \$10,000, have started -

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. STIRLING: Under \$10,000 in order to get the \$1,500.

AN HON. MEMBER: The full amount?

MR. STIRLING: Well \$1,500 was what we were announcing as a programme and you have to be earning under \$10,000 to get the \$1,500. The rest is one of those little details that the Premier refers to. There is a lot of confusion among these people.

AN HON. MEMBER: This would make you confused.

MR. STIRLING: It is very confusing. I wonder if the Premier would consider in these cases instead of having an August 1st date and then all the procedures, would he take a look at these houses that were actually started in 1979 that are going on a pay as you go basis - the people who really need it most, the earning under \$10,000 people - would he consider making the effective date anytime in 1979?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would not. You know, you have got to have a cutoff date. You cannot do it for certain classes and not do it for other classes. It is budgeted, given a certain number of applications from August 1st onward and it would cause financial problems as well and I really do not know if you would be getting yourself out of the problem or just digging a hole for yourself. I appreciate what the hon. member is saying: There has to be a start and there has to be a finish. There is a start now on August 1st and I would like to leave it there. On the other issue, I would be willing to pursue it with the hon. member or pursue the issue and the problem with him next week.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
Baie Verte-White Bay.

The hon. member for

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) arising out of his Ministerial Statement this morning on the mini hydro project in the Roddickton area. I wonder if the minister would tell the House what the anticipated cost of the project is? I do not believe it was in the statement. I just read it through briefly. And how many people might be employed in the construction of the hydro electric turbine at the peak period?

MR. SPEAKER:
Mines and Energy.

The hon. Minister of

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the total amount available for the study of the potential sites and for construction of the project is \$1.2 million. I do not have the exact breakdown. I will obtain how much was spent on the study. The bulk of that would be available for construction but obviously it would be hoped to bring it in as cheaply as possible because the whole name of the game here is to find out just how economic a small hydro site can be, so that to a certain extent it is an experiment and an experiment being carried out in order to determine just how costly this type of project will turn out to be.

MR. RIDEOUT:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:
hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

A supplementary. The

MR. RIDEOUT: I thank the minister. The minister did not give any indication of the number of people who might be employed during the construction stage. Would the minister undertake to let me know? The supplementary then, Mr. Speaker: Does the minister anticipate that the cost of electricity to the consumer

Mr. Rideout: in that area as a result of coming onstream of this experimental project might be lowered? because, Sir, they are now, of course, paying the higher diesel rate than the hydro rate. Is there any anticipation that the cost to the consumer will eventually go down and they would go on the hydro rate?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Again it is too early to say. And I would not have expectations created that this will occur because it is an experimental project to determine just how cheaply or how expensively this type of energy source can be developed. So until it is built - it is a demonstration project - we will not know exactly at what mill rate this type of small energy source will come in at, and therefore I do not want to have any expectations created that this may lead to a reduction in cost to consumers in that particular area. It will lead to an improvement in the Provincial position as far as the reliance upon diesel fuel is concerned.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if it is final I will have to put two questions to the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman should know by now, I put the question to him earlier this morning when he was announcing the project, which I agree with because the hon. gentleman was not in the House when I was advocating that the course we should be taking is the small rivers and streams.

MR. BARRY: I heard it.

MR. NEARY: You heard it? Well then the hon. gentleman knows that I agree with his announcement.

But the hon. gentleman should know if they are going to use the low head turbine concept or will it be just a conventional type. In this pilot project, is the hon. gentleman going to take advantage of the new technology, or will it be just the conventional type generator? And also would the hon. gentleman indicate

Mr. Neary: in his answer to me, over the long haul, and I detected this in his last answer there about the price of oil, over the long haul the cost of electricity will catch up and probably pass the hydro that will be developed in Roddickton because of the increased price of oil over the long haul.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Again, Mr. Speaker, since these are obviously low head streams it will be necessary to have low head turbines in order to generate the electricity from them. As far as what specific turbines, which specific designs will be used, that will be the subject of bids and the normal bidding process.

MR. NEARY: Is Eddy going to get a crack at that?

MR. BARRY: He can put a bid in, let us put it that way, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: As far as the projected cost of petroleum products is concerned, I would not hazard a guess, Mr. Speaker, as to where we are going to be. We have seen Mr. Carter's energy secretary upon his retirement indicate that in his opinion it was going to double over the next five years. I have seen other figures indicating that was a moderate assumption and that it was in fact going to triple, all of which is going to have a very serious impact upon electricity prices, not as much in Newfoundland as in some other places which are 100 per cent, virtually, dependent upon diesel fuel.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

MR. SIMMONS: As a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: As a matter of privilege, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: It arise out of a matter raised earlier by my colleague, but it is another distinct matter of privilege. My colleague for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) indicated to the House that the remarks attributed to him in The Daily News this morning were not remarks that he had made. During the course of his speaking to the point of privilege, it was construed by a number of members across the House that I had made the remark attributed to the member for Grand Bank, the remark that "a charge that the RCMP had been hustling."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have since had an opportunity to obtain Hansard and I direct Mr. Speaker's attention to page 1682 in Hansard, and in putting a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) I preambled by saying that "there is the matter of alleged hustling as an issue here." And then in my question, I asked him would he undertake to initiate, and I quote, "To initiate whatever kind of enquiry is required to determine the substance of these charges, these allegations,

MR. R. SIMMONS: and more importantly, to ensure that the practice does not continue if, indeed, it is ongoing."

I distinctly and very carefully, Mr. Speaker, used the term the qualifier 'alleged.' I, Mr. Speaker, have great confidence in and respect for the RCMP and I would not consciously do anything to undermine their role or effectiveness. And my concern yesterday in putting the question was based on a couple of examples, one of which I gave during Question Period, a case of a young married woman, about 30, who came to me some months ago saying that she had been accosted three times during the one evening by an RCMP officer. She was alone at the time and he was alone at the time. At no time did he ask her for identification or licence or whatever. He did engage in some casual conversation, asked her what she was doing later and that kind of thing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to do anything to undermine the effectiveness of the RCMP. My concern in asking the question, the reason for asking it had to do with a concern that perhaps certain members of the Force may, themselves, be undermining the Force's effectiveness and it was in that spirit that I asked the question. I did not charge hustling. I gave an example of alleged hustling and asked the minister would he pursue it. I just wanted to raise that point which may not be a matter of privilege so much as a matter of explanation but I thank Mr. Speaker for his indulgence.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) To the points of privilege, before moving on, if I might with respect to the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms), and I believe the same ruling would apply in the case of the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. R. Simms), having had the opportunity to check some references, and there are many precedents set for this particular

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) type of situation, I would have to rule that there does not exist a point of privilege as such but that the hon. members have taken the opportunity to explain and clarify remarks that have been attributed to them.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MS. H. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer a question tabled by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) on the Order Paper of July 20th. And the question was, "What are the monthly totals paid to E.P.A. or reimbursed to workers to and from Labrador since January 1, 1977 under the scheme to reduce fares for residents of Labrador?"

I would like to inform the hon. member that this does not come under the jurisdiction of my department. I think it would rather be the Department of Transportation and Communications, although I have inquired and I have been informed that government does pay a percentage of fares for the residents of Labrador travelling forth and back in a form of a block of money payable to E.P.A. and that as of April 78-79 that the amount of \$190,000 was paid to E.P.A. But for further particulars, I would prefer that the hon. member check with the Department of -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MS. H. NEWHOOK: No, you would refer to the Minister of the Department of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) to give you more particulars on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Land and Forests.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to answer a question appearing on the Order Paper of Thursday, July 26th, Question No. 16, placed there by my friend from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary).

MR. J. MORGAN: He was asking that this department table the agreement between the Department of Lands and Forests and Omega Construction covering leasing of Hangar 21 at Gander airport. The answer, Mr. Speaker, is we have no agreement between this department and Omega or anyone else regarding renting of a hangar at Gander airport known as the Allied Hangar.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give answer to a question asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) on August 6th. The question was "information concerning a special telephone system connecting Newfoundland Information Services to various newsrooms throughout the Province "

MR. YOUNG: The answer to part (a): Newfoundland Information Services operates a Vucom system which transmits via wire press releases to the various daily media in the Province. This system is a modernized version of the old TWX equipment which was originally installed at Information Services.

The answer to these questions are quite long, Mr. Speaker, and it is unfortunate that the hon. member has - these questions were answered mostly at the committee and the hon. member decided to boycott these or he would have had his information.

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

MR. SIMMONS: That is a point of privilege.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, Sir, in answering a question that I put on the Order Paper just made a statement that is unparliamentary, untrue and could only lower the decorum of this House and I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement. I did not boycott the meetings of the committee. Granted, I did not -

AN HON. MEMBER: You were not a member of the committees.

MR. NEARY: I was not a member. I was not a member of any of these committee, Sir, and I ask Your Honour to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that remark, Sir; it is unparliamentary.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is neither a point of order nor a point of privilege. The hon. the minister was expressing his own particular opinion with respect to a certain observation that he made with respect to the operations of the Committee and it is not a point of order at all, or a point of privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I will be very brief, Mr. Speaker, What the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) did, I think, was in effect in giving an answer - he rose and gave an answer to a question of which notice had been given and this is the appropriate place for him to do it and the proper thing for him to answer a question - but, Sir, in so doing he broke the rule of the House which says a minister giving an answer shall not enter into debate, just as a member asking a question will not enter into debate. And what he did was do that and the reason for the rule is shown and is shown to be quite an exemplary rule because by so doing he touched off a debate. I think what he attempted to do, wittingly or not, and knowing the minister it may well have been unwitting, was to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - try to take a sly crack at the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I do not think this is the place to do it. I think if he wants to take a crack at the member for LaPoile let him do it in debate where there can be the back and forth.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: But to use the answer portion of the Order Paper to enter into debate, Sir, that is wrong and therefore there is a point of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order raised, I would rule there does not exist a point of order but simply a difference of opinion between both hon. members.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Hon. members will recall that yesterday there were some questions asked by hon. members opposite, by two or three of them I think, with respect to law enforcement, Corner Brook, and this arose as well out of some discussions in the Estimates Committee. I have the information now which I will pass on to hon. members.

