

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
DEBATE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD  
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.  
TUESDAY, July 17, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from 154 residents of Hopedale in Labrador. And the prayer of the petition is the discontinuation of T.V. service in Hopedale. The prayer reads as follows: "We, the people of Hopedale, had two T.V.'s in the community hall which operates three evenings a week. We will be losing our television on June 30, 1979. We want to keep television in our community on a full-time basis."

Mr. Speaker, this petition was postmarked June 28, 1979. However, because it took Her Majesty's mail sixteen days to come from Hopedale in Labrador to St. John's, Newfoundland I was unable to present it earlier.

Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me a few moments I would explain the set up of this T.V. in Hopedale, Makkovik, and Postville. CBC sometime last Fall took two T.V. sets into the three communities mentioned-Hopedale, Makkovik, and Postville-and allotted eighteen hours per week for the residents to view. This was done on a six month trial basis. Now as of June 30, in conversation with a resident of Hopedale today, this service was discontinued. The people in Hopedale are very fortunate to have CBC radio; however, there is no T.V. coverage whatsoever in the other communities or radio coverage. I believe that in this day and age when we can see communities in Labrador not being able to view the election results as on June 18 past is a sad state in our Province.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this petition is more or less a Federal matter. But, however, I believe we do have a Minister of Communications and also a Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. And I pray that they will co-operate fully

MR. WARREN:

with myself and the residents of Hopedale, Makkovik and Postville in passing our concerns to their colleagues in Ottawa to have TV services restored along the Labrador coast. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

LaPoile.

The hon. member for

MR. NEARY:

I rise to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague who represents one of the four Labrador seats in this Assembly, Sir. And in so doing, in supporting the petition, I want to congratulate my hon. colleague for making his maiden speech in the House and for presenting his first petition ever in this House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman indicated it took the petition eighteen days to come from Hopedale in Northern Labrador to his office here in Confederation Building in St. John's. I am surprised that the residents have not circulated another petition to try to get the mail service improved in that community. It is absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker, for us, who take so many things for granted, to hear the hon. gentleman read the prayer of the petition and tell us that the CBC, who provided television services in these communities, in Makkovik, Postville and Hopedale by placing two television sets in the community hall, are now going to take the television service to these communities away from the people, from the native population who live in these communities. I think it is scandalous, Mr. Speaker. I think the CBC should be severely reprimanded for being so penny wise and pound foolish, for squandering taxpayers' money on all kinds of foolish nonsense, some of the programming that we see, so-called Canadian content, by getting involved in all kinds of foolish, arty stuff and will not even give the native population of Northern Labrador a chance to look at television and to keep themselves up to date on what is going on in their Province and in Canada.

MR. NEARY:

They were only getting, I believe, six hours a day anyway. One of the programmes they were getting was the Here and Now .

MR. WARREN:

Three days a week.

MR. NEARY:

Three days a week, by the way, I am told, getting the Here and Now programme from St. John's. Now they are going to be denied that. And as I understand it from what my hon. colleague said, the only community in Northern Labrador now that will be getting CBC television will be Nain, the only one. Right from Postville, Makkovik, Davis Inlet and Hopedale, four if not five communities will be without television. It is incredible. It is hard for us to believe in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, and

MR. S. HEARY:

I think that the strongest criticism possible should go out from this hon. House, that the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Premier Peckford) should reprimand the Government of Canada, and the minister responsible in the Government of Canada, for taking the only little bit of pleasure that these people had, taking it away from them.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition and I also would like to point out, Sir, as so many of us have already done in the last several years in this House, that CBC service and programming in this Province leaves a lot to be desired. In my own district of LaPoile I have a problem, people have a problem with the CBC programming and the CBC reception. And I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what you have to do with that crowd. The message never seems to get through to them. Mr. Speaker, we have neglected Labrador so much, especially the native population who have been kicked from pillar to post, and here is an opportunity now for the Government that claims that it has such a genuine and sincere interest in Labrador, here is an opportunity now for them to do something to help the people in Northern Labrador, especially the native population, who, in my opinion, are being discriminated against in the worst way. And so I support the prayer of the petition, Sir. I do not know, it may be just useless on our part to bring the petition into the House, to get up and speak on it because, obviously, the bureaucrats who operate the CBC are not going to pay any attention to what we say anyway. "Who do they think they are down there in Newfoundland to demand television for the native population? who do they think they are? Let us take the taxpayers' money and send people off all around the world on all kinds of foolish jaunts and expeditions."

Mr. Speaker, it is high time that something was done for these people in Labrador and here is an opportunity for the government to do it. And let us hear now the

MR. S. NEARY: Minister responsible for Intergovernment Affairs (Premier Peckford) or the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) get up and tell us that if necessary they will lead a delegation into Ottawa to try to get something done to restore six hours - that is all they are asking for, six hours - of television on two sets in the community hall in four communities in Northern Labrador.

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence, notable as it may be, of the minister, may I say a word or two in support of this petition but before I do may I note with pleasure the appearance in the House for the first time in this House of the member for Naskaupi (Mr. J. Goudie), who I think was sworn in this morning and is now with us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I think the hon. gentleman would agree the recount was carried out according to not just the letter of the law but according to the spirit of the law and

MR. E. ROBERTS: that we were not in fact too green to burn on either side of the case.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition perhaps for reasons somewhat different than my friend from LaPoile district (Mr. Neary). I do not derogate from what he said, in fact I have a great deal of sympathy with what he said. I think some of his points were ones that we should all heed and we should listen to. But my feeling goes a little beyond that because what was really touched upon here, Sir, is the question of the television services available to the people of this Province, in particular the people of the Northern coast of Labrador, the Torngat Mountains area. My hon. friend, the member for the Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren), told me that the real problem is that there is no reception in Hopedale or in Postville or Makkovik, the other communities, there is no machine there that is capable of reaching down from the sky the television signals. In other words, there is no earth satellite station, no receiving station such as in Bay Bulls or a number of other places throughout this Province. There is one in Goose Bay; there is one in Nain, I believe. And there is no means of a television signal coming in to Hopedale so what this means is one cannot go and buy a television set and get a signal, there has to be this special machine. CBC has provided one on a trial basis for reasons known only to CBC, and I am not sure known even to them, but certainly at most known only to them, they, after having taken the people up on the mountain tops and shown them the green and pleasant valleys of All in the Family and all of the other television programmes they have provided, they have now chosen to take this away. And I suspect that this is certainly the feeling of some - or not the feeling, it is a decision of some bureaucrats who live elsewhere than in Postville or Nain and do not really realize what television can mean in the lives of these people.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

The remedy to it, Mr. Speaker, is not simply to go after the CBC, I think that is part of it, but the remedy of it, I submit, lies in part with the Government of this Province. If this government really cares at all about the people of Northern Labrador - they have given them a seat in the House of Assembly and that is a good thing - but let them now find just a relatively few dollars to provide the hardware. There is nothing in the constitution that prevents the hardware being provided by the Government of the Province to receive television signals. And that is the way the people in Postville or Makkovik or anywhere else get it and that is the way the people in my district, Mr. Speaker, can get access to the second channel because now they can get only the CBC, and I would say to my friends from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) it may be better than nothing but at times it is not a lot better. I can recall vividly spending a Sunday afternoon in Forteau in watching and listening to people give vent to their opinions at being forced to spend the entire Sunday afternoon watching a very good but completely irrelevant production of the opera Macbeth - the opera, not even the play, but the opera Macbeth which is all that CBC television saw fit to offer. That is all very well for the .000001th of one percent who like



MR. ROBERTS:

to watch the Macbeth - the time is up already. No, it is not. It is a note from the Speaker. It is not a note saying my time is up.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that the CBC program for a wide spectrum; they do not program often in the interests of the people who can watch only CBC. So in supporting the petition I want to say quite simply that I think it is up to the government of the Province, not simply to excoriate the CBC or to attack them. I expect nothing from the present administration in Ottawa and they have shown us nothing in their time there. If they do show us something, well and good, I would welcome it. And I expect even less from the CBC given the kind of financial constraints with which allegedly they have to live. But what I do want to see, Mr. Speaker, is the people of this Province having access to cultural and social amenities comparable to those elsewhere throughout Canada and comparable to those available elsewhere throughout the Province. So the answer in the case of Postville, in response to my friend's petition, is let this government provide the hardware if nobody else will. Let them provide the receiving station so that the people in that community and in the other communities on the Northern Labrador can have access to television.

I support the prayer of the petition.

Mr. Speaker.

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

motion.

Mr. Speaker, I have several notices of

I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask this House to consider resolving itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supply to Her Majesty.

I also give notice that I will on tomorrow ask this House to resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and

DR. J. COLLINS: Means to consider the raising of supply to be given to Her Majesty.

And I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask this House to resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions for the granting of Interim Supply to Her Majesty.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I did have a notice of motion to give at this time but the Opposition has requested that we - it pertains to the amendment of the Standing Orders of the House. The Opposition has requested that we defer this for an hour or two so that we can have a talk with them and I do this on the understanding that we will be given leave to give it later on in the day in the proceedings.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for the position he has taken and for our part, Sir, we will assert to give leave to revert to this section of the routine proceedings. I understand my learned friend and I will get together and have a talk and hopefully what will come in will be an agreed upon version and can then proceed on that basis. But in any event the government may give notice if they wish before this day is over as far as we are concerned.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to respond and give an answer to the question posed by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) yesterday as it related to CN and layoffs pending and so on over the next number of years and indicate to him, as I promised yesterday that I would within twenty-four hours, and I do not know if I am right on time or whether I am behind or not given the fact of it being 3:18; I do not know what time it was yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

In any case, I shall table an answer to the question for the hon. member for LaPoile which in effect indicates that the position of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador is that we are opposed to these layoffs, these 250 job layoffs

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Newfoundland Transportation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - that we have been in touch with the union, we are in process of getting in touch with CN. It seems to us, and this I have in a statement that the hon. member and other members can read, that CN is spending most of its time devising ways and means of closing down the railway rather than spending its time trying to develop some creative and innovative ways and marketing techniques to make the railway work.

We are in the process right now - and I mean this sincerely for the hon. member for LaPoile and for members opposite, and I hope they will take it in the vein in which it is meant - of developing the five year plan that was mentioned in the Throne Speech, and it is presently before Cabinet and before a number of Cabinets committees over the next week or two, and well for that matter for the next perhaps months or more before it is finally put into place, it could even go to two months.

But suffice it to say now in the statement which I have prepared that as a result of this latest move by CN to

Premier Peckford: phase out twenty-six different stations, to begin the process after April 1, 1980 of laying off 250 people through this means, that means or some other means; that I have struck this morning a committee of officials, a railway committee I am going to call it, which will begin immediately to put together all the facts and figures as it relates to CN's position in the Province - this would have been done at a later date, but now I think it has been expedited because of this so-called move - that the committee will immediately report to Cabinet on all the data surrounding it; that we want a permanent liaison methodology established between the Government of Newfoundland and CN immediately; that we will be hiring railway consultants, people who are expert in the business of railways around the world to give us as

PREMIER PECKFORD: much information. One of the things that we lack in this Province right now is expertise as it relates to railways. You can talk about highways and we have some, and I guess you can talk about steamships and we have some, or marine things, but we really do not have any expertise as it relates to when somebody tells us something about the Newfoundland railway and it will cost this or it will do this, we do not have anybody else that we can bounce that off of to know whether, in fact, that is really a valid projection or a valid way to go. So this committee has been struck. It will be hiring and reporting to Cabinet immediately, and we are going to try to establish some kind of permanent Liaison with C.N. so we know what is going on.