A few statistics which might be of interest: For the past seven months of this year as compared with the same period in 1978 - so the past seven months of this year as compared with the same period in 1978 - impaired driver and refusal to take breathalyzer test in the '78 period - 138, in the '79 period - 156. Out in the Corner Brook area, hazardous moving violations, in the '78 period - 1,275, in the '79 period - 1,360; injury in motor vehicle accidents '78 - 28; in 1979 - 36. In the past seven months, an average - obviously you cannot check half a vehicle - but the average is 24.5 vehicles per night between 8:00 P.M. and 4:00 A.M. on that shift. I think this is very significant, I think this is a most significant. In the past forty months, two persons have been killed in motor vehicle accidents in that area - in the past forty months two people killed in motor vehicle accidents. Prior to that, four people per year were killed.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: So I think that that - I am not here to interpret the statistics, but I think that they are quite important. Also insurance adjusters in the area report a thirty to forty per cent reduction in motor vehicle accident claims in the past few years. They are unaware at this time of any particular motorist having been checked two or three times during the night, unaware

MR. OTTENHEIMER: of any particular person. If an hon. member has -

AN HON. MEMBER: Specifics.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - Yes. - a specific name, date or some such thing they can give it to me, they can give it directly to RCMP, but they are unaware at this time of any such occurrence. I should point out as well that the matter of checking of vehicles, including at night, including after midnight is a long established investigative technique. During those periods members of the force are expected to ask as much information as is reasonable and practicable, and it is realized that drivers do not have to answer this information but at times it is asked, including the name of the driver, of passengers and destinations, some of the reasons for this are to help the police officers in identifying criminals, who also travel by car, to locate wanted persons, including runaway children, and at times to locate tourists or non-Newfoundland residents whom they are looking for -

MR. ROBERTS: You cannot be serious.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am reporting, I am giving the answer to the question which I said I would. They understand that people do not have to answer these questions. However, I will point out what I think is the very significant statistic which is available and that is during the past forty months two people killed and before that in motor vehicles accidents the four persons per year was the number.

So, as I say, if a person, or any hon. member or anybody with a specific incident or a person or a date or that type of thing, if they wish to give it to me privately or if they wish to ask the RCMP themselves, certainly they will be able to look into it. But they are not aware now of a person being stopped, say, three times in one particular evening.

August 10, 1979

Tape No. 713

DW - 2

MR. S. NEARY:

You do not have

Port aux Basques.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, I do not know. As I said,

I only know of Corner Brook, not Port Aux Basques.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS)

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer

a question from the member for Bonavista North about the application forms to hon. members of the House. Within fifteen minutes there will be 200 applications delivered to the House of Assembly for members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And next there will be another delivery

to the Opposition office to ensure that you have sufficient application forms.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

On behalf of all hon. members, I

would like to welcome to the gallery today the Mayor of Musgravetown, Mr. Alfred Saint.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'

Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I am

dissatisfied with the answer given by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in response to my question of yesterday, and I wish to debate it on the next Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give

notice that I am dissatisfied also with the answers that I asked yesterday of the hon. Minister of Justice in connection with the stopping of cars in Western Newfoundland and I want to join with my colleague and reinforce what he has to say on the next Late Show.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Order 27, Bill No. 38.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting An Increase In Certain Pensions," carried. (Bill No. 38)

On motion, Bill No. 38 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Order, 28, Bill No. 36.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Enable Unifund Limited To Become A Federal Corporation." (Bill No. 36). Is it the pleasure of the House the hon. Minister of Justice shall have leave to introduce the said Bill?

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, this is not a debatable matter and I do not intend to debate it and I am not at all sure exactly what should be done but I do want to make sure that what is done is proper. The Conflict of Interest Act has a requirement in section (17), I believe it is section (17), that no member shall vote on any matter in which he has an interest that is comparable to the interest which we must declare.

MR. ROBERTS: This bill is, as I understand it, a bill to enable a particular corporation to become a federal corporation. I think it is a routine matter, but the fact remains that I, in my professional capacity as a member of the Bar, have from time to time acted in behalf of this corporation, Unifund Limited. And I am not sure what the procedure is - I am not sure whether we voted first reading or not - but it would obviously be improper for me to vote its second reading but I simply wish to declare the interest and place myself in the hands of the House. I know my friend from Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), who I believe is an officer of Unifund Limited, the corporation, is in a similar position. He may wish to say something or he may wish to let what I say speak for him. Simply, I wish to raise the matter. It is not often we get what amounts to a private bill in the House. I do have what amounts to a personal and pecuniary interest in Unifund Limited in that I have acted for them from time to time, I may say, against other members of the House who have brought claims against them, among others.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Unifund Limited is a subsidiary of Johnson Insurance Limited, and I have declared in my conflict of interest statement that I am an employee of Johnson Insurance Limited and, therefore, I am following counsel in suggesting that the only way that I can record that I am not speaking or voting on this matter is to do it in this manner.

MR. SPEAKER: So taken notice of.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Enable Unifund Limited To Become A Federal Corporation," (Bill No. 36), read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 29.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act," (Bill No. 49), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 49, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 30.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 31.

Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Armistice Day Act," (Bill No. 48), carried.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 32.

Motion the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Prevent Discrimination Against Blind Persons," (Bill No. 42), carried.

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Motion 33.

Motion the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend Further The Government - British Newfoundland Corporation Limited N. M. Rothschild & Sons (Supplemental Agreement) Act, 1978," (Bill No. 43), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 43, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)
Bill No. 26.

Continued debate on

The hon. member for
Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday

the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in talking about this bill raised certain matters having to do with what he called the threat of separation in Labrador. I have since had a chance to check the Hansard for yesterday and that is what he did indeed call it, a threat of separation, a threat of Labrador separation, he said. And then he went on to say that the attitude of separation had come through many times in debate in the House and it has been so persistent that - I quote him, "Has been so persistent that I do not think it is too strong to say that there has been a stated or certainly an implied threat of separation brought forward time and time again." And then the minister went on to point out that six members had represented Labrador in the House since his time here and that only two had brought up this clearly stated threat to separation, as he chooses to call it and he pointed out that both these people sat on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on a matter of information, first of all, I can recall at least three people who brought up this matter, at least four people indeed, and to their credit they have all sat on this side of the House. To their credit they have all sat, all four of them, the former member for Labrador South, Mr. Martin, the former member for Eagle River, the old Eagle River seat, Mr. Strachan, the present member for Eagle River, (Mr. Hiscock), the present member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). All four of them have brought up this possibility of separation. To their credit they have all had the courage to do so. The member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) has not had an opportunity to address himself in this debate and knowing him as I do I fully expect he will address himself to the subject. The member for Naskaupi

MR. SIMMONS:

(Mr. Goudie) I expect will give voice to it. Without putting words in his mouth, I believe to some extent he has over the years in this House but we will wait and see what he has to say in response to the latest exchange on this particular subject. But to the credit of the four members I have mentioned, they have all had the courage, they have not been fettered by partisan stances, they have had the guts, the courage, the intestinal fortitude to get up and speak the reality as it exists.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) yesterday - and I want to quote him again from Hansard said this and I quote, "There has been a stated threat and I would say that this is an effective way of operating. And we can only look to Quebec and see how effective it is if one wants to get benefits from a central organization" and in the case of Quebec it is a central government and in the case of Newfoundland it would be the government here on the Island part of the Province, "that is an effective way of achieving an end." The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) Mr. Speaker, yesterday quite openly charged that the reason these members over here had made that statement and the reason others in Labrador were making the statement - I only wish the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) were in the House. I assume he is within hearing of my voice. He was here a moment ago, I have no choice but to pursue it at this time because I just have a half hour or so in which to make the point. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) yesterday charged that this whole thing is contrived for partisan reasons. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to lay one on him because he is forgetting something very important, he is forgetting that over the last two years this concern has mushroomed. Virtually everybody who has visited Labrador has voiced this concern. Only last week I happened to get on a plane in Deer Lake, an airplane coming out off Labrador and there was a salesman on the plane from St. John's and I sat with him, an acquaintance

MR. SIMMONS: of mine, and in no time at all he said, "Look it was my first visit to Labrador. I could not believe what I heard." He said, the alienation there. The alienation. He said they talk about us as foreigners. They do not relate to us at all, the Island people. And he elaborated on the alienation in Labrador. Was he the only one who has sensed that alienation, Mr. Speaker? Was he the only one?

MR. J. CARTER: Rubbish.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SIMMONS: Do not spoil my punch lines now.

MR. SIMMONS: The member for St. North (Mr. Carter) says "I speak rubbish". First of all he knows what rubbish is. He is an expert at rubbish, Mr. Speaker. He is an expert at rubbish. But if he tells me I speak rubbish, I want him to listen for a moment because a couple of other people have said the same thing I am saying. And if he thinks it is rubbish I hope he will have the courage to tell these other people to their faces that what they say is rubbish.

I have just told him about the salesman who went to Labrador. Well, Mr. Speaker, there was another individual I say to the member for St. John's North - there was another individual who went to Labrador in the last couple of years, who travelled the Coast of Labrador right to Nain and had an opportunity for the first time to go into these small communities, he too sensed the alienation, he is a person who normally does not speak out on these issues, he is a person who normally does not address himself to this kind of issue at all, but he felt it so strongly, he saw it as such a potentially divisive force that he came back and made a public statement on the issue, an unprecedented public statement. And, of course, as hon. members will know, I am talking about the Lieutenant-Governor.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rubbish is it?

MR. SIMMONS: I am talking about the Lieutenant-Governor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Rubbish! Rubbish!

MR. J. CARTER: Will the member give way -

MR. SIMMONS: The member for St. John's North will have adequate opportunity in this debate, adequate opportunity. I am sure when he rises he will have some silly poem or some even sillier prose which may relate to nothing but he will think it is important any way, so we will give him a half hour to say, to mouth his important trivialities.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in a closed mind, no, Mr. Speaker. I am not interested in a silly charge that somehow

Mr. Simmons: this whole thing is for partisan reasons, I am not interested, Mr. Speaker, in people playing with the legitimate concerns and aspirations of the Labrador people. I am not interested in that, Mr. Speaker. That is what the member for St. John's North would like to think.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think what happened yesterday is one of the biggest insults ever perpetrated on part of our people, in this case the whole Labrador population. An insult without precedent. And the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) would be well-advised not to be so verbal on this, to back away from it, because it is going to become an increasing embarrassment to his administration.

I know I have faith that when the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) rises he will disassociate himself from it. He will disassociate himself from it, either that or he had better disassociate himself from some remarks that he has reported on here. Because the remarks that the member has quoted here - in this one, I am sorry - the remarks that are recorded here and attributed to the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) do not at all reflect what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said yesterday, indeed the member is in very direct contradiction, the member happens to feel, if we go by his words of a year ago, that there is some alienation. And that it is not all politically contrived by a bunch of Liberals on this side of the House. I am sorry.