We are opposed to the layoff or any downgrading of the C.N. in this Province at the present time, number one; and number two, on a positive note, we support and will be putting forward in the next number of weeks and months a proposal that we hope will get some positive results from C.N. and from Ottawa as it relates to the permanence of a railway across this Island, not for five years or not for three years but forever, and that efforts would be made to try, through being a little creative, to make it work. We believe that there are a number of modes of transportation needed in the Province, the railway is one of them, and that it should be permanent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. I do not wish this afternoon or expect him to be specific with regard to various matters now underway relating to the Come By Chance refinery, but I believe he is aware - and perhaps other members have had the same kinds of representations that have reached me - about the concern as to when it might open. And I am wondering if the Premier, or perhaps the appropriate minister, might be able to give some indication as to whether or not people who now, for instance, are contemplating a return

MR. JAMIESON: to Alberta for the opening of the school year, people who are wondering whether or not they should take jobs elsewhere - people who are my constituents, I might add - I am wondering if he could - and I appreciate there may be constraints - but give some kind of general expectation? And if I could put it in specific form, does the Premier expect that the very complex negotiations will be concluded, let us say, before the end of the present year?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition recognizes and so says in his preamble to his question, time frames are very difficult when one is dealing with something like the Come By Chance oil refinery where there are presently environmental consultants looking at the environmental procedures that F.A.C. and Ashland want to put into place at Come By Chance. That report, I think, is due in by the end of July - if I can bow to the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) for a second - around the end of July,

PREMIER PECKFORD: and we have some ongoing negotiations with them as it relates to financability, the return on their investment of thirty plus interest, \$30 million plus interest which amounts to somewhere around \$47 or \$49 million, which is outstanding, and these are the two major issues as I have mentioned on a number of occasions already. So, yes, I think to answer the Leader of the Opposition, we would anticipate having negotiations completed with the present proposed buyer, if you will, by the end of this year, hopefully long before that. Right now our time frame is to try and get the environment thing finished by the end of July, and hopefully more negotiations with them by the middle of August, and then be in a position to make a decision that early. I think the Leader of the Opposition is being kind in his question and therefore I am trying to be as co-operative as I can in my answer. Hopefully we can get a resolution to this proposal and hopefully it will be a positive resolution before the end of this year.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: I thank the Premier by his response. I think, however, he also is aware that there is a second, in a sense, phase to all of this and that with regard to the Newfoundland Government's actions he has already, not only this afternoon but earlier, indicated the key points with regard to financing and to the environmental considerations. But the Federal Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) has also indicated that there are a number of processes that have to be followed through in Ottawa. And what I am seeking to ascertain, because I suspect that these can only follow the resolution of matters here in Newfoundland, that it is a reasonable assumption on my part, I ask the Premier this, is it a reasonable assumption on my part due to his consultations or those of ministers with people in Ottawa, that in fact the process is likely to be one which will not

MR. JAMIESON: produce anything by way  
of, let us say, wide scale employment within the current calendar year?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When I responded I was responding on behalf of the Province and the Province's involvement in it and the Province's okay or rejection of the proposal. Obviously there are other procedures that have to be followed, the ones dealing with FIRA and the federal government on the wharf and other matters that FAC are discussing. I have talked to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) in Ottawa about this over the last week or so and I think the prediction, if you will, that the Leader of the Opposition puts on it - unless things move a lot quicker in August and September and October and November 1979, than they have worked in August, September, October and November of any other year that I am aware of since Canada became a nation, it is highly unlikely that we could see employment generation at Come By Chance before December 31, 1979.



MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), and it really comes out of the remarks that he made in his speech in the Address in Reply yesterday. I want to ask the minister whether he was really telling us, and telling the House and the people of the Province, that there is now a very real departure from previous stated government policy in the development of Labrador hydro resources? Is the minister really saying that first of all now we are going to be going ahead with the development of the Muskrat Falls project and that the Lower Churchill development is many years down the road? Is the minister really saying that there has been a major departure in stated government policy up to this point in time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I should point out to the hon. member opposite that Muskrat Falls is one of the sites on the Lower Churchill and that it is a matter of whether it be the Gull Island site that is first developed or the site at Muskrat Falls. Muskrat Falls having a capacity of approximately 600 megawatts, Gull Island having a capacity of approximately 1,700 megawatts.

MR. ROBERTS: 1800 of the budget speech.

MR. BARRY: The figures I have seen in the annual report of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro as of last year was 1,700.

MR. ROBERTS: Last year's budget speech, excuse me.

MR. BARRY: I will take the hon. Leader of the Opposition's word for it. Perhaps we can clarify this on the estimates.

But it is simply a matter of balancing. Of the one hand, the Gull Island project would supply in one site a larger amount of power at a somewhat lower cost, I believe. I will have to ask leave to clarify this during the estimates when I have had more time to go into the details. But my understanding from previous examination here is that the Gull Island site apart from given a larger number of megawatts would also be at a slightly lower unit cost than Muskrat

Mr. Barry: Falls, but the problem with it being that the capital expenditures, and therefore the capital financing required, is much larger, so that it might be more feasible to proceed first with the Muskrat Falls site because of the smaller amount of capital financing that would be required for that site.

That is all I am prepared to say at the present time and I have to stress again that this is very preliminary and is all

MR. BARRY: subject to a final report which is being prepared now and which we should have ready at the end of 1979 or early 1980.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for the information but I am not really sure that he told us very much. The real question is - I know where Muskrat Falls is located - the real question is is that the project that is going to go ahead first? And let me ask the minister, therefore, in view of again his remarks today and what he said yesterday, are there any prospects, any real, firm prospects in sight for the industrial consumption of that particular power in Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Again I have to point out, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member opposite that we will, as of this year, be consuming an extremely large amount of imported petroleum in the thermo plants at Holyrood, and if we never see another industrial development in this Province it will be advantageous to this Province to see, provided it can be done at a reasonable cost, to see us lessen our dependency upon this imported petroleum and to have hydro based electricity substituted for what now comes from the burning of petroleum products from the Middle East and elsewhere. If the hon. member noticed, this is the main plank in the energy position put forward on Sunday by President Carter in the United States. He said that the United States must lessen its dependency upon imported petroleum.

Mr. Hnatyshyn, the Federal Minister of Energy, I noticed today reported in the papers as confirming that the position of the Canadian government is very much along the same lines as of course we have all known for some time. Here in this

MR. BARRY: Province, if we can see our domestic and our light industrial users that are presently in the Province being able to fuel their furnaces, heat their homes, meet their business needs from hydro electricity from Labrador, then it will be in the best interest of this Province. And that is not to say that we will not be able to attract further industry; all I am saying is that the hon. member's question seems to imply that we must first, before we get any significant hydro development, we must first attract new industry. To my mind that is still questionable in light of the most recent information I have which is that as soon as the Muskrat Falls development would come on stream the existing demand, residential, business demand in this Province, would take up virtually the full-capacity on the Island and the new growth in Labrador as well - would take up virtually the full capacity of that new project.

So the only reason that we may find it necessary to go out and obtain new industrial customers is if it turns out to be necessary for the

MR. L. BARRY: financing of the project. As both the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) and the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Roberts) mentioned yesterday the financial markets look for a certain degree of securities, they would like to get as much as they can, would not we all? But if by the time a Muskrat Falls development comes onstream our existing customers here in this Province can use all of this, and if the Government of Canada is prepared to back it—and it will be a matter of determining how far their commitments should go - if the Government of Canada, I think the Leader of the Opposition would agree, were to say tomorrow, 'We will guarantee the loan of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador', then I do not think there would be any problem with the project going ahead.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Nine other provinces would be seeking the same thing.

MR. L. BARRY: Nine other provinces would be seeking the same. But I do believe that we can establish a case where the Government of Canada has gone further in other provinces in terms of backing energy projects than they have yet been prepared to go in this Province. We recognize it is no light decision that has to be made by the Government of Canada, but we will be seeking sufficient financial commitment by the Government of Canada to make that a viable project when we go to the financial markets of the world.

MR. E. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: There are more 'if's' in there than there are currants in a plum duff but I would like to ask the minister if he could give us a figure. He mentioned that when the Muskrat power comes onstream, I think I am reading him correctly and he said this yesterday, that we would be able to dispense with the very expensive power being generated at the Holyrood Thermal Station, I think that was the gist of what the minister was saying. And I think that obviously has - I can see its attraction because the Holyrood power is going to become more

MR. E. ROBERTS: expensive, I assume, as the price of oil rises. But could he tell us the value of the capital investment which will then become idle and be at best standby? How many millions of dollars would have been invested by that time in the generating plants at Holyrood that presumably not be required, it would be surplus, it would best be standby?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Hon. minister.

MR. L. BARRY: The last qualification, Mr. Speaker, is the important one, that it would be at best be standby. This 'at best be standby' is very important. We will need - if we tomorrow were to be able to lay cables from Labrador to the Island of this Province, that does not mean that we can thereby do away with our existing thermal plants even though we would not be running them at full steam and burning the \$10 million, \$12 million or \$15 million -

MR. ROBERTS: Vic Young says it is about \$40-odd million being consumed this year.

MR. L. BARRY: \$40 million this year. The capital investment that is put into the Holyrood plant, the unit that is presently under construction, number 3, is coming in at a projected cost of just under \$80 million. I do not have the figures at which numbers 1 and 2 came in, less than that, but you can figure it out roughly from there. This is not a wasted capital expenditure because, as I said, even if we got recall power from the Upper Churchill, the Gull Island site developed, or the Muskrat Falls - and even if Holyrood were not there, we would still have to build generating capacity on the Island as standby and for various technical reasons to permit the engineers to do what they have to do to balance the system. I would not even try and attempt to explain to the hon. Opposition House Leader (Mr. Roberts) just what is involved

MR. L. BARRY:

in that because right now I do not know enough about it to explain it. But for technical reasons we will need generating capacity on the Island however much hydro development we see in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

supplementary?

Mr. Speaker, may I have one more

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. E. Roberts) before you proceed, I would like to remind all hon. members, at least it is my understanding that questions should be brief and to the point and I think answers should be as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

And I ask all members (inaudible)  
The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

And I ask all members (inaudible)

The hon. member for the Strait of

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I gather that those for whom the snice fits should wear it and I hope in this case that snat is directed, at least in part, to gentlemen on the other side and maybe on this side as well.

Obviously, this will be a fertile

subject for debate but I want to ask the hon. minister if he could give us at this stage, since he has some figures, what are the current calculations of his officials or his advisors at Hydro, as the case may be, as to what it is going to cost to have that Muskrat Fall's power delivered here on this island? Are we talking thirty, thirty five mill, forty mill power? What is it going to cost to have it delivered here and fed into the grid?

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I really would answer this if I could but this is the whole purpose of this study which is

MR. L. BARRY: now ongoing and I would be on very hazardous ground indeed if I attempted to second guess the many, many consultants that are now busily engaged in trying to arrive at that bottom-line figure. I would just like to say in terms of responding briefly to questions, Mr. Speaker, George Bernard Shaw apologized one time in replying to a letter. He said, "I did not have the time to make a shorter letter." I have to beg the forbearance of the House, I have not had time yet to learn enough about my job to make my answers any shorter but hopefully they will get shorter as time goes on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: The question is, why should we have to suffer while the minister is learning experience?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: If I may be permitted a supplementary question, Sir. My hon. friend reminded me when he asked the hon. gentlemen if the power from the Muskrat Falls would take the place of the thermo generating station at Holyrood, it reminded me of the gas turbine station out in Stephenville. When the government was floundering to spend some money, they spent \$12 or \$14 million on a gas turbine generating station in Stephenville that I understand has never been used. What will be the future of that station.

AN HON. MEMBER: Linerboard

MR. S. NEARY: No, it has never been used for linerboard. It was never used because it did not work.

AN HON. MEMBER: It worked. It took them two years to get it turned on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, to get the bugs taken out.

MR. SPEAKER: Let the member ask his question?

MR. S. NEARY: What I want to know, Sir, will there be any more gas turbine stations built? What is the future of this



MR. S. NEARY: gas turbine generator station in  
Stephenville and is it currently in use?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Hon. Minister for Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Again I have to draw on information  
received many years ago, Mr. Speaker. But it is my understanding  
that this gas turbine was then, and I assume still is, necessary for  
the system to provide security for the West Coast in the event of  
transmission line failure from Holyrood and at times to balance the  
system, for technical reasons again, and that the advantage of a gas  
turbine over a thermal plant is that it takes much longer to bring  
a thermal plant into the system if it is down than it does to bring  
in a gas turbine.

MR. S. NEARY: It is the most expensive electricity  
in the world.

MR. L. BARRY: You can bring in a gas turbine very  
quickly if you have problems in your system but the countervailing  
disadvantage is that it is more expensive to run a gas turbine than  
it is to run one of the thermal fired plants or units at Holyrood.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for  
the Premier. It should probably be directed at the Minister of  
Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) but since it arises out of a public comment  
by the Premier a few days ago I thought I would direct it at him.  
Are we to understand that plans by the government for two cold storage  
units for fish, one in Central Newfoundland or on the Northeast Coast  
and one on the West Coast, have been scrapped, that those plans have  
been scrapped at the moment?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not know what the hon. member  
for Lewisporte is suppose to understand. I can provide him with some  
information, I guess the Minister of Fisheries can. My only  
knowledge is that there has been - and the Minister of Fisheries can

PREMIER PECKFORD: answer this better than I can -  
the Department of Fisheries has done some work on identifying the  
necessity of additional cold storage facilities on the Northeast  
Coast and on the West Coast and that the matter is under review by  
the Minister of Fisheries as far as I know and I will bow to the  
Minister of Fisheries if he can add to it.

MR. F. WHITE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for  
Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Just as a preamble, Mr. Speaker,  
I asked the question because I thought-I am sure-I heard the Premier  
say a few days ago that the government was reconsidering the two  
fish holding units that were planned and were thinking

MR. WHITE: in the area of private enterprise. Perhaps I could ask the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) whether or not the consultant's study on the location of holding units has come in and if so what the result of that study was and if the government still plans to go ahead with those two huge cold storage units?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: The first question to the Premier; The answer to that is, no. The second question, yes, the study is in and is now being studied and we will be making a report on it, at least a public statement on it very soon.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the minister when he anticipates that construction will start on those cold storage units since he says that they will be going ahead?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. W. CARTER: We are hoping, Mr. Speaker, that the engineering will be done this year and hopefully construction will start next year. But I should point out and maybe I can elaborate on what the hon. the Premier has said, that we did some time ago commission a study into two cold storage facilities, one on the Northeast Coast and one on the West Coast. Since that study was commissioned and the report filed, a certain well known Canadian company has expressed an interest in coming into the Province and putting together an overall package for providing additional cold storage facilities in different parts of the Province, including the two areas under study by the Department. This will be private money without too much government involvement. That is the sort of thing we are looking at, the private sector doing it or, as opposed to that, the public sector, government doing it. Once we determine the route we want to

MR. WHITE: go, whether again it is through the private sector or through government, then we will be having the necessary work undertaken. That is, of course, if we decide to go by means of the public sector.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan). Back in February, 1979, the Ottawa federal government announced a programme whereby \$236 million was to be made available to the provinces for forest improvement programmes. It was broken down, quickly, \$90 million for Quebec because they had negotiated and signed their agreement, \$46 million for Ontario because they had done likewise and \$60 million for the Maritime provinces. Up until this House adjourned, as far as I can determine, the Province had not signed this agreement and has not taken advantage of that programme. Would the minister indicate whether or not the Province has signed that agreement? What portion of the \$60 million accrued to the Province? And when was the agreement signed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman was not listening to the media during the election campaign because it was announced during the campaign that the agreement was signed between the two levels of government. In the spirit of co-operation between the two governments of the same stripe, in Ottawa and here, an agreement was signed valued at \$11.5 million, very labour intensive, whereby we will see approximately 400 to 500 men employed over the next number of months.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, an obvious question then would be that since the Maritime Provinces were allocated \$60 million, how is it that the minister settled for \$11 million for Newfoundland when our forest industry, obviously, is more important to the economy of this Province than some of the Maritime Province's forest industries are to theirs?

MR. ROBERTS: That is all the friendship was worth.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, that is something I would like to hear the minister indicate. And, Mr. Speaker, just to let the minister know that I do recollect what was said, I recall the minister and the Premier indicating that there would be jobs created in forestry; reseeded, reforestation, thinning. They even referred to the cleaning up of Red Indian Lake that we have been hearing so much about this past three years. So now I would like to ask the minister when we can see these projects started and the jobs so badly needed in the forest industry. Since the agreement is in place, when will these projects actually start and men be employed in cleaning up the mess that we all know our forests are in?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)  
and Forests.

Hon. Minister of Lands

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all in reply to the first question we are now in the process of finalizing negotiations, again in a spirit of co-operation with the new government in Ottawa, whereby we are hoping to finalize negotiations and sign a substantially greater agreement, greater in regards to financial amounts for this Province for forestry development in our Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. In fact, we are looking at a figure around \$50 to \$55 million for forestry development in our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:  
regards to

And, Mr. Speaker, in

MR. MORGAN: the first agreement signed, the hon. gentleman can be informed and the House can be informed that projects have already been commenced around the Province. Recently we took on approximately fifty-eight men in one of the worst hit areas of the Province, on the Great Northern Peninsula, with regards to unemployment, in the Roddickton - Main Brook areas.

MR. ROBERTS: Twenty-eight.

MR. MORGAN: We took on fifty-eight men, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. gentleman from the area could keep quite a second.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I am giving the actual figure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the minister has the right to reply in silence.

MR. MORGAN: The worst offender in the House, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, fifty-eight men. Also in the Sop's Arm - Jackson's Arm area a further twenty-eight men in that area. Over the next number of days the projects commence around the Province, primarily forestry thinning programmes, the cleaning up of the areas where pulpwood is around different ponds and lakes and also the clean up of roadsides, the forest stands and roadsides of the TCH and the major secondary roads. Mr. Speaker, these are labour intensive but as I mentioned, the big programme for the overall development of our forestry industry in the Province is yet to come and will be coming very soon.

MR. FLIGHT: A further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Suchans.

MR. FLIGHT: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister knows that any major reforestation, or major forest policy that would benefit this Province would have to take place on limits held by the paper companies because they now, in effect, hold

MR. FLIGHT: anything that is worth talking about by way of merchantable timber in this Province, has the minister worked out at this point, has he had any negotiations, with Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters as to what those two companies are prepared - how far they are prepared to allow the Province to go in on their timber limits and do the rethinning and reseedling and the reforestation and the clearing up that they to this point have not done and that we will have to do and where our money would be best spent by way of protecting our forests? Has the minister had any negotiations with the companies and what is the companies' attitude to our doing what they should have been doing over the years.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, not only does this administration co-operate with the other governments across the nation, and particularly the federal government, but also with industry. Just recently I recall sitting down for at least a twelve hour session with Bowaters and the officials of that company in Corner Brook and received an outline, a detailed outline of their plans and, of course, they received our suggestions as well as to what we felt they should be doing in regards to reforestation in that part of the Province which they are concerned with and now meetings are being planned with Prince (Nfld.) in Grand Falls and meetings are being finalized with Price Abitibi regarding the Stephenville operation in the Western part of the Province.

The situation is that we look forward, in fact, to the forest management programme that was brought in by this administration some time ago; that we look forward to seeing benefits - we have already seen some, not as much as we would like to see - we look forward to seeing further benefits from the forestry management programme we have in place by working in the spirit of co-operation with the companies concerned.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary, or another question for the minister, I will deal with his cracks at the appropriate time but now I would like to deal with facts. I wonder if the minister would be good enough to lay on the table of the House, I do not want the names of the twenty-eight people who have been hired although I can supply him with those if he would like, but the date on which the fifty-eight people were hired to work in the Roddickton-Main Brook area and I say that because I was told by a constituent of mine yesterday that twenty-eight people had been hired yesterday, I would like to know when the other thirty were hired, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Not only, Mr. Speaker, will I table the names of the fifty-eight men -

MR. ROBERTS: No, I do not want their names. I do not want their names.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the offender of the House - please ask him to keep quiet.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman has a right to be heard in silence, Sir, but he also has a duty as well as a right not to misquote any other member and he - whether he is deliberately or negligently - knowing the hon. gentleman it is more likely negligent than deliberate-but, Sir, I made a point of saying I did not ask for the names and I did not require them and he is yet inferring and, in fact, stating that I did ask for them, Sir, and that is the point of order. I would ask that he be directed to act in accord with the rules of this House.

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



MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, what a substantive point of order for the first one of this session. That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that it is probably not in good form to get off this House for members to be interrupting when they are speaking by spurious points of order such as that.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!  
I believe I have heard enough discussion on the point of order. In my opinion this is not a point of order, merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

I would call on the hon. minister to reply to the question and that will be the end of Question Period.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
Mr. Speaker, I will be only too pleased to table any information and all information pertaining to the number of employees who will be taking part in the forestry programme around the Province in the next number of months.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 2.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972," carried (Bill No. 3).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Motion 1.

Motion, the hon. Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Unified Family Court Act," carried (Bill No. 2).

On motion, Bill No. 2 read a first time ordered read a second time now by leave.

Motion, second reading of a bill, "An Act To Amend The Unified Family Court Act" (Bill No. 2).

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And although I am not germane to the bill I am sure hon. members will permit me to offer my personal congratulations and best wishes to you in your office as Speaker of this House of Assembly.

I thank the hon. Opposition House Leader and his colleagues opposite for their concurrence in going through the various stages of Bill 2 today. This bill contains a number of amendments to The Unified Family Court Act which began, which was June 18 actually, it was a day which obviously a number of us will remember for other reasons.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It depends from which point of view. But it may go down in somebody's history as the day in which the Unified Family Court sat, one never knows.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No doubt in his diary.

However, what is being requested here essentially, essentially not exclusively, but the essential meat of this is to give a precise, specific definition to the area in which the court has jurisdiction. Until this amendment is passed that is an ambiguous situation. So the essential purpose is to specify concretely the geographic area of the jurisdiction of the court. Concomitant with that an oath is put in, I do not think that is necessary, but apparently it is the feeling that it will be nice to have everything in one Act.

The other provision is that the judge would have authority of a magistrate with respect to certain sections of the Criminal Code and they deal with these areas; common assault, bodily harm, committing an assault that causes bodily harm, a situation where an accused is bound by a probation order and refuses to comply with it, and situations

MR. OTTENHEIMER: With respect to a person bound by recognizance and refusing to comply with that, or who has breached his recognizance. And the only other situation covered there is a clause which, after its enactment and Royal assent, will assure that decisions or orders of the court made previous to this enactment will have full validity. The essential purpose, as I say, is to concretely specify the geographic area of the court's jurisdiction which up to now is vague.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. and learned friend from Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) does not wish to speak on it, I will simply say that for our part we support the bill. As the minister has said, it is really a procedural bill to remedy some potential or possible defects which have become apparent in the legislation constituting the Unified Family Court. The Unified Family Court is an experimental venture and I think all concerned with either the operation of our courts or concerned with the operations of the law as it deals with matters affecting the family will watch it with a great deal of interest and with the utmost confidence in Mr. Justice Faqan and his staff. And I think for our part, Sir - and I am sure I express the feeling of the minister and his colleagues as well - anything that we can do to expedite and to facilitate the operation of the court, we do and do gladly, Sir. We shall support the bill.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Unified Family Court Act," Bill No. 2, read a second time, ordered referred to a committee of the Whole House now, by leave.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

MR. CHAIRMAN (BUTT): Order, please!

On motion, clauses 1 through 8, carried.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Chairman of Committees.

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. 2 without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted, Bill ordered read a third time now, by leave.

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Amend The Unified Family Court Act," read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper. (Bill No. 2).

MR. MARSHALL: Order 1.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order 1, the Address in Reply.

The hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am forced to change my strategy, my approach. I rose in my place yesterday ready to lambaste the government, ready to really level a blast at the government on this Speech from the Throne which is quite out of character with this hon. member, particularly with reference to this gracious Speech from the Throne. But it all resulted from a misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, a total misunderstanding. The problem was you see, and most hon. members will recall, I could not rationalize the statements that I heard the Premier make out of context. Because I was not listening to the total thing I could not rationalize the statements that he was making on opening day when he was talking about - and let me say the reason why I could not listen to it, and the Premier should take note of this, the reason why I could not listen attentively to the Premier was because of these lights; they were shining at me. Now, obviously, hon. members will know that the lights do not affect my ears, but they are a distraction. I could not look at the Premier and I was also blind, sort of thing, I could not see,

MR. LUSH: and always aware that by accident, by scanning the hon. the Leader of the Opposition or the hon. House Leader, by accident they might pick me up on television and I did not want to be going through any gestures that an hon. member should not be going through. Anyway, the thing was I lost the content of what the Premier was saying so I could not rationalize these strange, weird, wonderful, illusive and evasive statements that I was hearing, such statements as, 'Any reasoned Newfoundlander, enlightened Newfoundlander will see that we have another chance to make it. We have another chance to do things correctly. We have another chance to do things right,' and carried on:

'Mr. Speaker, may I be so bold as to suggest as a Newfoundlander that we are now on the threshold of the Lower Churchill, we are now on the Threshold, perhaps, of Come By Chance'. So all through he was talking about another chance and on the threshold and the new era. When I read this there was no way I could rationalize this statement with these kinds of statements, the ushering in of a new era, I could not see this at all. But anyway, I could not understand this at all, how Newfoundland, the Province of Newfoundland, how we were going to be ushered into a new era when we were going to see this Province develop. I could not see this at all. When one realizes that in the Western World we are gripped in the claws of agonized inflation with little economic growth and rampant unemployment, I could not rationalize these statements that the Premier was making.

But anyway, last night I took it upon myself to read the full speech and now I must say that I have the

MR. T. LUSH: solution. I know what the Premier was talking about, when he talked about the new era. I know what the Premier was talking about when he was making these statements upon the threshold and the major breakthrough, when he was talking about 'we have got another chance.' I know what he was talking about and this makes this, of course, a Throne Speech with a difference. I believe all hon. members should apologize because we have been talking about the sameness of these documents. And again, when the hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday was commenting on the language used in this particular Throne Speech and was commending the author, three or four thoughts came to me. I was tempted to say that the author is probably not in the House of Assembly because he is the author that wrote it in 1972. Now I do not think this was a case of precise plagiarism but a little bit of improvisation and this sort of thing. And then when he mentioned that it was lyrical my instant reaction was that it was also comical that this group had the audacity to present this same document to us so many times.

But anyway as I have said, it was a grave mistake, that this is a Throne Speech with a difference. Again the difference is, if we can believe the utterances in the Throne Speech and we must, then the developments, the proposals put forward in this Throne Speech are put forward with some positiveness, they are put forward with some certainty, there seems to be no doubt. But let us first of all look at the kinds of proposals that the Budget talks about and we will come back to the solution. And the solution too, of course, was the problem why this Province was not developing. The solution was also the problem. In other words, they removed the problem they got the solution. But anyway we will get back to that.