MR. GOUDIE: (Inaudible) has already spoken in the debate.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister has already spoken? Well, in that instance I would give the Minister five minutes of my time to make his position clear on it.

MR. GOUDIE: During the Committee.

MR. SIMMONS: The minister from Goose Bay undertakes during Committee, Mr. Speaker, to address himself to this question. I will look forward

Mr. Simmons: to what he has to say, because there is a very real contradiction between what the minister said before the Labrador Resources Advisory Council a year or so ago, and what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said yesterday. And for the sake of the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), I am glad for that difference because he knows Labrador, and I can write off what the Minister of Finance said to his ignorance. I can write it off to the phenomenon that I had mentioned earlier, that the Minister of Finance yesterday demonstrated that he knows just as much about Labrador as he knows about Finance.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that every person living in Labrador will have the opportunity, during the next day or so, to see in print or hear on radio or hear on television the remarks made by the Minister of Finance.

MR. R. SIMMONS: I hope they will hear it, then they will know why it is they have no priority in this government's scheme of things, then they will understand, Mr. Speaker, why it is that virtually so little has been done by this particular administration, because this administration has, in key positions people who do not understand Labrador, who want to treat it in a kind of paternalistic way, talk down to it, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) said yesterday, jump to insulting conclusions about the people, treat them as colonials of some sort.

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker,

I hope -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh! Oh!

MR. R. SIMMONS:

- they would like like to be Speaker,

Mr. Speaker, but you did the job so much better. And between you, Sir, and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), I am certainly glad it is you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Between you and the member for

Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg), from experience, I can not tell you how glad I am it is you.

MR. L. THOMS:

So are they on that side.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

As a matter of fact, I am almost

as glad it is not the member for Stephenville as the people on that side are glad it is not the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG:

(Inaudible) in a few minutes.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

I am sure you will. I am sure you

will. Can not wait to hear himself speak, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope when

the Premier goes to Labrador today, he will, in particular,

MR. R. SIMMONS: disassociate himself from what the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) said yesterday, that absolute insulting diatribe, the like of which you would never expect to hear from a mature man. A shame, an absolute shame and the frightful possibility is that he has charged that the people of Labrador were holding the Island at ransom. The frightful possibility is that that despicable charge might be the government's position. Is he speaking for himself? Is he speaking as a person who has probably not been beyond the overpass out here or is he speaking for the government of the Province? Is he reflecting the views of the member for Menihek (Mr. P. Walsh)? I do not think so. I hope not. Well, as the Minister of Finance, I would think he speaks for government. But then again, I was in committee the other day with him and I tried to get some answers from him on another issue and, if he speaks for the government then the government has about six position on most things because during the course of a ten minute exchange, he gave about six different answers to the same question.

The Minister of Finance, if he speaks for government on anything, demonstrates that the government has many, many positions on any given subject. If it were the appropriate place, I would talk about the answers he gave on the St. John's Trotting Park. And I sat down after and I just went over it, the answers I got from him on the subject, and without debating the merits of the answers or who is right or who is wrong, the fact of the matter was that he gave us at least five or six different answers which were mutually exclusive answers, if this one was right, this one could not also be right. And that is the nature of that particular minister. Unfortunately, he leaves a lot of people confused but more important here, not only does it leave people confused, it leaves the whole population of Labrador thoroughly insulted, thoroughly insulted about a very, very major

MR. R. SIMMONS: issue. I hope, Mr. Speaker, I have taken some time on this because I hope that there will be some response. Forget the name-calling I say to the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and let us respond in substance, respond in substance, let us know whether the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) speaks for the government on this issue.

Does the government think that it is all part of a deliberate partisan plot or did they recognize that there are some feelings of real alienation in Labrador that have to be attended to, that have to be addressed if we are going to change things for the better in Labrador and in this Province? To reduce it to a comment that it is somehow a partisan issue is naive, Mr. Speaker, in the extreme but not only naive, if it were naive you could excuse it, it is treachery as well, it is treachery as well, Mr. Speaker, and treachery that can not go unchallenged, treachery that can not go unanswered for the sake of the future of this Province and the sake of the future of Labrador in particular, the treachery, Mr. Speaker, perpetrated on this House and on the people of Labrador by the Minister of Finance yesterday, that

MR. SIMMONS: unspeakable, despicable, insulting treachery. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance had some other gems for us yesterday with his brilliant knowledge of -

MR. J. CARTER: Withdraw, that is most unparliamentary.

MR. SIMMONS: If we could withdraw the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) we would solve a lot of our unparliamentary problems in the House.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance, (Dr. Collins) yesterday, charged that BRINCO - now this is the crowd, Mr. Speaker, who wanted to forget during the election all about the past - "We are not talking about the past, we are looking into the eighties." Well, the eighties were somewhat absent from the comments of the Minister from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), and the Minister from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) yesterday, when they talked about BRINCO. And at one point the Minister of Finance said, "BRINCO developed the Upper Churchill without any great benefit for Newfoundland." Now, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden BRINCO is the villain. BRINCO is the villain now, Mr. Speaker. Private enterprise is the villain now, the Minister of Finance tells us. I thought it was the government. I thought it was those bad Liberals were the villains back there. They had better get their act together over there, Mr. Speaker.

The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: I am waiting. I am waiting.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) tells us it is that bad Liberal Government that caused all the problems with the Upper Churchill. Now, the Minister of Finance says it is BRINCO, it is private enterprise. What is this a new platform in the step forward approach over there? Step forward or backward into socialism, is that what the Minister of Finance

MR. SIMMONS: is advocating now, outright socialism. to do away with private enterprise? He tells us that the people of Newfoundland gave confidence in this Party to develop the Lower Churchill. Nonsense! Nonsense, Mr. Speaker! The people of Newfoundland, for one thing, are not socialists. They might choose one party above another to govern, to provide their governmental structure, but that should never be construed that they want us to get involved in every facet of human activity and get involved and push out the private enterprise and begin doing clumsily what private enterprise can do better. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is stretching the point much too far when he suggests that a mandate to govern is a mandate to interfere, when he suggests that a mandate to govern is a mandate to supplant private enterprise where private enterprise can better do the job than government can. He interprets much too freely, Mr. Speaker, when he suggests that the mandate to be the Government of this Province is a mandate to be the jack of all trades, however clumsily, however incompetently.

Now, Mr. Speaker, finally before sitting down, just a word or two on the bill itself. Mr. Speaker, the -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) on that bill (inaudible).

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible) irrelevant.

MR. SIMMONS: I quite agree. I have spent the last twenty minutes, Mr. Speaker, rebutting some of the totally irrelevant points raised by the Minister of Finance. I quite agree, Mr. Speaker, that they were irrelevant. I do not argue that point. I agree with the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), that what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) had to say about this bill was totally irrelevant. But it was also shameful and it had to be responded to, Mr. Speaker, or else it would get into the record, without challenge, Of course, it was irrelevant, of course, it had nothing to do with the bill, I am the first to admit that. I am the first to admit that for the past twenty minutes I have been irrelevant, but no more irrelevant than the Minister of Finance,

MR. SIMMONS: and I hope far less shameful in my remarks than the Minister of Finance's remarks have been.

MR. STAGG: Irrelevant for seven years.

MR. SIMMONS: I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that if I stood here and talked forever I could find nothing as insulting to say about the people of Labrador as he said even if I wanted to. It is not my desire. I could find nothing as shameful, nothing as low down to say about the people of Labrador as he said.

I make no apologies to this House, Mr. Speaker, that I have had to be irrelevant for twenty minutes to defend some people who have been maligned by a person in high office.

AN HON. MEMBER: Maiden speech.

MR. SIMMONS: I make no apology for that at all, absolutely no apology for that, Mr. Speaker, if it takes another twenty minutes, another hour to do so. Go back I say to the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and tell them what happens

MR. SIMMONS: when we talk about Labrador in this House. The member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) finds it very funny, tell the people of Labrador. They do not understand the problem that exists up there. They have never been there except perhaps to play hockey one night.

MR. FLIGHT: Or fish.

MR. SIMMONS: Or fish. And they do not run into too many native Labradorians in there in those fish camps - not too many.

MR. MARSHALL: (Inaudible) the hon. member
(inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: We are hitting nerves over there now, Mr. Speaker. I finally proved that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) has a nerve or two. I suspected he may have none at all.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition in the last day or so has given our position on the bill. The government spokesmen have given various positions on the bill. The member for St. John's East says we should blame the Liberals, the member for St. John's South (Dr. J. Collins) says we should blame BRINCO and he also says we should blame the Labradorians, by the way. So there are three or four villains over there now, Liberals, BRINCO and Labrador are the villains so far, and I am sure as other government spokesmen speak we will hear about other villains.

Mr. Speaker, I, for my part, will want to support this bill, whatever it does. It certainly will launch another feasibility study and, I suppose, we should never be against feasibilities, we should never be against study. I would not want to be on the record as against study, Mr. Speaker. This is a study bill, another stalling motion. We cannot be against it because one of those days they will tell us we did not want the subject studied. Well, I want it studied, Mr. Speaker, because \$110 million of my money have gone into it and I would like to know at least where that went. I would certainly like to have the matter studied. I cannot be against this particular bill, it is just a bill to study and let the record show that that is all it is.

MR. SIMMONS: This does not do anything to get the Lower Churchill on stream any faster. Indeed, in effect, it has the effect of stalling - stalling a proposal that we were told had a green light back in 1975, four and a half years ago. There is nothing in the bill that we can be particularly upset with, it is a bill to study. So let us study it - study it some more. And in the course of that, Mr. Speaker, and in the course of debate, let us have no more of this paternalistic, mischievous attitude about Labrador. I find that very, very disturbing, Mr. Speaker, very, very insulting, and I would hope that someone on government side will rush to strike it from the record and so so pretty soon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I finally get the floor, and I am delighted to have it.

I would like to strike all the comments of the hon. member from the record, because as I was saying here from the background, he was irrelevant. And certainly, if they could be struck from the record it would save us an awful lot of repetitive typing up in Hansard, because what the hon. member had to say was completely misconstruing what the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) had to say. And I will direct myself to that because he went on for forty-five minutes or a half hour, however long he had - it sounded like half a month - indicating that the Minister of Finance had made an attack on Labrador. All the Minister of Finance said, as I understood it, was that the Minister of Finance deplored the tactics being used by the two members from Labrador, opposite who were bringing Separatism into this debate, and he deplored that as cheap politics and looking for a headline not unlike the type of headline that the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) continually searches out when he gets into the record some ambiguous statement about the RCMP hustling women, and then gets up and tries to deny that he said it. That is the sort of thing that he is up to, Mr. Speaker, looking for the cheap headline.