And to think we have been accusing them wrongly as to why this Province was not developing. You will recall that we have said that they did not have the philosophy thought out. They had a few ideas and a few concepts that kept repeating, that



MR. T. LUSH: Kept coming up in Budget Speeches all the time but it was not a well thought out philosophy because a well thought out philosophy has the 'what' and 'how' figured out.

In terms of our resource development it means, 'What resources do we have? What is the resource potential of this Province? How do we go about developing it? How many jobs can the resources of this Province provide for our people? What is the full potential. We kept saying that that was the kind of thing, the kind of detail that the government had not gotten into but obviously they had. They have gotten into that because that was not the reason at all why, over the past seven years, they have not performed on any of these Throne Speeches in their major thrust to develop the Province in their major thrust to develop a sound economic base for the Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a Throne Speech with a difference. So, let us first of all look at some of the problems to which it addresses itself. The Throne Speech goes back in history to identify some of the problems that we have had with respect to the development of this Province. It goes back to 1934 to the Amulree Report and there, of course, it goes along with the conclusion that the state of political life in the Province or the state of the political process within the House of Assembly and the state of the health of the economy were linked, there was a relationship between them, there was a correlation. And, of course, to take care of this problem the Throne Speech brings in two major reforms, or they will be presenting two major reforms before the House of Assembly to rid ourselves of the kind of unsavoryness that was at the root of our economic problems back in 1934 and, of course, the suggestion that some of them are still around in 1979.

So these two major reforms are to clean up this unsavoryness within political life.

Mr. Lush: I am not going to comment much on these two reforms. We, of course, do not know what the new Elections Act will say, but no doubt it will do something to, I think, improve political life in this Province as will, also, the rule changes in the House of Assembly. I think they will certainly help to enhance debate and certainly to improve the decorum and to make the career of politicians a little more respectable. I expect.

But I think more needs to be done. I think that to get down to the deep insidious problem that The Amulree Commission was referring to, I think more needs to be done. I think we have to look in terms of making working conditions better for members. I think we have to look in terms of making the salary more attractive. I think these are things that we have to do. We have to go, I think, the whole gamut if we want to cure this problem.

But, Mr. Speaker, the second problem is the key one I think to this whole document. And it says "The second great problem that faced our forefathers in 1934 was the lack of a sound economic base." And the document goes on to say, "That the problems that they faced at that time will sound familiar even to the young people. Our economy was overly dependent upon one industry, the salt fish industry", and it goes on to say, "outside of some small commercial interest."

But, Mr. Speaker, of course, that was not always the problem. When our economy gradually improved and expanded, other problems, obviously, became evident. And the other problem, of course, was the one related to having a philosophy, having a strategy for the development of the resources. Well, we have been saying that this government did not have the philosophy, that they did not have the strategy and that is why we thought that we were not developing these plans that were being enunciated year after year. And as I said, Mr. Speaker, we did have the strategy, and here in this document now we have enunciated seven basic strategies and a five year plan.

Mr. Lush: And, Mr. Speaker, that is the plan, that is the basic plan for the economic development of the Province. And as I have said before, the difference is that it looks like it is going to be done, it looks like that we are not going to be able to come back here next year and accuse the government of bringing in a document like this on which there was no action taken. It looks like it is going to be done because it says, "However my government is confident that the strategies will within five years secure the Province's economic foundation and provide both employment and the tax base upon which our public services present and planned can be supported." Notice the use of the verb, Mr. Speaker, it says, "will secure". It does not say that will make approaches for its securing, or anything like that, it is very definite, "will secure". This five year plan will secure this Province's economic foundation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, so that is the basic plan for the development of this Province, its five year plan undergirded by the seven basic strategies. And, Mr. Speaker, the ingredient that was missing from all of this, and we did not recognize it, the ingredient that was missing all the time and the Premier goes on to say it, says it, and very clearly here, and he talks about, And this is where the key is as to whether Newfoundland's future can be secured. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, it is in federal-provincial relations.

MR. LUSH: That was the main election strategy of the present government now, of course, of having two governments of the same political persuasion, the P.C. Government in Ottawa and the P.C. Government in Newfoundland. And now they have arrived at that blissful state. It is not unprecedented in Canada. We have had the four reigns under our democratic system now, with the exclusion of the New Democratic Party, that we can have. We have had a provincial Liberal Government and a federal P.C. Government; we have had a federal Liberal Government and a provincial P.C. Government. We have had a Liberal/ Liberal - two Liberals - and now we have the two P.C.s. So they aspired to that. They have gotten there, Mr. Speaker. And I do not know whether indeed, there is any requirement in the law in Canada which says that in order for a Province to receive preferential treatment or just treatment or fair treatment even, that both governments, the federal government and the provincial government have to be of the same political persuasion. I do not know if there is any law that says that. Indeed, I would think throughout most of Canada that for the most part it is usually different. Right now we are into a little bit of an imbalance and, of course, this means, I suppose, that everything is going to be much brighter for this Province so it is going to be easier now, the easiest time in our history to get the things we want, because we have so many P.C. Parties. And when the Prime Minister of Canada irons out the international problems related to embassies and so on and gets Petrocan abolished and all of this sort of thing, he will be able to come down, sit down with the Premiers and get working on this proposal by the provincial government.

Well, Mr. Speaker, very seriously,

I do not know how it is going to work.

Obviously, because we have a solution, as I have said, the blame for not getting through on all of these strategies all the time was the federal government. That was the blame. That was where the blame lay. We did not know it. Because if I knew it I would have been saying a few things. But I did not know it. I did not know it.

MR. LUSH: But anyway, Mr. Speaker, they have arrived at that blissful state. I do not know how it is going to operate, I really do not.

AN HON. MEMBER: A bunch of dreamers.

MR. LUSH: If we can go by the performance of - How can I put it? - if we can go by the performance of this P.C. Government over the past seven years and use that as a yardstick and extrapolate that in a ratio of one federal P.C. Party to one provincial P.C. Party, then I think we would come up with an equation -

MR. FLIGHT: Equalling zero.

MR. LUSH: - that is equal to -

MR. FLIGHT: Zero. Zero.

MR. LUSH: - spectacular and colossal ineptitude, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, very seriously, I do not know how it is going to work but let me say this I have some concerns over this particular situation. What I think that the provincial government have done, possibly unwittingly because we all want to get elected - and the hon. John Crosbie here which I may refer to in a moment, makes a statement that sometimes we would do just about anything to get elected. We want to get elected and, of course, in our enthusiasm in getting elected we do some and say some things that will come back to haunt us. And I believe what you have done is that you have placed a great challenge and a great responsibility on your federal counterparts. We have also raised the expectancy level of the people of this Province. I will suggest to you that never before in our history will the people of this Province look to Ottawa as they will in the next two or three years, Never before will they look to this federal government or its performance to see what it will do. Never before will so much be expected of two Cabinet ministers as will be expected of the two hon. Cabinet ministers that we now have serving for us, Never before.

MR. LUSH:

And, Mr. Speaker, that is a concern that we have placed an unreal task in front of the federal counterparts.

Well, I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, how the two federal ministers will react to this plan, because it says here again, it is pretty definite, there is no ifs, ands, buts and maybes, it says, "My government is confident that the Government of Canada will be sympathetic to this five year plan and will place its financial resources behind the projects we will propose, and they will place the finances there." Mr. Speaker, it is very, very clear but I am wondering how the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. McGrath), and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Crosbie) will view this particular doctrine. I have my reasons for saying that.

You see the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. McGrath ) was the unofficial spokesman, the unofficial critic of the labour force statistics over the past number of years and come ever day or every month when these statistics were released you heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. McGrath ), the present Minister of Fisheries on of course criticizing the federal government for the tremendous high rate of unemployment in Newfoundland, criticizing the federal government for the disgraceful level of unemployment in this Province. And now, Mr. Speaker, the fact that this is going to be a proposal to Ottawa causes me to look at it a little differently. This is the total package, is it, that this government is going after Ottawa for: This is the total package, 40,000 jobs. Certainly goodness the Minister of Fisheries cannot agree with that. He cannot agree with only giving this Province 40,000 jobs which I pointed out yesterday which at the end of five years will bring, if it is all in place, will only result in bringing this Province's rate of unemployment down to ten per cent, which will still be the highest in Canada. Certainly the hon. Minister of Fisheries cannot accept that. He cannot accept that as an acceptable level of unemployment. He cannot

MR. LUSH: do it. He cannot accept that, so I am expecting the Minister of Fisheries to get this report back and tell the hon. Premier to beef it up, to beef it up. That is not enough jobs. That is not enough jobs - 40,000 - that is not enough jobs. I am wondering too, of course, whether the strategy and the philosophy has really been thought out. We cannot tell here, of course, because it is very vague and maybe the Premier has everything all thought out, but one wonders when we see the vacillating back and forth, when we see the swinging from one policy to the other as we have seen with respect to the blueprint for development. Now I liked that blueprint for development. I liked that a lot better than this particular proposal. I really did. I thought it was a better documented case. It looked at all the sectors. It looked at all the sectors in Newfoundland with all the jobs that could be created in these. I know it is only a rough thing in the Throne Speech, but I liked the blueprint for development. I thought that was a very good document. I liked some of its policies that it enunciated with respect to transportation. Transportation - that was an interesting policy it enunciated there, that all roads were going to be reconstructed, built and paved on the basis of resource potential. That is what they were going to do on the basis of resource potential. It was a good policy and I am wondering now whether that is scrapped. We talked about a transportation policy here, but we have used no rationale.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering, as I have said, how the two ministers will react to this. I could quote from the famous speech that was given by the hon. Mr. Crosbie when he was the minister here in this hon. House. I could give you some quotes from that famous speech of gloom and doom, but I could give you some real quotes from there to tell you

MR. LUSH: what he thought of the very elements that are listed in this five-point program for fisheries. Of course, he talks about the fisheries, the greatest potential, but he talks about the involvement of Ottawa. Now, of course, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), I guess he is going to be going to Ottawa for some kind of control. Over the past three or four years he has been talking about the licensing system and how that is sort of all in a mess. Well, I expect he is going to be going after Ottawa to try to get some control there, another big demand on the federal government. But these fellows, this is what they have been asking for, they have been asking for control. We talk about the hydro development, and Mr. Crosbie again in this document here suggests that the only way that we could get that straightened out and settled away, the Upper Churchill, of course, was with the federal government intervention, another responsibility that must fall over to the government's counterparts. And he also talked about the forestry and again, of course, there was the necessity for Ottawa to be involved in that. And we talked about the mining to which case Mr. Crosbie said that the Province was not getting as much money as it should and anyway the whole thing ended up by almost stating Newfoundland to be a disaster area. So we are wondering how Mr. Crosbie is going to react to this document. I believe that he will act fairly. I believe he will act fairly and in accordance with the way that any finance minister would take a document from a province to analyze.

Well, Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate what I believe, what I believe, the concern that I express now that I know what the Premier was talking about when he mentioned that we are about to be ushered into a new era, when he talked about the last chance, when he talked about the fact that we were going to develop the economic base of this Province, now that I know what he was referring to, again, as I say, the concern that I have is how this is going to affect the expectancy level of our people, the kinds of demands that



MR. LUSH: it is going to place on the federal government, the kind of commitments that it is going to place on the provincial government and, of course, the very negative effect, the very negative effect should this plan not materialize, the very negative effect that has been created by all of the furore that has been caused and all of the kerfuffle and all of the excitement of having two governments of the same political persuasion, federally and provincially.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish the government well. I certainly hope that we can get those things and let us affirm once again that this Opposition will be supportive of these policies, and not only supportive, Mr. Speaker, that we will be active participants: because where the development of Newfoundland is concerned, we are concerned with developing job opportunities for our people, where we are concerned about providing public services to our people and we are looking into this kind of thing. Hon. members on this side of the House are concerned, and we do not want to be passive observers of a new era. We want to be active participants and we want to be supporters and we want to be supportive of these policies.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to express these concerns. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. H. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members, I feel very honoured and privileged to have this opportunity to address this hon. House as the newly elected member for St. John's West. I would like to extend my personal congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to this privileged position and as well to congratulate my colleagues and friends on both sides of the House for their success in the recent election.

I also and personally feel very honoured to have been elected to such an historic assembly and to have the opportunity and the privilege to make whatever contribution I am capable of on behalf of the citizens of St. John's West and to thank them sincerely for their support given to me.

My political background is of very short duration but I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to many years as a member of the government side of this House. I would be remiss if I did not state here that if it had not been for my being able to relate and identify so closely with the Premier, with his enthusiasm and his policies, I would not have given second thought to seeking a seat in this House.

The first couple of days sitting here would seem to suggest that there is indeed an attempt on both sides of this House towards a mature and meaningful attempt and approach to governing our Province on a businesslike basis.

I would congratulate, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) and the members of his party for their apparent desire to help make government work and not, as is so often the case, object for the sake of objecting. I would hope that we, Mr. Speaker, are always mindful of our duty to represent the people of this Province and not to try to impress one another with

MR. H. BARRETT: glib tongues and to entertain the media to get passing reference in their reporting.