MR. STAGG:

So he probably had one headline in that, I do not know. The press seem to give him headlines and it only encourages him. I cannot get any headlines myself, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the Leader of the Opposition and some of the statements that he made in his frenzied reply to some of the comments and the invitation to speak that was given to him by our House Leader yesterday. It was frenzied. He stood up and he was flushed, he was angry, that the Government House Leader could in any way suggest that the Leader of the Opposition had not deported himself properly, or had not applied himself properly to the task of supporting our project when he was a man in authority in Ottawa. So I would like to deal with that. But before I do so I must say that -

MR. STIRLING:

Sit down.

MR. F. B. ROWE:

Shut up, I must say that these notes coming into me here, Mr. Speaker, fellows giving me suggestions, I have it all here 'boys', You do not have to give me any suggestions, I have it all here. I must say as I begin my speech here and am about to explode some of the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition, I feel somewhat like I am defacing a museum or I am hitting a national monument because the man has been a legend in Newfoundland over the years. But when he comes in here and he comes out with a statement suggesting to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) that we should study, get a constitutional lawyer to study whether a corridor through Quebec is in the national interest, when he suggests that, when he suggests that, I have to say, look deface a monument, hit an obelisk, you name it, I have got to do it because I am a Newfoundlander. I have got to ask where was the hon. gentleman from 1967 until 1979? Where was he, in Timbukto? Where was he?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Because the constitutional interpretation of the BNA Act to make something in the national interest - well, as far as I am concerned, the pipeline was declared to be in the national interest in the 1950s, and there is nothing more in the national interest of Newfoundland than a corridor through Quebec or pressure, real pressure from the federal government on Quebec to make sure that Newfoundland gets a better deal on the Lower Churchill or the other rivers in Labrador than it had on the Upper Churchill. And for the Leader of the Opposition to stand there and to make some sort of oblique reference, or to - not even to say mea-culpa, because apparently it never occurred to him in all his twelve years in Ottawa that he should have somebody look into whether or not a corridor through Quebec was something that should be declared to be in the national interest. So I must say that it grieves me sore to have to do it but I must explode that for what it was, it was tripe, it was a man trying to wiggle out, wiggle away from having abrogated his responsibility for twelve years.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is guilty of putting forward the national interest of the Liberal party, the national interest of the Liberal party rather than the provincial interest of Newfoundland for the twelve years that he was in Ottawa. The national interest of the Liberal party was that you do not put a corridor through Quebec because if you do it, you enrage them and they all vote Social Credit or Separatist or something else, or even PC. That is the national interest of the Liberal party, that is why it was not done. So you cannot escape from it, it was not done for twelve years and the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition cannot come into this House now and suggest that we should have a look at it. Our constitutional experts say - I am a constitutional expert as far as that goes, I say that it is in the national interest. I read Bora Laskin on many occasions, hard stuff. But at least I can read

MR. STAGG:

the BNA Act and the BNA

Act says that certain projects can be declared to be in the national interest. If this is not in the national interest there is nothing in the national interest. The Lower Churchill and the rivers in Labrador would save this country billions of dollars in oil payments that they make, sort of in ransom, to the Opec countries, Venezuela - well that is an Opec country. All of these countries throughout the world are holding us to ransom, and the hon. gentleman has to take his place as those who perpetrated it upon us and who stood by or sat by or travelled the world while we down here in Newfoundland were looking for somebody to carry

MR. F. STAGG: the banner of Newfoundland in Ottawa and we did not have it. And I suggest to you that we do have them up in Ottawa now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. STAGG: We have them in Ottawa now, we have got the men in Ottawa now who suggested in 1972, in the debate. -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is worse.

MR. F. STAGG: The hon. gentleman is going to have his chance. The hon. gentleman threatened me just now. The hon. gentleman from Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) said, if you speak, I am going to speak, the member from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) is going to speak and everybody is going to speak. Well, I suggest to them - they should all speak, and they should all address themselves to the position that I put forward, where was the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) when the Upper Churchill contract could have been renegotiated, when the Lower Churchill contract could have been -

MR. J. HODDER: About Port au Fort?

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Order, please!

MR. J. HODDER: (Inaudible) and Port au Port (inaudible) in the national interest, why did they not do it?

MR. F. STAGG: I declare it in the national interest. The hon. gentleman was up there for twelve years, he did nothing and pretends he was ignorant about it. Well, maybe he was, maybe he was, if he was then I say the people of Newfoundland made a wonderful choice. They definitely made the right choice on June the 18th when they tossed them out and put us in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. STAGG: And something else, Mr. Speaker, it is about people who get converted, they are calling us the born-again administration. There is only one man in this House who voted against Confederation and that is the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. F. STAGG: And what happens once you vote against something and later you embrace it? Well, you embrace it too much. He is more Canadian than, I would say, Douglas Fraser. Is that the fellow's name, Mr. Canada, Douglas Fraser? More Canadian than Douglas Fraser. He is more Canadian than Douglas Fraser and I suggest to you that when he embraced Canada, he abandoned Newfoundland.

Now, who are the Newfoundlanders who support this bill? Who are the Newfoundlanders that I respect who support this bill? Well, the first one is probably the man who is responsible for my being here and responsible for an awful lot of us on this side being here, John Crosbie. John Crosbie is the man who is much maligned by the members opposite. They would like to have us by not responding to the accusations against Mr. Crosbie or 'John' as I know him, they would like for us to not reply so that somehow or other the people of Newfoundland would have the feeling that John Crosbie was not a patriot. John Crosbie is the greatest patriot that this Province will see in this half century. And I am going to suggest to you -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. STAGG: Hear, hear? Hear, hear, indeed!

I am going to read to you now from the Canadian Press 1972, June 27th, 1972, a long time ago.- then I am going to quote a little bit from Hansard - "Legislature shocked by agreement," the Canadian Press said, "Finance and Economic Minister, John Crosbie, dropped a bombshell in the Newfoundland Legislature yesterday when he revealed that an agreement between Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation and Hydro Quebec said preference will be given to Quebec for personnel, services and equipment for the Churchill Falls Hydro project. The agreement was signed during the previous Liberal administration of Joseph Smallwood. Mr. Crosbie said a special liason committee had been set up with Quebec for recruitment of

MR. F. STAGG: workers." And I was up there, I was up there working in Churchill Falls and I saw them coming in. Fortunately, I had some French so I could get by. As a matter of fact, I had just enough French to help the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) get by as well. He was up there as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG: You need French in some obscure places.

Mr. Crosbie said a special liaison committee had been set up, yes.

"The information was in direct contradiction of reports issued by Mr. Smallwood's administration that Newfoundlanders would have preference and that Newfoundland materials would certainly be used wherever possible." Mr. Crosbie said the people of Newfoundland should have been given the information. I will skip a paragraph now Mr. Crosbie said, "It would be better for the Lower Churchill River to run into the sea forever than for the Province to agree to terms similar to those for harnessing the Upper Churchill." And here this is seven years later, it is seven years later and the Lower Churchill is still running into the sea and I would say that it will run into the sea until the year 2000 when this Peckford administration may be in its last years, when the Premier is about to hand it over to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Stagg.

MR. F. STAGG: I guess the next Premier of Newfoundland is not in the House yet. It can flow into the sea until the year 2000 because if we had listened to the member for Bell Island, as he then was, before he skipped to the other side of the Province where nobody knew him, when he said on June 27th. in the same debate, and I will just quote here for another few seconds, "We asked the hon. minister about the development of the Lower Churchill, the hon. minister spent, I suppose, about ten or fifteen minutes talking about the previous administration, what the previous

MR. STAGG: administration had done, what kind of a deal we had made in the development of the Lower Churchill and the Upper Churchill. Red herring, Mr. Speaker, red herring."and I am trying to emulate it now because nobody really can, although I must say some members opposite, and I digress here for a minute, some members opposite have accused me of being the Neary of this side. They have accused me of being the Neary of this side. They have come up to me in the corridor and they have said, "You are getting just like Neary. You are getting just as bad as Neary." And I have got a good mind, Mr. Speaker, to identify them, to identify who they are on the other side who are saying that I am the Neary of this side. And there was one fellow who even said I was the Simmons of this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: If you are going to insult me boys in that way you run the risk of being revealed. Now look, there are only two of them left in the House, only two of them left in the House, and one of them said it to me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: And the others are not coming in.

Now, I must get back to the member for Bell Island where he talked about red herring. "Red herring, Mr. Speaker, red herring, trying to evade the issue, did not want to come to grips with the problem. He said he would rather see the water flow into the ocean from the Lower Churchill than have it developed the same way as the Upper Churchill. Well, Sir, I say to the hon. minister tonight"- we used to sit in the night time in those days, which we do not do anymore - thank God,"that there are a lot of men, women and children in this Province who are depending on developments like the Lower Churchill for their living" - the construction jobs on the Lower Churchill what he meant - heads of households depending on it, Sir, to earn a living for themselves

MR. STAGG: and their families. They do not want to see the water continue to flow out into the Atlantic Ocean, Sir, or out into the Gulf of St. Lawrence, wherever it is flowing."

What the hon. member from Bell Island, and the member for White Bay South, as he then was, although I cannot find the exact quote for the member for White Bay South because he was a little more slippery than the member for Bell Island, and maybe even the member for White Bay North, as he then was, these men now are the members for Twillingate (Mr. N. Rowe), and the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). The only man who is really still in his seat is the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). I do believe that the record will show, and I am doing research on it and when I get it I am going to reveal it to the House, that they said; "Let the project go ahead, we need the jobs. There is unemployment in the Province, we need the jobs." And I say to you that Frank Moores and John Crosbie and all the members of this administration who said, "No, no, no, the water will flow into the Atlantic forever," we deserve a good round of applause. We deserved to get re-elected in 1975 and we did get elected in 1975 and we got elected in 1979, and 1983, and 1987, and 1991, and so on. And in 1983 will have to appoint an Opposition and I will probably be part of it.

Well, that is the sort of thing, that is the sort of thing that this administration stands for. This is the sort of thing that we are - we are willing to bite the bullet. We over here are willing to let the Lower Churchill flow into the Atlantic forever unless we can get a better job because as I said to myself, in 1972 I had two children, in 1979 I have four, very fecund the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), I have four, and two of these children born since 1972 are now old enough to say, "Daddy, why did you sell us out in 1972? They are saying at school that you sold us out in 1972."