Contrary to the basis of debate as presented by some of the hon. members sitting across, I have not reviewed the past nine years' Speeches from the Throne nor have I reviewed the past seven years' Budget Speeches. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that had I done so, I could just as readily have come up with as many or more specific cases where the policy and actions of the government of the day was, in fact, good policy and was, in fact, employment producing and was, in fact, socially beneficial and did indeed do everything that was intended. Or had I gone back similarly to review the Speeches from the Throne or Budget Speeches, I will say fifteen years ago or twenty years ago, I would just as readily have come up with as many or more specific cases where the policy and actions of the government of that day was, in fact, bad policy and was, in fact, unemployment producing and was, in fact, socially unbeneficial and did indeed do nothing that was intended. But for what purpose, what would have been proven? I guess it is a matter of who is doing the research and what specific time frame is being researched.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is mainly centered on what happens now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear

MR. H. BARRETT: - today, tomorrow and over the next few years. Surely now is when we lay out this blueprint for the future, my future, your future and the future of our children of our Province.

The Throne Speech of July 1979 is what I am concerned with right now. That is the document that is under debate. Without reiterating the entire content of this Throne Speech allow me to comment on a number of, which in my view are, the most significant points.

we are on the brink of the greatest period of progress and prosperity that we have ever seen. The

July 17, 1979

Tape No. 85

SL - 3

MR. H. BARRETT: government's stated approach towards  
the resource sector is most creditable. It has now been proven  
without doubt that the regulations that were formulated and are now  
being enforced as it relates to the oil and gas exploration

MR. H. BARRETT: programme were most beneficial towards providing substantial employment to Newfoundlanders and towards providing substantial business to Newfoundland companies. I am most happy to acknowledge that quite a number of residents of my own district of St. John's West are among the 700 Newfoundlanders presently employed in this year's offshore programme. Similarly, a number of businesses in my own district of St. John's West are also benefiting by supplying some of the goods and services making up the \$250 million being spent on this year's programme. The city and port of St. John's could become one of the most prosperous areas for its size in Canada with Newfoundland's new role as a supply and service centre for offshore exploration and development. This is just the first year of concentrated exploration under these new regulations and I feel confident that as a result of the experience gained this drilling season, even more employment and more business will develop next year and in the years thereafter.

It is easy to lose track of the benefits occurring from this programme, Mr. Speaker. Not only is employment created and business increased but each of these persons employed are now in the upper income brackets of our community and the increase in business places these companies in a sounder financial position, the result of which is obviously increased benefits in income to the economy of this Province. Not only have the oil exploration companies contributed to capital and supply expenditures estimated at some \$250 million this year alone but Newfoundland companies have also made significant expansions of their own facilities to respond to this demand.

I feel confident as well that this government will continue to improve and refine these regulations so that other areas of opportunity for employment, for supply and services will be identified. This, hopefully, will not be limited to just the offshore resource sector but will also be pursued as it relates to companies doing business in the other resource sectors as well, and along the same lines that have now been established.

MR. H. BARRETT:

To quote from the Throne Speech,

"Government intends to enter into all such arrangements in a careful and businesslike manner. It is therefore essential that our government has the right policy to bring such economic activity to its full potential." Again of particular interest to me and to my district of St. John's West, I am most pleased with the government's intention to develop a strong, marine research and development capability. Newfoundland is unique in that geographically it occupies a position unlike any other country in the world. We are located, as if being scientific platform, right in the middle of the Atlantic where the warm gulf stream meets the cold Labrador current. The significance of this merging of these two natural forces provides us with the opportunity of being of major strategic importance to the marine scientific community. Projects now underway and planned for the future, makes our present marine laboratory, the university science faculty, the yet to be completed Arctic Vessel and Marine Research Institute together with the newly formed Naval Architectural Programme at the university, of significant importance not only to us here in Newfoundland but to the entire world where already our facilities and research staff have acquired international recognition.

The city of St. John's and its harbour facility has the capacity for much more additional development to that which has already been alluded to as it relates to offshore exploration. This port now provides many hundreds of permanent jobs to longshoremen, to truckers, to warehousemen, to customs officials, equipment operators and the jobs in the many diversified spin-off service-related businesses. One of the principal employers is the CN rail and marine facility and the recently announced approval for construction of the syncrolift for St. John's initiated by continued pressure by this government will surely make a significant contribution of increased revenues to this Province and increased jobs and job security to many of our people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. H. BARRETT:

The movement of goods by the marine mode is without question the most equitable, least costly and beneficial to most Newfoundlanders today. This is being recognized by more and more shippers the result of which is much increased activity along our waterfront.

To cope with this increased activity, Mr. Speaker, the need has been already determined to pursue further extensive development to our harbour facilities. This development would, no doubt, make provision to establish an adequate container port facilities to respond to the growing activity in this area, to service the direct sailings between St. John's and Halifax and St. John's and Montreal.

Another area of significant importance is the growing demand for a railroad facility to properly handle the increase demand for this service that has developed between St. John's and Halifax. It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that over the next few months this government

MR. H. BARRETT: will pursue the further development of the port facility for the City of St. John's aggressively and vigorously with the city, with the National Harbours Board and the federal government.

The stated intent, Mr. Speaker, of government's policy to emphasize the development of small and medium sized business is a major step towards the goal of less dependency on outside assistance. This philosophy will solidify the economy and improve year-round employment, probably more than any other single program that has been announced. My own experience would suggest that the broader the base, the sounder the project. This concept would also seem to apply in this respect as well. If we can encourage the establishment of a large number of diversified businesses throughout our Province, then obviously we can avoid the shock impact of a failure of a major industry or plant much more easily.

This concept of development can also ensure improvement to the economic prospects for our rural areas as well, with the end result being the establishment of diversified and year-round employment and business success and the ability to improve substantially the social and community services.

Mr. Speaker, the programs outlined in the Speech from the Throne of 1979 and some of which I have mentioned this afternoon are the things which I look forward to helping implement during the next few years and will, I sincerely trust, be the beginning of the creation of a permanent base for our economy. For the first time in our history we have the chance to be a 'have' province and to break the stranglehold of fiscal handouts. This administration is committed to a new direction for Newfoundland and I am proud to be a part of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



MR. H. BARRETT: Government must always be there to help, to serve, to assist and to be answerable to the people of this Province, but private initiative is the keystone. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues from the other side who just spoke, I too am a new member in this House of Assembly and I too would like to congratulate you on your election and the Deputy Speaker. I would like to congratulate the Premier on his election. I think that he carries with it a tremendous responsibility. All of us, and I think I speak for all of Newfoundland, are looking forward as he encouraged us to do during the election. I am not saying this tongue-in-cheek. I am saying with the greatest of disappointment that I think that the last Premier held out the same kind of promise, the same kind of promise for a new Newfoundland and a great future and an opportunity to control our own destiny. I was not actively involved at the time, Mr. Speaker, but I think that the current Premier in his election campaign and as we have seen here by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry), an attempt to say, "Forget all that is past". The great disappointment that this Province has already suffered is the failure of the previous Premier to live up to the great expectation and now we are asked by a new, energetic, aggressive, young Premier, who says he has brought new people, new faces

MR. STIRLING:

and like every other Newfoundlander I have that same kind of hope, everything that he referred to in the Speech From The Throne, I have that same hope that he is going to be able to live up to those promises. Mr. Speaker, for a long time I have been involved with the municipal level of government and I have been involved at the party level and I would say to members on both sides of this House that I have the greatest of respect for the people who offer themselves for public office in this Province. I have seen nothing yet in this House to indicate otherwise. I have the greatest of respect and intend to defend members who are in this House on either side because I think we can do a lot, not only the new members of this House but some of the veteran members of this House by being just a little bit more careful about some of the responses, some of the comments. Because people really want to look up to the people who are elected in this House.

My first concern, when we go through the whole ritual that the new members were going through and we see why things are done in the House of Assembly, it must be very confusing. And I have my children here in the House of Assembly today and I hope that my conduct can always be such that they will be pleased to sit in the House of Assembly. I hope every other member will feel the same way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: This whole ritual of the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, is that we are electing fifty-two individual members. We happen to get together because we happen to agree on different things with no less respect for the members of the opposite side. But it is just that, as the last speaker had mentioned, he was attracted because of the leadership qualities of his leader. But when we go back to the days that the Premier mentioned, the days when this House collapsed, the days in 1934 when they came in from outside this Province and said, 'Newfoundlanders you are not fit to govern yourselves because you are so full of corruption, you cannot elect an honourable House.' Ladies and gentlemen let us never go back to that. But in those days when there

MR. STIRLING:

were many changes in the House there was not always one party or two parties, there were many parties. And the essence of this House is that we have to be able as members, with dignity I would suggest, to select that there are honourable differences of approach, differences of approach by a group of people collected together who call themselves the P.C. Party and versus a group collected together who call themselves the Liberal Party. But essentially we are joined together because we want to do what we think is in the best interest of this Province from our point of view. And hon. members on the other side, in this particular case, went to the people of Newfoundland and the people of Newfoundland said, By and large we believe that you people under your leader will deliver what you promised. And what did you promise? You promised to step forward, to provide a great new future for Newfoundland and the key point is that you could get along better with your colleagues in Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland believe that you are going to do that. You did not win by any trickery. You won this election, you have this responsibility because the people in Newfoundland believed you just the same way as the people of Newfoundland believed Frank Moores and you saw what happened when that trust was given and thrown into the mud.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) election poison.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to get involved at this stage in any pettiness in this House because I believe when we make speeches - because we all tried to get here - there is somewhere, everywhere else in this Province where other people wanted to get this job and I believe that we really do as individuals have a responsibility to live up to the promises that we made to our people and I do believe as individuals we can do something about the conduct of this House, because I for one am not going to participate in it unless I am provoked by the other side. If somebody will make a promise to me from the other side, then we should get along fine.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back to the Premier's comments and I look forward to them and I intend to conduct myself in this House of Assembly based on these two points that he made, and you can sum up the whole Speech from the Throne and all the comments made from the other side when he said, "There are two key areas", and I have a habit of making notes and I may remind the Premier from time to time of this, "There are two key areas". One, that he believes that the programs that this government will bring forward will make government accountable.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. L. STIRLING: I am quoting the Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that government should be accountable. I think that over the next little while - we have talked about, "Let us forget the past". Well, okay, but one of the things that did not happen in this last election and I agree that it is up to the other side to decide it, they did not agree to be accountable for their past seven years. I agree if you are not proud of the past seven years, let us not discuss it. Let us talk about this point forward. One point I would expect the Premier will be held to and that is that he wants to make this government accountable; and two something very dear to my heart, he wants to identify us as Newfoundlanders. What are we? What are Newfoundlanders? What does it mean to be a Newfoundlander? Mr. Speaker, one thing that the hon. members

MR. L. STIRLING: opposite and my colleagues from this side all have in common is that we are living in Newfoundland by choice. We love Newfoundland. We want to live in Newfoundland. We want our children to grow up in Newfoundland. Take all the places in the world with all the benefits that they can provide and all of us fighting to get into this House of Assembly are living in Newfoundland because we want to live in Newfoundland.

I happen to represent the great and historic district of Bonavista North and I would like to publicly now, although protocol may say that I cannot name him, name the former member for Bonavista North who was the Deputy Speaker of this House, Mr. George Cross, as a man who did a good job. He did a good job and with respect, Mr. Speaker, George Cross did a good job and he ran a clean campaign. Many of the things that he did in that district and the promises that he wrangled in that district I will see over the next four years get done, and it may very well be as the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. J. Morgan) said that he will be back. That is up to the people of Bonavista North. I do not presume on the voters of a district. I can tell you though about some of the things that maybe the hon. minister can answer directly to these voters in Bonavista North about. I asked some of them, "What do you want me to say in the House of Assembly?", because as far as I am concerned I am going to bring up the concerns and express the wishes and the views of the people of Bonavista North. They asked me to remind you and some of the people who may not physically be aware of the district, it runs from Gambo to Cape Freels. It is a district that in 1961 was practically wiped out by a forest fire, the district that this year has had another series of forest fires. But out of every bad thing, Mr. Speaker, some good can come and I would welcome the intervention of the Minister of Lands and Forests

Mr. Stirling: because I was pleased to receive the good news during the election campaign that an agreement had been signed between Ottawa and the Province. People in the Gambo area, Hare Bay, the Dover area, Trinity, Centreville, Indian Bay have a long history as professional loggers and woodsmen, and they had a good future, and they were hard workers, and they never asked for handouts, but that forest fire wiped them out. And if we have 400 jobs, and I give the minister full credit for looking for another \$55 million worth of money from the federal government, that surely the people who should have the first priority, Mr. Speaker, the first priority are the people who have had their livelihood wiped out, in 1961 it was wiped out, and again now forest fires all over the same area. The first priority should be to those professional loggers and woodsmen.