MR. ROBERTS: Why?

MR. STAGG: They are old enough to say it.

MR. ROBERTS: Why?

MR. STAGG: But they do not say it and they cannot say it because we did not do it. But if we had listened to hon. gentlemen opposite we would have done it. We would have done it. So this is what we on this side have to continue to get before the public of this Province.

MR. W. CARTER: You have done a good job.

MR. STAGG: That there is a matter of principle involved here, that this party stands for, this side of the House, this government stands for development. Yes, we stand for development, but not development just for the sake of the jobs. We do not stand for development for Quebec. And it seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) is following on in the ignoble trend established by his predecessors as leaders of the Opposition, and I would like for him, if he is within earshot or Hansard-shot, or wherever he is, to reply to that. Because he cannot come in here and sort of obliquely, as a passing reference, suggest to us that we should now have a look at the BNA Act to see whether a corridor through Quebec was in the national interest because he had the opportunity to influence the government, he was supposedly a big shot

MR. STAGG: in the Trudeau administration.
Evidently, he did not even think about it. It was not something that he cared about. He also attempted to heap ridicule upon this government. He said, 'They had four or five or six different positions, you never knew where they stood.' You never knew where they stood - that is what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said. Well, if that was the position, if this government was so waffling -

MR. MARSHALL: It breaks me right up!

MR. STAGG: It breaks him right up!

If we were so waffling as to not know where we stood, well, I think that the Leader of the Opposition in his capacity as whatever he was, Minister of Transport, Minister for External Affairs, minister of this and minister of that, then he should have revealed us. He should have been on the press telling the people of Newfoundland what a bunch of ignoramuses we were. Apparently, he did not do any of those things. So I wonder if it is correct. I wonder if it is just not rhetoric, if it is not just something dragged up to try to refute the very able and precise and incisive arguments put forward by the member for St. John's East, our House Leader (Mr. Marshall).

Mr. Speaker, that side of the House have been consistent since 1972. They look upon projects like the Lower Churchill like a LIP programme or a Canada Works programme or welfare. They see it as a magnificent project, as a grand imperial concept, as their mentor would have it. Well, we do not look on it as Canada Works, we do not look on it as welfare, we do not look upon it as LIP - we look upon it as a national treasure, something that has to be developed in due course, so that our children will not be able to say to us, 'Daddy, why did you sell us down the drain in - ?' - whenever it was. Our children are not going to say that to us. That is the kind of people we have over here. We do not care if we ever get elected again - well, maybe we do care if we get elected again - but if it means that we would have to stoop to that kind of short-term political gain, we will not do it.

MR. MARSHALL: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: And we never will do it. Certainly, I will not be here if we start doing it, and I cannot see our leader as being part of it. I mean, he is much too forward-looking.

And I would like to say in conclusion - I have only been on the go here for fifteen minutes - I swear I have said more in fifteen minutes than the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) said in all seven years he has been here! He has had one speech four thousand times!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Notice the applause from this side of the House.

This is a momentous day, it is a momentous bill, Mr. Speaker, and if we could still bestow knighthoods on Newfoundlanders - it was abolished, I believe, in 1947 or somewhere thereabouts, a further example of our independence from England - but if we could still bestow knighthoods on people in this Province, I would suggest that there would be Sir John Crosbie II - because I believe there was a previous Sir John Crosbie. John Crosbie is the man who gave this government its strength in the early days. We followed him in 1972, we followed him before that, some of us, and certainly, we have all followed him since then. But if John Crosbie had decided in 1972, 'This administration under some leadership from me must have a monument to dedicate after it,' and he had decided that we were going to do the Lower Churchill according to the BRINCO suggestion - that agreement that they were offering at the time which the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke about when he was into debate - if we had decided that we were going to do that and if John Crosbie had decided that that was what we should do, we probably would have followed him. He was a man of considerable talent when it came to persuading people. Fortunately, he will be able to look back, we will be able to look back - on June 27, 1972 when Mr. Crosbie said - 'Never,' - 'Never,' he said, 'I would sooner see the water go to the sea than for us to agree to terms like that on the Lower Churchill.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: A great man! And, Mr. Speaker, if we could bestow knighthoods on people, I would suggest that this is the man we should bestow a knighthood on - and I would also say to hon. members here - because he is a much maligned political figure in this Province and hon. members opposite would like to tear him down - everybody who stands up on this side, whenever it is considered relevant, should give the man his just deserts. He is a great patriot in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: He is a great man and deserves better than hon. gentlemen opposite are giving him.

I also commend to hon. gentlemen the November 28, 1975, full statement issued by the Minister of Finance, as he then was - twenty or thirty pages. Read it, read it - especially all hon. members who are here for the first time. You can get it down in the Legislative Library. You can also get all sorts of embarrassing previous positions of hon. members down there if you read the Hansard as I did here, exploding the member for Bell Island for what he is, which is, I suppose, a shrewd politician to some extent.

MR. NEARY: What is that?

MR. STAGG: In any event - I was quoting from Hansard the position taken by the hon. gentleman in 1972, which I consider, if we had followed in 1972, would have been tragic for this Province. The hon. gentleman may have another interpretation of it, as he usually does.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the end of my comments. There were a few more things I wanted to say, but they do not hang together now,

Mr. Stagg: but I especially wanted to get on the record about the Leader of the Opposition, and I think I have done that adequately, he became more Canadian than Douglas Fraser, he became a zealot, and this is the danger of the newly converted. He became more Canadian than a Newfoundlander.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few comments I commend the House to this bill. And I know that the implementation of this bill and the agreement between Canada and Newfoundland will eventually, it may not be this year, it might not be the next year, it might not even be until as I say the Premier decides that he may want a leadership convention around the year 2000, and it may not even be until then.

MR. NEARY: When you want to get born again.

MR. STAGG: It may not even be until then, but we are on the right track because time marches on and we will never have to say to our children that we sold out Newfoundland, as hon. gentlemen opposite were prepared to do in 1972.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I was prompted to speak in this debate by the vicious speech given yesterday by the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the hon. Government House Leader, and then again, of course, by the two speeches that followed by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the most recent speech, the latter speaker, the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, the greatest repudiation of the substance and the content of what the hon. the Government House Leader had to say was the complete lack of attention given to it by the press. So, I suppose, that in itself says something about what the hon. member had to say.

Mr. Lush: However, in view of the Premier's efforts to make this a new government, and to indeed for this new House with a new approach to the debate, the decorum of the House a few things ought to be said about the last three speakers on the government side. The Leader of the Opposition speaking yesterday made the point relating to the government's deliberate and continuous efforts to disassociate itself from its immediate predecessors, wanting a new approach, and to disassociate themselves, Mr. Speaker, from the past.

 Indeed, at one point the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was speaking, and in alluding to this new approach, a positive approach, to use that example that educators are so familiar with, of looking at a glass that is half full as opposed to half empty, Mr. Speaker, these three last speakers on the government side certainly did not use that approach, that positive approach of looking at a glass half full.

 So it would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) and other members they want their

MR. LUSH: cake and eat it too. It is fine to refer to the past as long as its with the Liberal party. It is fine to have a negative attitude as long as it relates to the Liberal party.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Forget Egret, the scandals.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a two way place and this hon. member not very often says anything that is negative, I try to be a positive person. And I would suggest to Mr. Speaker that if the tenor of this House is changing, if the tenor of this House will change I think Mr. Speaker can put it on the hon. member for St. John's East and mark yesterday as the day that it began. The day that it began, Mr. Speaker. That hon. member has become so obsessed with hatred for the Liberal Party that whenever anything comes up that he can, in the most remote way, associate it with the Liberal Party, either federally or provincially, his mind just simply becomes a muskeg of mediocrity, a sulphur pit.

Mr. Speaker, when it comes to talking in the past I have never heard a member on either side of this House who dwells so much on the past. Indeed, he dwells so much on the past with respect to what went on in the past Liberal administration that his mind is a relic of antiquity that would be cherished by any Archives in Canada.

MR. S. NEARY: I have a few surprises for the hon. Premier on Egret.

MR. LUSH: I think the best thing the Premier could do to prevent that hon. member from again talking about the Upper Churchill - because everytime he gets a chance he wants to talk about the Upper Churchill, the sell-out, the traitors who designed that contract, everytime he sees it, makes the slightest association with anything, he has to say it - I think the best thing the hon. the Premier can do is to change the name of the Churchill and this might prevent the hon. member from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) making the association between the Churchill River and the Liberal Party immediately when he reads the name or hears the name. Absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker!

MR. LUSH: Well, I do not want to dwell, Mr. Speaker, on that contract. It is before the courts, decisions will be made and everybody has their opinions on that particular development. But let me say to hon. members that that contract - any agreement for a large development like that, as this agreement here, is made in the context of the times, in reference to the social milieu. And I would expect all hon. members on the day that that contract was made, were hon. members interested in Newfoundland, they got the best expertise that was available as hon. members did today in drafting this bill, got the best financial advice, the best legal advice that they could get and came up with a deal. Who is to say, as the social milieu changes, that ten or fifteen years down the road there might be some flaw in this document that would result in some economic disadvantage to this Province?

Well, if it does, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that politicians of the day would be honourable enough to look back and say that the people of the time did their best for Newfoundland, they did what they thought out of the context of that time, out of the social milieu, came up with a document, with the best legal advice they could find and the best financial advice they could find, they came up with a document that they thought was going to be of the best of Newfoundland. And as I have said before, I hope if a flaw does come that the people, the politicians would be gracious enough to concede to them that they were good Newfoundlanders that they tried to do their best, that it was only because we cannot predict what will happen in the future financially, economically, the day of prophets is gone. Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the politicians of that day if they find a flaw, as I say, will be gracious enough and kind enough to give credit to the patriots of the day who tried to come up with the best deal that they could for Newfoundland.

Mr. Lush: As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell on that contract other than to say that if there were mistakes let history record them. If there were mistakes in this project, if there were mistakes by previous governments in the past, let history record them, that is what history is for, let not us, as a group of politicians, be continually making a political football out of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: But let history record the mistakes, let us as a group of politicians, let us as the people who will develop the future of Newfoundland benefit from these mistakes. Let us not make the same errors, let us not make the same mistakes, but let us not continually make a political football out of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: So much for the past, Mr. Speaker. It is the very first time that this hon. member ever spoke to anything associated with Churchill Falls. And I would expect I am the member most qualified to speak about Churchill Falls, of all members in the House. I spent five years there from start to finish, 1967 to 1972, I probably do not know as much about the legal contract, but the practicality, the job that went on, the magnitude of that job, the immensity of that job, I saw it, I was there and grew with it. And all hon. members have done in ridiculing the contract, certain parts of the contract, the sell-out, and labelling us Liberals as traitors, all they done is to undermine that project, a marvel of the Twentieth Century, one of the greatest achievements of the Twentieth Century, a Newfoundland and a Labrador achievement, a great scientific and engineering achievement.