I would recommend that immediately the minister consider setting up a committee, a task force, to look from the point of view of what good can be salvaged out of this current forest fire in Gambo. For example, I have been told by the loggers and the people in the area, the sawmill operators, some of whom have had their operations burnt, that if we move quickly in the next two years we can salvage a lot of that timber, that timber which was held by Price or Bowaters, that they could not get their hands on, that has now been burnt, the limbs have been burnt off, the wood is salvageable if we do something with it in the next two years. And I accept the fact that the minister wants to do something in that area. And I would ask him to consider the professional worker in that area, because they are professionals. They are professional loggers and lumbermen. That these people be given the first priority to be given an opportunity to work in this area of cleaning out and salvaging that area.

The minister may have misunderstood a question I was asking him yesterday, and I would like to clarify it today. I have no doubt that the people who are working in that area are working as hard as they possibly can, but the Premier mentioned that we need to bring

Mr. Stirling: in consultants on railways, to understand railway type operations. And a concern that I have that I would like to discuss at sometime with the minister is that maybe somewhere where the weather is better than in Newfoundland. It seems every time we get some good weather our forests burn down, but there are places surely somewhere in the world where they have a very effective control before a forest fire gets out of control. And that maybe somewhere, when the Premier is looking for experts elsewhere - if we had a blowout on the offshore oil there is no question that we would bring in experts to try to control and maintain and get it while it is still in a state where it can be controlled - and I think we should take a look at the same sort of thing.

I am sure that the minister is not satisfied that everything that could be done is being done. That we should spend money - we are talking about offshore development, offshore controls, well, our forestry in this Province and in my district, what there is left of it, around the district, needs to be protected.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned this question of accountability. The Election Expenses Act could have been brought in before this last election. March 16 I think it was or March 17, St. Patrick's Day, we got the new Premier and the new government. The Election Expenses Act could have been brought in before that election. There was nothing that required us to have an election. The estimates that we are now debating

MR. L. STIRLING: could have been brought in earlier so just temper this newness with the fact that some of these things could have been done.

I would like to move on to a question - I am glad the Premier has returned to his seat because I think it is essential - the thing he has mentioned in his Throne Speech - I think it is essential that we clearly build our whole programme around this question of identification. I attended one of my first functions, I attended the Memorial Day parade in Gambo and saw the people from World War I and World War II on parade and we reminisced and talked a little bit. and I wondered what some of those people who died would have thought if they would come back to Newfoundland today as fishermen and say, "We can not even catch a fish."

I am so pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier represents a rural district. It is no secret that most of the members on the other side are from urban seats. I am so pleased that the Premier represents a rural district because this whole question, until you get down and talk to a fisherman, as many of us did during the election campaign and he said, "I got a son here. I fished with my father. What guarantee am I going to have that my son is going to be able to fish. He does not want to go away. He does not want to go to university. He wants to be a fisherman." But this is important and, Mr. Speaker, that is why I am expecting the Premier to spend a lot of time concerned about the identification of the Newfoundlander and where we are and where we are going.

You know, young people want to live in Newfoundland. We have got to take - I propose, Mr. Speaker, that one of the first conferences that we call, we call a conference of fishermen. We can have a lot of subjects that need to be discussed and I am sure that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) has many of them. Well, one of the things that we need to discuss and



MR. L. STIRLING: rationalize with Ottawa is this whole question of licensing because it affects the basic family unit as the Premier knows. In many parts of rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, it is important that the family can stay together, the sons want to work with the father. And then when somebody gets ready for eventual retirement it is very late. In Bonavista North I have met many people eighty-five or ninety years old still looking after their own homes. Well one of the saddest cases I saw was somebody who wanted to keep their family, keep their mother and father near them and the home was filled up. I hope we will have active discussions, that a new home will be built in the Wesleyville area to accommodate more people who want to be near their families. I talked to somebody who said, "Look the nearest I can get my family is in St. John's and they do not want to be in St. John's, they do not want to have the senior citizens in St. John's."

AN HON. MEMBER: I cannot blame them. I do not want to be here either.

MR. L. STIRLING: And it is more important to members all across this Province that we should insist that as a basic - and this is why I am so pleased that the Premier has in the Throne Speech referred to the identification of the Newfoundlander because it is the identification of the Newfoundlander and the Newfoundland family. We have to have the right for the Newfoundlander's son to get a fishing license to follow his father into the fishing business, not that the father has to give up and then give it over. He has got to be able to develop the business, a business of fishing. Many people here have businesses or professions and they build up a value into it and people can buy that value or they can pass it on to their families, to their sons. Basic and essential to the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the young person must get a job in the fishing industry. Basic to this whole concept of identification with the family is that the family should be allowed to stay together. Crown lands that are all through the rural part of Newfoundland and have not been made available.

July 17, 1979

Tape No. 91

SD - 3

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. L. STIRLING:

Thank you very much. By the way, as  
an aside I meant to mention in the opening comments, let me say that I  
have had nothing

MR. STIRLING:

but the greatest of co-operation in the last four or five days from the ministers and from the senior civil servants. I have had absolutely first class co-operation in collecting this information. I am pleased that the minister interjected because I intend to get some Crown land approved for some of the constituents in Bonavista North and I am so glad to see that he could not hold himself back and had to tell me right now, yes okay you can get Crown land. And the fellow who was waiting for three weeks -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) all over the Province.

MR. STIRLING: Yes but I just want to get it through in Bonavista North.

AN HON. MEMBER: In Labrador?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, I do not wish to give up but I mean if they will let me start again tomorrow I would gladly sit down and let all my colleagues now get the commitments for land in Crown lands if the minister is in such a great frame of mind.

But little things, Mr. Speaker, things that for example a third of the members opposite who represent St. John's take for granted, as the RRAD programme. The Residential Rehabilitation Programme which you take for granted in St. John's, is not available in Bonavista North. I do not know why Mr. Cross was unable to persuade the other people to make that an approved area, a designated area. I am sure he worked hard but for some reason it was not done. You know there is not one unit of public housing in Bonavista North, not one unit of public housing and yet a forest fire wiped out their opportunity to get full-time employment to do some of their own financing. A lot of the people are seasonal workers and they are the most industrious people in the world. They go all over the world to get a job and then come back home. Some of these people who do not have a regular income could benefit most from public housing and I hope that we will be able to do something. But there is not one unit of public housing in Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

I asked another person, "What do you want me to bring up in the House of Assembly for Bonavista North?". They said, "Just tell them that we want our share. We have been neglected for too long. We want to have our share of the good things in Newfoundland." And adequate housing is a basic, fundamental right.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with some of the matters related to industry; we had a promise in writing in Bonavista North about a blueberry plant. It was an all inclusive type of thing. Now in that area there are very industrious people working in the blueberry industry that have a lot of ideas about how to improve that industry. I would hope that we can do further development as this House moves along.

In the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, there has been a very disturbing thing going on in the last few days and I am sure the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) is concerned and I am sure that the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) will be concerned when he hears about it, maybe he already has, and that is there is some concern about the Hamilton Banks and a trade off between the discussions on the Hamilton Bank and the discussions on the Grand Bank and that the quota over the next four or five years may be greatly increased. I did a little bit of research and I found that it was none other than the Minister of Lands and Forests now who brought in a resolution to this House which I understand received unanimous support to ban fishing off the Hamilton Banks. And I am sure that the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Lands and Forests will not let that slip by in any negotiations between Ottawa and this Province. I have a real concern, Mr. Speaker, that we may be into almost a conflict of interest situation in this cozy, palsy-walsy arrangement between a government in Ottawa who happens to be P.C. and a government in Newfoundland who happens to be P.C., just a bit of a concern that they will not have the same kind of an aggressive approach that they would have if there was a government of another stripe

MR. L. STIRLING: political stripe, just a little bit.

I want to mention another development that is taking place in the Bonavista North area which is also taking place throughout other parts of the Province and that is in the Development Association. This development association, the Gambo/Indian Bay Development Association, that group of volunteers have actually built a fish plant with great help from various departments on both the Provincial and Federal level. They should be encouraged. Right now they will be writing the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter) looking for some support and for a water supply hookup with the main location. They will be looking to rural development and the Minister of Fisheries for help in bringing in an ice plant. I am sure that they will receive consideration.

I think, Mr. Speaker, most of what I have had to say will be dealt with in greater detail in further discussion as the House proceeds. I want to sum up simply by saying again what I said in the beginning, I am proud to be a member of this House, I am proud to be associated with the colleagues on this side and I am looking forward to a very progressive and aggressive approach by this whole House of Assembly as we deal with the problems of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, it is really delightful to pause for all of that heartfelt applause from my side and I think we may even have had a few thumps from the other side. So it is in the spirit of unanimity that I begin this speech and I am sure as it continues the unanimity will remain the same.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, occupying the Speaker's Chair, from my seat right here I compliment you on your election to the office of Deputy Speaker. It was an office that I held myself for some three or four years and it is a very interesting office. You have to be impartial

MR. F. STAGG: throughout. I achieved great notoriety for my impartiality as I was Deputy Speaker and I am sure that you may not emulate me in that regard. In any event it is a very interesting position. My predecessor in the position was the man who is presently the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). He was noted for his impartiality as well. So I compliment you on your election to the position, a most interesting position. And, Mr. Speaker, if you are within earshot I compliment you on your election to the office of Speaker. It is a most interesting and thought provoking and sometimes mind provoking office. The present Speaker, it may not be known to too many people, is the National President of the Kinsmen Clubs of Canada, an office which is very prestigious within that service organization. And as I address him if I say, "Mr. Speaker, and fellow Kin"occasionally, then it is just lapsing into my previous association with the Kinsmen Clubs as well. And on the other side of the House we have - I know the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) sponsored me into the Stephenville Kinsmen Club initially, so we at one stage had an harmonious relationship. And my colleague down here to the left, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) is also a Kinsmen. So the Kinsmen Clubs are well represented. The fellow over there from Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) he also is a Kinsmen. He is a better Kinsmen than a softball player I must say. He came to Stephenville and we whopped them there several years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) teacher.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, well they were that too, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the death watch here the same as the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) had yesterday. The press does not cover anything said after 4:30 but I may have to circulate copies of my speech to them. And I want to set the record straight, especially with the CBC and with the Evening Telegram or whoever had the audacity on election night to indicate that I had been defeated in 1975. I was not defeated

July 17, 1979

Tape No. 93

DW - 3

MR. F. STAGG:

in 1975. I was not defeated in 1975.

Right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

You gave up.

MR. F. STAGG:

I chose not to run in 1975 and because

I chose not to run we have the present member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder).

But had I chosen to run

MR. F. STAGG:

I suggest he would be still at his job in Stephenville. So the record is straight; I did not run in 1975. I retired undefeated and as I said in one of my election campaigns, not unlike Mohammed Ali, retired undefeated and came back some four years later when the draft movement was over and got back into politics on a successful note. And I am delighted to be here, and I am sure that everybody on this side is delighted to have me.

Now, I would also like to compliment the member for Bonavista North (Mr. L. Stirling) on his interesting speech. It was provocative in part and as soon as he started to evoke some response from this side of the House, because he was making provocative remarks, he immediately fell back and said well he is not going to participate in petty debates. Well, I suggest to hon. members that if you are not going to participate in it, you should not start it. You should not start something you cannot finish, but other than that his speech was excellent. I would also like to compliment him for doing yeoman service to this Province in the dark days of late May when the hon. the Premier called the election and pulled the rug out from under the Liberal caucus and the Liberal party. The hon. member did yeoman service because what was shaping up in Newfoundland at the time was a rout. It was a rout shaping up. I suspect that there were four or five seats in the Province safe at that time and the call went out from St. John's and the man stayed home all weekend receiving telephone calls and so on, and the draft was successful. Back came the gentleman. So I want to compliment the member for Bonavista North. Obviously, he is indigenous to Bonavista North. He is indigenous to the area. He is not a person who was parachuted in. I know he was probably born there and has lived there quite some time during his lifetime, so I compliment him on his draft movement in getting the Leader of the Opposition, as he now is, back to Newfoundland. As I



MR. F. STAGG: recall, that was one of the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Home to stay.

MR. F. STAGG: - home to stay and all of the things that went with it. Well, I am delighted that he was successful because I believe that had the present Leader of the Opposition, and there had been several, had he not come back to Newfoundland that we would not have room on this side of the House for the members. Right? I suspect we would have 45 and anybody over on that side who won this time with less than a thousand majority, you can thank your seat to the present Leader of the Opposition, because you would not have had it otherwise.

So, it was a fair fight. It was a fair fight and I am quite sincere in that. I make a certain amount of levity in my remarks, but I think the people of Newfoundland are quite, well, they are appreciative of the fact that you got the Leader of the Opposition back to Newfoundland because we had a fair fight. You fellows put up your best; you put up your best; and we put up our best and the result is square. We put up our best.

Now I have some remarks here that - I should get into my district things first, but since I have gotten into this I think that this element -

AN HON. MEMBER: Better leave it.