I suppose there are hon. members over there who have never seen the project. They do not know what it is. They think it is probably some little hole in the ground. The tremendous skill and expertise that had to be brought together to get that job off the ground, the idea itself, the concept can be classified as that of a genius, the concept, the idea to develop it.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, by making a political football out of it, a political issue out of it, continuously, we undermine the project, we undermine that tremendous achievement of the Upper Churchill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, if there were mistakes in the contract, if there were mistakes, if there were errors made by the previous administration or by any other administration, let history record them, and let us as a group of people take advantage of them and make sure that we do not make the same mistakes, but let us not continually make a political football out of it. It is time to leave that alone and let us get on with developing the Lower Churchill, let us get on with what this document said. And that is what I am concerned about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: And, Mr. Speaker, I tried to read the document. I have read every part of it. I must say I do not understand all of it, the legal jargon, but I have tried to make myself knowledgeable about this particular document. And in view of my experience in Churchill Falls, there are some things I want to say about the bill. In view of my five years there, watching the job grow, Mr. Speaker, day by day, knowing all of the senior personnel there, in every company, I have seen some things go on, some weaknesses if you will, that I want to pass along to my colleagues so that we will be able to plug the holes and make sure that they do not occur.

One of the greatest complaints, of course, when the Upper Churchill was being developed was the lack of Newfoundland people engaged in the work force there. I was there, Mr. Speaker, and let me tell you the politicians of the day that spoke to that issue, they did not over exaggerate the situation. They did not over exaggerate the situation at all. Newfoundlanders were very few, as scarce as hens teeth, I might say, particularly in

Mr. Lush: the first couple of years of development. But why? Was there any discrimination against Newfoundlanders? No, not at all. It was just the way the thing was set up, Mr. Speaker. It was just the way the thing was set up, the very logical or the arrangement, I might say, out of which came logical sets of pattern for hire, Companies coming from the Mainland, companies coming from the States, naturally they brought in people whom they knew, people who had a record of working with them. They knew where the skills were, so they did not come to Newfoundland. When these people got there -

AN HON. MEMBER: Truck drivers?

MR. LUSH: - when the foremen got there they knew people back there, so they did not come to Newfoundland. It is just logical. If I am a foreman and I am from Montreal and I need people as truck drivers or whatever, I am going to go to the people whom I have worked with over the years, people who have demonstrated to me that they are heavy equipment operators and whatever. So it was no deliberate attempt to discriminate.

MR. STAGG: And you agreed with it?

MR. LUSH: No, Mr. Speaker, just let me finish - I am just telling what the circumstances were.

MR. J. CARTER: And you agreed with it?

MR. ROBERTS: Ignore them 'Tom', they are being (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Agreed with it? I am coming up with a proposal, I am telling you that there was no discrimination against Newfoundlanders as such, that Newfoundlanders were not allowed in because they were Newfoundlanders

MR. LUSH: it was just because the top managerial people had associations someplace else. and this is where they knew their workers and they brought them in. And if I am a foreman and I want a man, it is natural, if I know a man in Montreal I am going to bring him in because I am a contractor and I want to make money, or if I am a foreman I want to produce for my contractor and I am going to bring in the people I know. And what went wrong was that there was not a study to decide what the Manpower skills would be, what the Manpower skills would be for that project. And maybe we were not ready to do that back in the time when we started that. But today we are more advanced educationally. Today we are more advanced educationally and my suggestion to the government is to make sure that we carry on a Manpower study and nowhere in this document do I see that, that there will be a Manpower study carried on to determine what skills will be needed so that we then in turn can train our people accordingly.

I see, Mr. Speaker, there a section on the study stage work. But it does not at all look into what skills are going to be needed to complete the job once we decide that we are going to develop the Lower Churchill. This is just a mechanical thing to point out the legal arrangement between the Province and the federal government and the arrangements with shares and all this sort of thing. There is nothing there in the actual - how the work will take the place and what skills are needed with this kind of development, none at all. And, Mr. Speaker, I would advance that this is where we fell down on the Upper Churchill and if the government is not going to listen to advice this is where they are going to fall down here now. And I believe that the IBEW presented the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) with a proposal on this very thing. It was related, naturally, to the electrical part of the job, the putting in of the towers and the lines. And they made a recommendation so that we would get the top-notch jobs that would result from these installations of the lines that are going to be needed. And they presented a proposal to the government to carry on

MR. LUSH: a Manpower study precisely as it relates, of course, to people within this Union, the IBEW, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. And I wonder what is the status of this report? Have the government acted on it? Have they taken these recommendations? To really look into this and to study what will be the requirements with respect to the transmission lines and whether we have the people who can take care of that. That is very specific. I would like to see it, Mr. Speaker, on a broader scope, to see what skills we will need.

Now, I agree with the government's insertion here, "that the development of specific principles and plans which shall endeavour to ensure that the supply of goods and services for the project will be such as to give the residents of Newfoundland and then residents of Canada," you know I like that. I like that. We are going to become a little broad in our thinking, and move away from this parochialness of giving special preferences to people in this area and that area. This is a job that is done for all of Canada. It is Canada's money, so I agree that it should be Newfoundland, but then to all of Canada.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me say, writing in preference is absolutely useless unless we carry on that other thing of conducting a manpower study to ascertain what skills are needed, then let us accordingly make the adjustments in our institutions, the trade schools and put in the courses and programmes that will be needed to train our people. It is absolutely useless and silly and futile to put in a preference clause if we do not have the skills. What contractors are going to take people because they are Newfoundlanders? - a lot of nonsense. And we should not ask them to take them because they are Newfoundlanders, we should ask them to take them because they are good workers. And there are good workers in Newfoundland. And Newfoundlanders do not want to be taken on a job because they are Newfoundlanders. We want to be taken on a job because we have the skills, and let us make sure that we do not put an

MR. LUSH: obstacle in front of these contractors by not having the skills. And, Mr. Speaker, that is the direction in which we should be going and there is no reference to it in this particular bill, that there is going to be a manpower study, an intensive manpower study to look into what skills, what requirements are going to be needed in this particular job. And that is the way to insure that Newfoundlanders get the total benefit, that is the way to insure that we get the total benefit, by insuring that we develop it and we own it, that we develop it in the true sense of the word, that it is being developed by Newfoundlanders because we have the Newfoundlanders who can develop that job. And then, once we do that, then that natural logical course of events that I spoke about earlier will not happen. Once we get Newfoundlanders there in managerial positions and in positions of importance, then they are going to be getting their people that they have worked with, bringing these in so the thing will be reversed, totally reversed. Once we get Newfoundlanders in there in top managerial positions, naturally they are going to go for the people whom they have associated with, people who have a work record with them, people who are productive. And to insure that we have Newfoundlanders there is not good enough just to put in preferential treatment. It is not good enough. Let us look into the total ramifications of what the skills, of what skills will be required on that development and let us get down to business and see that our Newfoundlanders are trained so that they are the people who will get the jobs, not because they are Newfoundlanders but because they are skilled and productive workers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, that is all

I had to say about this great bill. And again I just want to say that I would certainly urge hon. members to stop this nonsense of making a political issue out of the Upper Churchill and making it

MR. LUSH: appear as if this job was nothing, this marvel of the twentieth century.

Mr. Speaker, I would love to be able to read statistics on the Upper Churchill here. And if hon. members want to know about the Upper Churchill, they can go down to the legislative library and read the newspapers that were put out by the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation Limited every week and told the progress of that job all the time. They are all there. Hon. members can read them. I go down now and again because now and again my name was mentioned. I just go down to see and to reminisce, that is all, for old time sake. But if hon. members really want to know something about the magnitude of that job, a job that nobody knew how big it was until we went there. It grew as we went there. We did not know it was going to be so big. We did not know, Mr. Speaker. We did not know at all. And when I hear people ridicule that job, a project that I have walked over, every inch, in every lake that is there Michikamau, Ossokmanuan, Lobstick, Seal Lake, fished in them, walked the shores, walked over the dykes and saw the tremendous development, Mr. Speaker. And to hear people ridicule and make it to come to nothing is terrible. And to hear the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) talk about the concept that students have of it, our young students, it is ridiculous, it is an indictment on our political system that our young students are calling this a sell-out, the greatest achievement in Canada in the twentieth century. Nonsense, Mr. Speaker! And as I said, I would hope that as the social milieu changes, that in time nobody will be able to look back and see a flaw here. But if it is, I would hope that we would all be patriots enough to come back and give credit to these hon. men who tried their best, with the best knowledge that was available, with the best legal advice, the best financial advice and came up with the best documents they could think of of the day. I hope that we

MR. LUSH: will always be that way but as I said before, I hope if we find an error that we will be a little more generous, that we will be a little more gracious in attributing to these people the kind of zeal that they had, the kind of desire they had to really work for Newfoundland and to come up with something that was going to benefit Newfoundland to its maximum. And I just made the suggestion that in order to benefit Newfoundland to its maximum I have indicated what I would call the weakness in the development of the Upper Churchill and it was within employment strategy, in not determining the skills that were needed and I hope this government will do it so that it will turn itself around and be fully, fully beneficial to Newfoundland in every way possible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

Order, please! If the

hon. minister speaks now he closes the debate.

The hon. Minister of

Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the last

member, the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) made certain points,

Mr. Barry: comments that I have to vehemently disagree with. I will get to those. But there is one that I have to agree with where he spoke of "Stop making a political issue of the Upper Churchill." I just wonder why it is that hon. members on the other side of the House decided to make a political issue or football out of the Lower Churchill Bill, when they get up and say that they agree in principle with it?

Now, the thing that members on this side are making a political issue out of, as far as the Upper Churchill is concerned, is not the building of the project, a great job was done. The thing that is the terrible, terrible, shocking, shameful thing about that project was the sellout, s-e-l-l-o-u-t, that is what it was, sellout.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: How long are you going to dwell on that?