MR. F. STAGG: - I think I am going to deal with it in a little more partisan way at the present time, and I have not heard enough from our side of the House complimenting our leader. I have not heard enough of it, and I think that everybody on this side who gets up should spend a significant portion of his speech telling the people of this Province what a great man we have as leader. Right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG: And right on cue, and right on cue the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. G. Flight), as I set him up to do earlier, those of you who may recall, I went across the floor earlier and I said, "Now you fellows interrupt me quite often because I am best extemporaneous". 'Extemporaneous' - that is a big word. That is

MR. F. STAGG: something like 'extrapolate' which I heard down there from the member for Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush). It is a big word. I am best extemporaneous so I would like for you to interrupt me as much as possible.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) leadership.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, yes, you mentioned the leadership. You mentioned the leadership and my interview on the CBC some ten minutes before the Premier was elected Premier. Well, I must say that the remarks that I made at the time were made in the heat of the moment. I was supporting the man who is now the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) who was aspiring to the position and I gave the Premier, as he now is, I gave him some advice. I said there are certain characteristics about you that remind me of Joey Smallwood

Mr. Stagg: and I would like for you to tone them down. Well, as far as I am concerned that is what he has done. He has toned down the negative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: He has toned down the negative. Gentlemen! Gentlemen! Your applause, look, you are ruining my speech! There is too much applause here. He has toned down the negative. But there is one thing about him that is similar to Joey Smallwood - the guy can win elections. He can win elections -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: - and we have just had number one.

AN HON. MEMBER: Changing your mind?

MR. STAGG: Changing my mind? I would not be here, Sir, I would not be here if I did not believe in the man and believe in this party, because I was quite comfortable where I was. When I retired from politics it was, as I considered it at that time, permanent. But I am back in because of the leadership shown by our Premier, and because of the fellows he was gathering around him. And also, may I say, since the election is over now, because of the entry into the fray of your Leader of the Opposition. He was not an insignificant entrant in my estimation. And it was in my own calendar of when I might get back into politics, I thought I might get back in when I was around forty-five, which would be many years from now, after I had secured my financial status or whatever.

PREMIER PECKFORD: As soon as you (Inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: But there are things about this game that you cannot predict.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you hear what the Premier said?

MR. STAGG: I do not know. What did he say?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Great! Good!

There are things about this game that you cannot predict. If you are a political person you have got to strike while the iron is hot.

Now the entry of the Leader of the Opposition into the election, as I go back to my earlier statement before I was interrupted by the Premier, is that it was not an insignificant event, in my estimation. So I felt that this was the time when, as they say in typing class, "Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of the party." And considering myself a good man, and I immodestly put that forth, -

AN HON. MEMBER: A great backbencher.

MR. STAGG: - considering myself a good man and electable, and having a record of never having been defeated, I decided I would have shot at it. And sure enough I was right.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) your ideas.

MR. STAGG: Now the Premier needed help from his friends and he had help from some fifty-two, thirty-three of whom made it quite handily in most part through the election. As a matter of fact, there was only one recount and that was just a sort of a farcical thing because anything under fifteen should not be recounted. But, of course, the former member for Labrador North has plenty of money. I think you have to post a bond for those things, and if it is unsuccessful you forfeit your bond. So having had everything in Labrador that I know of tied up for years there should not have been any problem for him to finance a mere recount.

But anyway, the member for - what is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Naskaupi.

MR. STAGG: Naskaupi - the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) you are welcome back here. I am delighted you are here, and I am sure all of us here are delighted to have you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Only one recount.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: It was a decisive election. It was decisive. Well I remember back in 1971, many of you may not recall that I was elected in 1971, not that any of you particularly follow my career anyway, but since I have the floor you do not have any choice but to listen to it, or you can leave, one or the other, because I have the mike and I have the floor and I have another half an hour to go.

But back in 1971 when I was elected in October 28, 1971 polling 4,100 votes to my opponent's 2,700, a smashing victory, there were several recounts. As a matter of fact, in January of that year the Supreme Court, showing its political wisdom if not its legal wisdom, decided to confirm the member for St. Barbe South, Mr. Maynard, in his position and we went on to great things.

And I was looking over the line-up here and from the 1971 caucus on our side there are only five of us left, that is the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) - I was the member for Port au Port at the time, but under the redistribution Port au Port was divided into Stephenville and Port au Port and, as

MR. STAGG:

as I again immodestly said, it took two men to replace me --the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), the member for Waterford-Kenmount (Mr. Ottanheimer) who was splitting duties between here and Oxford as the time, and the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey). There are only five of us left. So we are in a pretty significant majority--or we are a pretty significant group of people. And I notice when we are handing out the parking places downstairs that I am sitting to the east of fellows who were elected a heck of a long time after me. So I do not know about this hierarchical system. It becomes especially significant in the wintertime.

AN HON. MEMBER: Alphabetical order.

MR. STAGG: Alphabetical order. Well, L should come before P. But you fellows are all down there on that end. I do not know; maybe we start the alphabet at the other end.

And there are only three people on the other side that are left from 1971, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe). Only one of these is in the district now that he was in at that time. The member for LaPoile escaped Bell Island and went down to Port aux Basques, and the member for Twillingate went a variety of places, one of which included being Leader of the Opposition. Anyway he is back now as the member for Twillingate. I was hoping too that the member for LaPoile would be here because I wanted to compliment him on his shadow cabinet position. I understand that he is shadowing the member for Gander (Mrs. Newhook), the portfolio of Consumer Affairs and Environment, and I am sure that he will labour extensively under these very strenuous duties and will probably do service to the position. It may be a bit of come down from positions he held when we were here before when he was House Leader, which is a position that is not recognized in the Statute but is recognized by the House. But I am sure he will do a good job.

Now, having digressed schizophrenically from what I was going to say into what came out, I think I will probably get on to some

MR. STAGG:

of the points that everybody should make when he is talking about his district. I come from the West Coast, right?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: I come from the West Coast. Now that is, for the benefit of all of you people here and for some people in the gallery, that is out that way past the intersection for Conception Bay highway. It is out past the Crossroads Motel. It is out that way. It extends quite a way. The West Coast is indeed very, very interesting and it has tremendous potential for this Province. Unfortunately, because of problems in communication or perhaps the power generally has been centered on the Avalon Peninsula, it has not been given in the past an adequate role in the economic development of this Province. Maybe I should just acquaint some of you with a general history of the West Coast. It was once known as the French Shore and I am going to quote here from a document. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is somewhere in the rules that you are not supposed to read from documents, so for the record I am referring to my copious notes.

The French Shore as it is known today resulted from the Treaty of Versailles signed in 1783. This treaty reconfirmed and extended the rights given the French fishermen under the Treaty of Utrecht, 1713. According to the terms of the later treaty the French Shore included all the coastline between Cape St. John in the North and Cape Ray in the southwest. I know where Cape Ray is but Cape John I am not too familiar with. The member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) may be able to fill me in on that. Any British settlers were required to vacate the territory and leave it entirely to the French. British subjects could not compete with French and small fishermen, nor could they disturb the French in their cutting of wood needed to repair stages, huts and buildings connected with the fishery. The Treaty of Versailles was still in effect in 1901 and the Newfoundland government subsequently had no power to interfere with French fishermen on the shores of the areas

MR. F. STAGG:

now called White Bay, St. Barbe, Humber, Port au Port and St. Georges. So from 1873 to 1904, these areas formed the French Shore. Now everybody has heard a little about the French Shore. All most people know is that you have some people over there who speak French. Well it is quite an interesting part of the history of this Province that we do have a French population on the West Coast that is not French Canadian as such, but it is French. It is probably more French than the people from Quebec as far as their connections with France are concerned, and it has been the subject of many, many masters' theses as people have come in from other parts of the world and other parts of Newfoundland and resided in the French parts of Port au Port and they have had a great time and they have gone away and they have become masters - master's degrees and whatever. Not all of them have gone away saying the sorts of things that they said while they were there. I am not completely happy with a lot of them, and I would like for them to return and read their theses to the people.

In any event, that is the setting in which you find the town of Stephenville. Now Stephenville, for those of you who travel, is a stop on the airlines. Eastern Provincial Airways and Air Canada stop there and if those of you who stop there and have not come into the community would like to do so, you will find it to be a most cosmopolitan place. It is a very cosmopolitan place, particularly cosmopolitan for visiting service clubs. They have a great time when they go there. So if any of you who may have people who want to hold conventions, why not hold them somewhere else for a change? I mean, all conventions in Newfoundland are held in St. John's, Gander and Corner Brook.

AN HON. MEMBER: Marystown.

MR. F. STAGG: Marystown? Well, yes, I suppose there are some conventions held in Marystown as well. Well I would like for you to come to Stephenville for a while because we can sure



MR. F. STAGG: put on a great time over there. It is left over from our days of being an American airforce base and, whatever else you say about the Yanks, they sure know how to have a good time. So we have the physical facilities over there, the physical facilities are the buildings, and we also have the people who are used to having a good time. So, it is a great place.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have another physical facility.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, we have the physical 'physical' facilities as well. Right.

So that is what some of you may know about Stephenville. Others of you may know of Stephenville from 1975 to 1978 as the place that had that bloody linerboard mill. That is the place that was causing all of the problems in Newfoundland, the linerboard mill, and I say to you now that Stephenville did not ask for the linerboard mill. Do not hold it against the people of Stephenville that there was a linerboard mill put there. We did not ask for it. We did not ask for it. In 1966 in order to win a provincial election -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. STAGG: Where was he? He was there. The former premier of this Province decided that it would be propitious to announce and to throw a couple of shovelfuls over his shoulder with a silver shovel, a paper mill for Stephenville. And as I understand it through the grapevine and the telephone, he then phoned John Doyle and told him he was putting a paper mill in Stephenville. Meanwhile, the Americans were leaving and the best industrial park in Canada, the best industrial park in Canada was lying there waiting for proper entrepreneurs and the proper kind of industrial development. Instead, what was given the area as a sop and as a most successful device in winning the 1966 election in which the former premier won 39 of the 42 seats, a record that will only be exceeded in the next election by this side of the House, and that was -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MR. F. STAGG:

Well I could never be Deputy Speaker anymore. I was revealed as a charlatan in the role.

In 1966 he won the election and I recall it. I was a freshman in law school at the time and, as a matter of fact, I was just going up there and I was saying to myself, "My God, I wish I was back there to vote for him!", because he had come there in August and he had had the most stupendous meeting. The gymnasium was full; the parking lot was full; the Paris Hall was full; and there were bugles not bugles - loudspeakers outside -

MR. STAGG:

bugles too probably. There were forty-five industries announced that evening, forty-five, A light bulb factory. I do not know if the orange juice factory was announced at that time. Anyway the people of Stephenville were ecstatic. And put in there somewhere was the linerboard mill for Stephenville. It was going to be the Rhur Valley of Canada. Now that is the kind of treatment that the people of Stephenville have gotten, that is the kind of nonsense that was perpetrated on the rest of the Province, and it was extrapolated to me that the people of Stephenville were over there making fools of themselves thinking up all those foolish industries. So anything you have heard from my predecessor in this position, or the other gentleman who now occupies half the position that I once held, that is critical of this government, I say that everything they said whenever they were here in that forty-five hour debate concerning Labrador Linerboard, everything they said that was critical of this government can be bloody well critical of the previous one because they gave us, and extrapolating it again, critical of themselves, because the people of Stephenville are not responsible for the debacle that was Labrador Linerboard. So just get that straight right from the beginning, that we are not responsible for it. It is an historical fact how the linerboard mill came about and we are not responsible for it. Have I got to say it again? It is not our fault. If the linerboard mill was losing money it is not the fault of the people of Stephenville that it was losing money. It is the fault of the political process in this Province that was once extant, spelled with an 'a', e-x-t-a-n-t. I have to spell some of these words for you. It is the fault of the political process in this Province and it was, as far as I am concerned, a sorry page in our history, in the declining years of Mr. Smallwood, from 1960 on. And it has taken this government and this administration and the previous one a heck of a long time to get us back where we should have been fifteen years ago, in the context of Stephenville where we were in 1966 when the Americans pulled out and left us the greatest industrial park in Canada.

MR. STAGG:

Now, I could go on in a more partisan vein but I will get back to the partisan stuff later. Now that I have your attention and the attention of all the members of the press gallery and the people who are up there looking for something to put on the news tomorrow, well you can say that the member for Stephenville exposed all of the ludicrous thoughts -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, it is more than that.

MR. STAGG: Well, he has not done that yet but anything is possible when you are trying to get the press's attention. He exposed it for what it was, a pile of nonsense and he put forward the true facts about Stephenville. I am going to read you something about Stephenville and I am going to read again from my copious notes. In 1966 in what was from an intellectual point of view at least a very perceptive and useful endeavour, the Harmon Corporation was set up. The Harmon Corporation is basically an industrial incentive organization set up to administer the affairs of the Ernest Harmon Airforce Base. So the Harmon Corporation. And the Harmon Corporation in subsequent years was the recipient of an awful lot of political interference, especially between 1966 and 1971. So, I will get to that later.

I am just going to tell you a little bit about it now. The Harmon Corporation is the largest industrial park in Newfoundland. Now you can take all the rest of your industrial parks, many of which have been created at tremendous government expense and private expense, you can take all of the industrial parks in Newfoundland and you can plop them all down in Stephenville and ours is still bigger. That is the way it is. The Americans spent a couple of billion dollars there. What we have there is magnificent. The Harmon Corporation is the largest industrial park in Newfoundland and the third largest in Canada. I said the largest earlier. I take that back and I apologize to the other two, whoever they are. It covers almost 8500 acres. That is about fifteen square miles. It was set up as a development agency to create employment when some 1500 jobs were lost with the American withdrawal.

MR. STAGG:

In spite of the problems enumerated by many people, the Harmon Corporation did achieve a certain measure of success. It is certainly unequalled by any other closed military installations in Canada or the United States. In spite of everything it achieved some success. Today, even with the linerboard mill still in a shutdown position, the Abitibi Mill just being converted, over 2,000 people are employed in the Harmon Complex. There are 2,000 people working there which is 500 more than were there in 1966.

MR. STAGG: The surrounding area is rich in natural resources and scenery, and other physical resources as well to which I have already alluded, and along with facilities at Harmon offers almost unlimited opportunities for job creation.

The Acres report which was commissioned by the previous government in the 1960s states the possibility for growth and development in the Stephenville area are significant and noted that Harmon possesses these things; (a) the whole range of modes of transportation in useful relationship to one another - today it is called interface, f-a-c-e, just in case anybody might be wanting to get into senior citizens homes here - useful relationships to one another. A thirty-five foot ice free harbour. You can bring 30,000 ton vessels into Stephenville Harbour. Now the biggest ones ever to come into St. John's would be about 20,000 tons or so. So those of you from St. John's who are listening, especially the eleven or twelve members on this side - there are no members on the other side from St. John's; I guess the people from St. John's are in some ways very perceptive - anyway all of you know that when you see the biggest ship come in the harbour down there you know that bigger by half they come into Stephenville. A thirty-five foot ice free harbour; an airport runway that is 12,000 feet long, it can handle the largest jets; and all the necessary related facilities. One fellow told me we have the ability to refuel forty-five 747s at a moment's notice. And I said, "Where are the 747s?" He said, "Well, they have not come here yet." But that is the sort of thing that is over there. Potentially direct access to the Trans-Canada Highway and rail services and spur lines. Potentially - I must digress here for a minute - potentially direct access to the Trans-Canada Highway.

MR. STAGG: During the election campaign, maybe it was co-incidentally - who knows? - but during the Provincial election campaign the agreement for the Stephenville industrial access road was signed, some \$9 million, money that is going to come from the federal government and some contribution from the Province that is going to give us practically a superhighway from Stephenville to the Trans-Canada Highway which is going to have significant impact on the Abitibi mill -

MR. HODDER: Set up by the former Liberal Administration in Ottawa.

MR. STAGG: Well, I will give the former Liberal Administration in Ottawa credit for something. They were involved in the negotiation, but I believe that the Leader of the Opposition would not sign it until something was put in it for Port aux Basques.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Is it not something like that? He wanted to politicize it by putting something in it for Port aux Basques that was not indigenous to it. So, as I understand it, he refused to sign it because he knew - well anyway, maybe this is all - is this all nonsense I am saying? I do not think it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: I do not think it is. But I could go on, but some of it would be hearsay, and all of it would be provocative.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. STAGG: But I will admit that there was a previous government in Ottawa, we are all aware of that, from 1963 until 1978. I also got to say this, they had plenty of opportunities to sign that agreement from 19 - well in 1978 the Corner Brook harbour development and the Stephenville access road they could have put that in during the election, in the federal election, it would not have bothered us. Why they did not do it I do not know.

MR. STAGG: I cannot explain it, so maybe some day when the Leader of the Opposition is here, maybe he might answer it. If he reads Hansard maybe he might answer it. Why did they not sign it? Well I know that John Crosbie signed it. John signed it. He said that he was up there to help us out, and he bloody well did. They signed it. So the co-operation that was referred to as a conflict of interest by the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), I say that is the kind of conflict of interest we can do with. That is the kind of political conflict of interest that we love, where you have people who sowed their



MR. F. STAGG:

political roots in this Chamber up there now running the country in Ottawa. I mean, that is the way it should be. Supposedly in the hierarchy of Parliament, this is the minor Parliament and the big show is upstairs. This is what we do on this side, we nurture them over here. They are children of the House of Assembly first and then they go on to - not the mother of Parliament because the mother of Parliament is in England - but they go on to greater things. So they run the Province here first, do a good job of it and then they are up there now, they are running Canada. So I think that is excellent.

AN HON. MEMBER:

But there is a certain

crowd that come back down here.

MR. F. STAGG:

Oh, yes, excellent. I am glad you reminded me of that because that was my final point. We over on this side, we progress upward. We are upwardly mobile, upwardly mobile in the vertical mosaic of politics. This is the way we go. We go up, up, up; whereas on the other side, apparently, and I am giving the House of Commons its just position - in the hierarchy of Parliament it is known as the senior institution - on the other side they seem to think that you start off at the top and work your way down, so there it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) but he started off on the

Liberal side.

MR. F. STAGG:

Started off on the Liberal side?

Well, I do not know. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter), you can ask him that question. Anyway it was a good argument from my point of view. You fellows may find -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. F. STAGG:

You fellows may find some flaws in it. A fellow cannot get up here, cannot get up here and extemporaneously be right all the time, you know. I mean, let us face it now. I thought it was a very good argument and my colleagues, I am sure, agree with me. It was an excellent argument.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG:

I was talking about what tremendous facilities there were in Stephenville and I will continue with that, and if my colleagues over here would choose to interrupt me at the propitious moment where I can launch into another partisan tirade, I certainly would appreciate it. Anyway, the water and sewer and electrical services to service a town of up to 25,000 and the possibility with additional expenditure of expanding the water supply of up to 100 million gallons a day to meet the requirements of such large users as a pulp mill, a brewery and so on. There is also a heating plant, not a gas turbine. There is a gas turbine there too, also a heating plant with 80 to 120 million B.T.U.'s of unused capacity.

MR. J. HODDER:

You must remember that there is a problem with the water supply.

MR. F. STAGG:

There is a problem with the water supply? Oh, very good, Well I am sure the hon. member will elaborate on that in due course.

Thirdly, a wide range in choice of industrial warehousing and commercial buildings whose rents and leases can be adjusted to be competitive with other areas. Also several thousand acres of undeveloped potential industrial land. I would rather get back at the partisan stuff quickly so I am going to run through this as quickly as I can. A higher grade of housing for employees than would be available in most other areas at competitive areas. Both the town and the airport are in a pleasant setting, rimmed by hills and fronting on the sea. 'Rimmed by hills and fronting on the sea' - how poetic! A high standard of structure and facilities for schools, hospitals and recreation, particularly recreation - great golf course over there, great golf course. I was talking with my colleague in front of me here. He says he has a twelve handicap. I thought I was the best golfer in the House.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

That is not the only handicap he has, you know.

MR. F. STAGG:

In his other life he was a golfer, I guess. I know that my colleague over here from Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) is a golfer. He has gone to Corner Brook on a number of occasions and participated in the golf tournament there. He has yet to finish one. I remember on the fifteenth hole one time, he banged four balls into the swamp - it was worse than rough. Anyway, the next time I saw him he was administering to himself with Coca-Cola. I am not sure if it was laced with anything else or not, but anyway my colleague over here, I am sure, does not have a twelve handicap. My handicap is fourteen and some others say that I am handicapped in other areas as well.

We also have in Stephenville a large group of employees, approximately 1,000, immediately available with experience in construction and maintaining jobs. It has a central position, Stephenville does, which contains conditions for potential agricultural development, which are scarce in Newfoundland. Added potentials in fishery, recreation and mineral deposits such as chromium - chromium?

MR. STAGG:

limestone, magnesia, magnesia not magnesium, gypsum.

AN HON. MEMBER: Manganese, I guess.

MR. STAGG: Manganese, good. Tungsten. An effective organization, the Harmon Corporation, has been established there now. That tells us a little bit about Stephenville.

I could say here this evening that one of my roles as a member of this government caucus will be to change some of the perceptions of Stephenville held by public servants about the Stephenville area. I do not think I will have any problems with my colleagues, I can handle them, but I think that within the public service there is a gross misconception about Stephenville and I think that every public servant who is listening to me here this evening, of which there are probably none, but everyone who is within earshot or who is able or who reads the Hansard -

AN HON. MEMBER: They should be instructed to read it.

MR. STAGG: Will be instructed to read it. I am going to hand it out to them. You are going to be bothered by me because I do perceive a negativism within the public service as it applies to Stephenville and that has got to change. Right?

MR. HODDER: Right.

MR. STAGG: The member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) agrees with me. Right. I do not know how it got started. Why, I do know how it got started. I already told you earlier. It started in 1966 when the Premier of the day went over and announced forty-five industries. It started when they put a linerboard mill there that everybody knew should not have been there. That is how it started, when the public servants were paraded out to promote these things that should not have been promoted at the time.

But aside from all of that, Stephenville is an area that can be and should be and will be an economic asset to this Province, have no doubt about it. I am spending my full time on it so you know it is in good hands. Right? Where are all the thumps?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

I do not say it facetiously and I say that it is a problem within the public services. How do you get at it? One way I will get at it is I say it publicly, I say it to the media of this Province and if they do not cover it I am going to make sure that they get it. If they do not cover it because it is too late for the six o'clock news I am going to circulate it to them and hopefully some of them will consider my remarks provocative enough to interview me afterwards. I mean, that is what politics is all about, is it not? And I am saying to every public servant in this Province now who has anything to do with Stephenville and who has preconceived ideas about it, if they are negative, they are wrong because the Stephenville area does not need negativism, it needs positivism. And this government here is going to be badgered by me from - well as a matter of fact there was a meeting going on here this afternoon set up by myself that hopefully is going to culminate in the first major industrial success in the Stephenville area and maybe the first major industrial success of this government in the near future.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now who sounds like Joey?

MR. STAGG: Laugh! Laugh! It is an announcement of an announcement.

I mean we are all politicians, are we not? You know, I did not say Joey was not a good politician. I just said that he came over there and made political hay with the people of Stephenville and where was he when the chips were down?

So, I guess that is about it. I am telling the public service of the Province to beware and to get on the right side because I am not going to go away. As a matter of fact, I plan to run for re-election in 1983, so that assures me of being here until at least 1987. So I am sure given another eight years that I will get through and I am sure that by sheer strength of will and perseverance, not to mention courage and ability, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And modesty.

MR. STAGG: And modesty, yes. I forgot modesty. I am sure that

MR. STAGG:

it is going to get through to the grey eminences that either elect or defeat any government. There is unfortunately an inertia within the public service as it applies to Stephenville and I am saying to all of you that you are going to have to shape up or my recommendation to the powers that be will be ship out, shape up or ship out.

MR. ROBERTS:

Stagger (inaudible)

MR. STAGG: Well, you can say that if you wish. Let me see what else I have here. Oh, this is confidential.

MR. ROBERTS: It looks like we are going to be here this evening.

MR. STAGG: Confidential memos. I think I am just about on -

MR. HODDER: It looks like we are going to be here this evening.

MR. STAGG: Anyway I have a few more things here.

MR. ROBERTS: Adjourn the debate.

MR. STAGG: Adjourn the debate? I think I have three minutes left in the next debate.

MR. ROBERTS: Adjourn the debate or at 6:00 o'clock Mr. Speaker will call us back.

MR. MORGAN: Let the man alone, boy.

MR. STAGG: I think that is about it, ladies and gentlemen.

I have tailored my remarks for the forty-five minutes, I have gotten through them in about forty minutes, I think I have four minutes to go the next day, so what I will do in that four minutes I will use that to tell the people of this House what I elicited from the Public Service, and how many interviews I have had from the press and just generally speaking how it has worked out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: So I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

May I say to all hon. members there appears to have been a fairly good exchange and a good air of friendliness throughout the debate, and you may have noticed that there was a fair amount of flexibility as well, and I would intend to continue it that way unless it does get out of hand.

MR. ROBERTS: The iron hand with the velvet gloves.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising to adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 P.M. and this House do now adjourn.

Motion the House at its rising do stand adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 P.M. in the afternoon.

MR. MARSHALL: If I may just for the information of the press, Mr. Speaker, because we indicated that we will be giving notice of motion of the rules today, we have made considerable progress, and as a result of which we will be giving notice of motion tomorrow of a set of rules and a new beginning of the House we hope.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Those in favour of the motion to adjourn say, "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary "Nay".

The motion is carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 P.M. in the afternoon.