MR. BARRY: The hon. member opposite says, "How long are we going to dwell on that?" I noticed the first speaker on the other side, the member for Baie Verte (Mr. Rideout) -

AN HON. MEMBER: Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. BARRY: I am sorry White Bay -

AN HON. MEMBER: Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. BARRY: Baie Verte-White Bay. He gets up, the energy critic for the Opposition gets up and what does he do in the way of constructive criticism of this LCDC Bill? He decides he has to go after the minister introducing the Bill, myself, because he believes that I made a mistake back in 1975, Mr. Speaker. I have nothing to apologize for, for any of the decision that I participated in in 1975, in saying that the Gull Island project should start. And it should have continued in 1975 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - and would have if we had had the support from the federal government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: -that grudgingly we had to extract from them. And this is one area, I have a lot of respect for the Leader of the Opposition, this is one area where I have to say he disappointed me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Because his support for this project was grudgingly given, grudgingly! He did not pay the attention to this, as a minister in the Federal Cabinet, that he paid to the tar sands of Alberta, where, if you look at what we were asking and still are asking in terms of assistance for the Lower Churchill River, it is less in terms of barrels of oil or equivalent energy than is being supplied to the tar sands of Alberta.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And we have, Mr. Speaker, this suggestion, that we have all these terrible problems that hang over the Lower Churchill development., And the Leader of the Opposition gets up there and throws up his arms in almost despair and says, "Oh these problems that we have." Instead of saying, "By God we are behind you, we are going to get this project off the ground. And these problems we are going to tackle. Difficult problems, one by one, and be right behind you in solving them." No, no. I got the definite impression from the Leader of the Opposition that he was just sitting back and hoping that we would stumble, Mr. Speaker. We may stumble, but we will never fall flat on our you-know-whats the way the Liberal administration did in negotiating that contract in connection with the sale of power to Quebec on the Upper Churchill River development. Now, the energy critic, the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout), decided that he was going to have a go at me for my participation, my initial participation, in my previous portfolio as Minister of Mines and Energy. I mean this is an hon. member who got up and the first question he gave me as energy critic indicated that he was not aware that Muskrat Falls was on the Lower Churchill River, the energy critic for the Opposition. The first question

MR. BARRY:

Hansard will reveal, Mr. Speaker, was the question, "Have we changed our decision to develop the Lower Churchill by our decision to develop Muskrat Falls?" Now, look, I have daughters in high school and elementary school who are aware of this. Let me get to the essence of the energy critics, and I must say I am disappointed in their contribution to the energy policy of this Province that was

MR. BARRY: made in the course of this debate on the other side. There were three or four members there I do not think referred to energy, never referred to it, and I am suggesting that there is a responsibility on the Opposition sure to oppose, but also to be constructive, and I am sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not seen too much in the way of constructive criticism. Accusing us of going back to the past, they decided that they would go back to the past, to 1975, to the commencement of the development of the Lower Churchill power potential, and they decided that they were, since they could not find anything in the bill to attack, going to attack decisions made back in 1975. And we had the suggestion that there had been expenditures made and wasted, this was the position put by hon. members opposite. Now, I have a document here, Mr. Speaker, which I am going to file, and I would ask the press, if they have not disappeared for their weekend haunts, to take note that this document is filed, because it is something, I think, that the public of this Province should be aware of, and that is a document establishing that we got value, value for the dollars spent in 1975 on the development of the Gull Island power site, a value which still exists. This is the first time, that I am aware of, that it has been filed. What is this? This is an independent, and I stress independent, analysis of the current value of assets of the Gull Island power complex, and this consultant, Bechtel Canada Limited, and I will file one copy for the House and I have one copy for the Opposition. I am sorry I do not have copies for all hon. members. There was work done, there was work done on the Lower Churchill power development, and certain assets accrued from the work done, the money expended. We have, as a result of decisions made back in 1975, right now, I would say, a two to three year lead time in getting this project off the ground. If we were today in the position of not having had these expenditures back in 1975 and the work leading up to those, we would be looking years down the road to any development

MR. BARRY: of the Lower Churchill River potential. Instead, we have a situation where money was expended, we have received, as a result of this, survey and exploration data, engineering studies, reports, drawings, technical specifications, tender documents for certain long-term delivery items of equipment, contract documents for the construction of some temporary and permanent features of the work. All of this, Mr. Speaker, spent on three main items, the generating site itself at Gull Island, Muskrat Falls area, the transmission facilities across Labrador and through the Island portion, and the Strait of Belle Isle crossing. And what is the conclusion of this consultant? The conclusion of this consultant is that there was \$68 million, \$68 million, spent in the period leading up to the project start and spent in 1975 while the project was underway, \$68 million spent,

MR. BARRY: and what is the present value of those assets today? The present value of those assets today is \$77 million. We are money in, we are money in, not to even consider, not to consider at all the time that we are in, the time that we are ahead in being able to get an early start on this Labrador power project. Now, that is filed, that is on the record that we have and I have nothing to be ashamed of in terms of the the money that was spent on this Gull Island power project to date. It is there documented and it is like money in the bank. Now, that I think should deal with what appeared to me to be the main thrust of the Opposition debate on this Lower Churchill Development Corporation bill. There was the allegation, Mr. Speaker, the allegation that, "Oh, this bill does not mean anything because there is no commitment from the federal government", and I heard the Leader of the Opposition again this morning being recorded in the media that there was no commitment from the federal government. I have already referred to Section 5 of the agreement dealing with the study stage work where, amongst other things, the federal government says, "The parties will exercise all reasonable efforts to ensure that the project is constructed", and the next section, 5, subsection 6, says, "Canada and Newfoundland agree" - agree, underline it - "agree to consider in good faith" - underline it, in good faith - "when the study work is completed whether they can meet the financial commitments that are required". Now, is that not a commitment that they are going to do everything reasonable and in good faith, decide whether it can be supported? If that is not a commitment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what it is. I would like to have the hon. members explain to me what they mean by a commitment. We have the allegation, "Oh, that this LCDC bill is merely a bail-out, merely a bail-out, an attempt to avoid this government's having egg on its face from participation in the previous administration in spending the money on Gull Island". Well, I have already established that we have nothing

MR. BARRY: to be ashamed of of having spent this money, we have nothing to be ashamed of. But let us assume, let us assume that we did not even have this report. Do we have any embarrassment in requesting federal government involvement in the development of the Lower Churchill River project when we look, and this is the previous administration, the previous federal administration, a Liberal government in Ottawa, their national energy policy as developed in consultation with the First Ministers at the National Energy Conference held, I think it was in 1973, and all policy statements they have made since then stress the need to develop the renewable resources of Canada, that it is in the national interest, as the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) has said, to see that our hydro-electric potential is developed and that our dependency on foreign supplies of crude oil is decreased?

MR. J. CARTER: Well, he said his car must run on a quarter full tank.

MR. BARRY: Now, do members realize, do hon. members realize what we are talking about here? With the development of Muskrat Falls and Gull Island, it would be the same as we made an oil discovery with a flow of 27 million barrels a year forever, that is the amount of oil, 27 million barrels, the amount of oil that would be displaced by harnessing the water power of the Lower Churchill. Now, do we have to be ashamed when we go up to Ottawa and we lay out their national energy policy and we say, "Here, look, you are saying we have to develop our renewable energy, you are saying we have to decrease our dependency upon foreign supplies of crude oil. Well, boys, you are saying we have to decrease unemployment in Atlantic Canada. Do we have a deal for you! Look at this".

MR. BARRY: "Here we have a project which is established as technologically feasible, which is established it can be economically feasible and competitive if we have the proper financial backing from the Government of Canada, which will displace 27 million barrels of oil annually", Mr. Speaker, I ask you, do we have to be ashamed? Did we have to be ashamed when we went, when the Leader of the Opposition was in Cabinet up there, and we presented these facts? Were we looking for a bail-out? When after we did not get the support that we should have gotten from the federal government in 1975 to permit the continued development of that Gull Island site, should we be embarrassed by going back and saying, "Now, look, it has to be done? You know it has to be done. Now, let us work out a way of doing it". Is that a bail-out? Is that something shameful? Is that something that this Province would have to hang its head about in helping Canada meet its national energy needs, in helping Canada diminish its dependency upon foreign supplies of crude oil by some 27 million barrels? No, no, Mr. Speaker, this is not anything that we have to be embarrassed about.

One interesting comment was made by the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary), and this has been raised publicly a number of times, a lot of members of the general public have asked the same question, and that is, "Why could we not let BRINCO go ahead and develop the Lower Churchill?" Construction-wise they did a good job with the Upper Churchill, as the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has suggested, why could we not let them go ahead and build it? Mr. Speaker, I was in government before and in my first year as Minister of Mines and Energy spent a good part of that year, and actually negotiations went on for over a year, trying to work out a deal with BRINCO whereby we could see the development of Lower Churchill power on the basis that the power would be used in this Province. We met with them on numerous occasions, and for some reason we could not

MR. BARRY: get anywhere. They were not putting their heart and soul - they said they were - they said that, yes, they were going to seriously look at the economic viability of a project which would bring electricity down to the Island portion of the Province. They said that they were looking at that, Mr. Speaker, but somehow or another their hearts and souls were not in it. And after a year and a half when we were getting nowhere, in terms of getting this project developed for the supply of energy to the Island and to the Labrador portion of this Province, instead of having it shipped West, we concluded that if we were ever going to get a start on the Lower Churchill it would not be through BRINCO because we could not get any acceptance of the underlying preconditions that we insisted had to be there, namely, that it be developed for the benefit of this Province. We decided, reluctantly, that we had to terminate BRINCO's association with the Lower Churchill development. Mr. Speaker, was that a wrong decision? Now, I have something to tell this hon. House, that the Premier has alluded to previously in the press, but that I do not think the general public of this Province are aware of, and that is, at the very moment we were negotiating in good faith with BRINCO to develop the Lower Churchill River and while they were indicating that they were prepared to put together a proposal to consider ways of getting this power delivered to the Province, do you know that they had already given the Province of Quebec a right of first refusal on the power of the Lower Churchill River? They had passed, they had passed a minute of their Board of Directors to the effect, to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that the company should give Hydro Quebec the right of first refusal in respect to any contract

MR. BARRY: for the purchase of the electric power of the Lower Churchill.

MR. ROBERTS: What rights had BRINCO - what rights did BRINCO and the Province have at that time? They never intended to lease the Lower Churchill.

MR. BARRY: We were fortunate, Mr. Speaker, in that the rights which they had been given, and they had been given certain rights -

MR. ROBERTS: What rights?

MR. BARRY: Statutory rights.

MR. ROBERTS: What were they given?

MR. BARRY: Well, we would have to get out the documentation. It is all there on record, a matter of record. But what we were fortunate in is that the rights which they had were not sufficient at the time; certain things had changed, conditions had changed, and were we ever lucky that those conditions had changed.

MR. ROBERTS: Would it be fair to say that what they purported to give Hydro Quebec - now BRINCO can answer as best they can for what they did, if they can answer at all - but what they purported to give Hydro Quebec really was not - for whatever reason, they were not able to get the Province in the ring on that.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, they had rights. They held rights from the previous Liberal government -

MR. ROBERTS: They held rights under statutes of this House.

MR. BARRY: - under statutes of this House that gave them the right to develop the Lower Churchill River and other water rights in Labrador under certain conditions.

MR. ROBERTS: Under certain conditions.

MR. BARRY: Under certain conditions. And it was just pure, blind luck that those conditions were not economically viable at the time.

MR. ROBERTS:
in the legislation?

Those conditions were spelled out

MR. BARRY:

If they had, they were set out -

MR. ROBERTS:

They were left vacant.

MR. BARRY:

- and if the conditions had not changed

the Lower Churchill River would have been developed and the power would have been sold to Quebec, and we would not have the possibility of developing the Lower Churchill River for the benefit of this Province.

Now, in light of that revelation is there anybody who still - And the Leader of the Opposition supported the suggestion of the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) that we should go back to BRINCO and have BRINCO do the development. The member for Lapoile is still suggesting that it should be done through BRINCO. The Leader of the Opposition said he agreed with the comments of the member for Lapoile. Now is that an energy policy? Is that the 'the' energy policy of the members opposite that the hydro potential of Labrador should be developed for shipment to Quebec? Is that the energy policy? The member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) seemed to be saying that was fine. He was proud of the Upper Churchill project -

MR. LUSH:

That is the point.

MR. BARRY:

Proud of it.

MR. LUSH:

Right.

MR. BARRY:

- including the sale of power to

Quebec.

MR. LUSH:

That is another question.

MR. BARRY:

Oh ho! That is another question.

It surely is, Mr. Speaker, and I think the people of this Province have spoken loud and clear on that question, and they have spoken loud and clear as to which party has the proper policy in terms of energy development, and they have shown their support for this government.

Mr. Speaker, there were some indications from time to time that - I think the member for Lapoile indicated that the tunnel route is the only route, or seems to be saying that we are

MR. BARRY: saying that the tunnel is the only route. And in the course of our estimates there were questions raised about possible fracturing in the Strait of Belle Isle that might make tunnelling difficult. Mr. Speaker, the fracturing in the Strait of Belle Isle has been known since the early Seventies. The decision initially to construct the tunnel took this into account and decided that the tunnel should be constructed in the Cambrian level, geological level -

MR. F. ROWE: Pre-Cambrian.

MR. BARRY: - no, I think it was Cambrian - which meant that you had to go down to a greater depth than you otherwise would have had, but they figured there would be less chance of running into problems with faults if they went down to that depth. Now, the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) suggests it is Pre-Cambrian; he may be right, but I do not think so.

MR. ROBERTS: The member for Trinity-Bay de Verde is a geologist.

MR. BARRY: I am aware of that which is why I am willing to indicate that he may be right.

But the fracturing that might exist in the earth's strata on the Strait of Belle Isle would not make a tunnel impossible. It might make a tunnel more expensive and there might be increases in the price of the project because of this, but from the best information that we have either a tunnel or a submarine cable is technologically feasible.

MR. BARRY: The main decision initially in going for a tunnel was the greater reliability or security that that would provide, but recent technological developments indicate that maybe the submarine cable is competitive again, just the last two years. This is being looked right at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other comments that I wanted to rebut made by hon. members opposite, but really they had very little to do with the main thrust of this Lower Churchill Development Corporation bill.

The potential here should have been developed four years ago. There was no reason why in 1975 the federal government could not have put its support behind the project, as we finally managed to grudgingly drag out of them in the course of negotiating this agreement. It took that long for it to sink in, that this was the ideal type of project, energy project. It was in an area of high unemployment. Instead of all your make-work projects where they were spending hundreds of millions of dollars, you would have a project, not just make-work but where you would have a continuing resource once the work was finished. It would displace 27 million barrels of oil a year, so it was consistent with the national policy of relieving dependency on foreign oil. It was established as being a technologically and economically viable proposition. Now, this could have been done in 1975. If I had had the opportunity to continue in the portfolio, I am sure it would have been done in 1975, but there was a minor stumbling along the way, Mr. Speaker, destiny had other things in mind, and it has been an interesting four years outside of this House. I have gotten a respite - ready, willing and able now with renewed vigour to get back into the fray. But there were things that, you know, sort of reared its ugly head when we were trying to get federal commitment here. There were subtle indications from time to time that we wanted to see the Lower Churchill River develop - well, maybe, we ought to consider giving in on the offshore mineral rights question,

MR. BARRY: you know, which I said, Mr. Speaker, no way, which the government said, forget it, and which I think the federal government eventually came around and saw that they could not force us to do it.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) new federal government, we will see what they do.

MR. BARRY: We have a new federal government and we expect, as the Minister of Finance for Canada indicated since this debate started, the federal is prepared to put their financial resources on the line to support this project.

Mr. Speaker, just briefly, there is just one other point that I have to mention, and that is the reference of the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) that Newfoundland does not have the skills or may not have the skills to carry on this project. Mr. Speaker, we know that the people of this Province can build that project. We know that by giving preference that we will see this project developed for the benefit of the people of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, we intend to see that the Lower Churchill River is developed for the benefit of the people of Labrador and for the Island, and we ask the hon. members opposite to give us their wholehearted support in this great step forward for this Province. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Facilitate The Development Of The Hydro-Electric Power Potential Of The Lower Churchill River," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the whole House now, by leave. (Bill No. 26).

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt):

Order, please!

Bill No. 26.

On motion, clauses 1 through 9, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Shall clause 10, carry?

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, there is just one little minor typographical error in clause 4 that the minister did not alert the Committee to.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is it important?

MR. ROBERTS:

Yes, it is the law of the land.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, there is a typographical error in the agreement. The second recital, where it says, "pursuant to clause (3)" should be, "pursuant to clause (4)" and in Schedule (b); where in clause (4) it refers to paragraph (8) to (g) it should be (8) to (g) and I move that these amendments be -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed then that we will have the necessary changes made?

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, we will adopt the amendments. The minister moved two amendments

MR. BARRY:

I move that the agreement be amended as set out by the hon. the House Leader.

MR. ROBERTS:

(Inaudible) colleague had.

MR. BARRY:

Sorry about that.

On motion, clauses 10 through 15, carried.

On motion, schedule (a) as amended, carried.

On motion, schedule (b) as amended, carried.

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

On motion, that the Committee rise, report bill 26, with amendment and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. CHAIRMAN(Butt): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report Bill No. 26 with amendment, and ask leave to sit again.

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

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Facilitate The Development Of The Hydro-Electric Power Potential Of The Lower Churchill River," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: I thank the House for its co-operation and the indulgence for the extra few moments. I would like to inform the House as well that on Monday we will be proceeding with the concurrence debates and we will be considering Government Services first.

I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Monday, August 13, 1979, at 3:00 p.m.

VOL. 1

NO. 20

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

AUGUST 10, 1978

AUG 10 1979

QUESTION #16 (as appearing on the House of Assembly Order Paper dated Thursday, July 26th, 1979).

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Lands and Forests to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Agreement between the Department of Lands and Forests and Omega covering leasing Hangar 21 at Gander Airport known as the Allied Hangar.

ANSWER:

There is no agreement between this Department covering leasing or renting of a Hangar at Gander Airport known as the Allied Hangar.

ANSWER TO QUESTION # 31 (ASKED BY THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR
LAPOILE)

ORDER PAPER 9/79 - JULY 26, 1979

AUG 10 1979

QUESTION (A) INFORMATION CONCERNING A SPECIAL TELEPHONE SYSTEM
CONNECTING NEWFOUNDLAND INFORMATION SERVICES WITH
VARIOUS NEWS ROOMS THROUGHOUT THE PROVINCE.

ANSWER NEWFOUNDLAND INFORMATION SERVICES OPERATES A VUCOM
SYSTEM WHICH TRANSMITS VIA WIRE, PRESS RELEASES TO
THE VARIOUS DAILY MEDIA IN THE PROVINCE. THIS
SYSTEM IS A MODERNIZED VERSION OF THE OLD TWX
EQUIPMENT WHICH WAS ORIGINALLY INSTALLED AT
INFORMATION SERVICES. THE PRESENT EQUIPMENT IS
INSTALLED ON A THREE-YEAR CONTRACT, THE FIRST YEAR
OF WHICH HAS EXPIRED. THE CONTRACT CONTAINS A
PROVISION TO TERMINATE THE SERVICE IF THIS IS
REQUIRED BEFORE THE END OF THE CONTRACT. THERE WILL
BE A PENALTY SHOULD THE CONTRACT BE TERMINATED.
THE ANNUAL COST OF THIS SYSTEM IS APPROXIMATELY
\$50,000. LAST YEAR IT WAS SLIGHTLY LESS.

QUESTION (B) NOW THAT NEWFOUNDLAND INFORMATION SERVICES HAS BEEN
ABOLISHED, HAS THIS HALF MILLION DOLLAR PROJECT BEEN
CANCELLED?

ANSWER NEWFOUNDLAND INFORMATION SERVICES HAS NOT BEEN
ABOLISHED. A NUMBER OF POSITIONS HAVE BEEN
ABOLISHED AND THE NATURE OF THE SERVICE HAS BEEN
MODIFIED. THE MEDIA SERVICES DIVISION OF INFORMATION
SERVICES WILL CONTINUE TO OPERATE USING THE VUCOM
SYSTEM. THIS WILL PROVIDE A MEANS FOR GOVERNMENT
AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY TO TRANSMIT
NON-POLITICAL PRESS RELEASES ON A TIMELY BASIS TO

ALL DAILY MEDIA IN THE PROVINCE. AS NOTED ABOVE, THIS PROJECT DOES NOT COST HALF A MILLION DOLLARS.

QUESTION (C)

HOW MUCH WAS SPENT ON THE PROJECT UP TO THE TIME NEWFOUNDLAND INFORMATION SERVICES WAS ABOLISHED?

ANSWER

AS NOTED ABOVE, THE VUCOM SYSTEM HAS BEEN IN OPERATION FOR ONE YEAR AND HAS COST APPROXIMATELY \$50,000.