

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the
Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor), who is not in the Province
at the present time; Yesterday, December 1st, Newfoundland
Tourism and the Newfoundland Public Service in general lost
one of its distinguished sons in the person of Mr. Douglas
Wheeler. Starting with the Department of Economic Development
in 1954, Doug Wheeler very quickly became involved in the
promotion of Newfoundland as a tourist and vacation area. Often
working long hours and forgetting that there was such a thing
as an eight hour day, Doug used his incredible talent to write
and design pamphlets; to train travel consultants, to meet
with media guests and to see that they were favourably impressed
with Newfoundland.

Since this was long before there
was even such a thing as the Trans-Canada Highway in Newfoundland,
Mr. Wheeler success in this position was extraordinary. As
a civil servant he brought a unique quality of dedication and
service to his job, earning for himself the title of 'Mr.
Tourism' amongst his colleagues and co-workers. He had a
tremendous memory for facts and figures, names and dates
about Newfoundland history and tourism that made working with
him a pleasure indeed.

His talent for drawing and his
wonderful sense of humour were always evident in his daily work.
This talents of Mr. Wheeler's were always freely given, whether
it was for some special work for the department or for remembering
in some special way an achievement of those who worked around him.

MR. ANDREWS: Outside of his work, Mr. Wheeler also found time to become an amateur actor and herein again he displayed another unique talent.

This House extends sympathy to his wife Joyce, his daughters Bonnie and Donna, his sons Tony and Lee, his mother and his sisters and brothers.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we would like to join with the government in extending our sympathy. Most of us who knew Doug Wheeler knew him as a true Newfoundlander, a person who put everything that he had into it, and even in his latter years, when he knew he had a problem, he still continued on as if there was no problem. He worked very hard.

We want to join with the government in expressing our deepest sympathy to his family.

MR. SPEAKER: You have heard the motion.
Those in favour, Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary.
Carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: I have a question for the acting Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall). When the Finance Minister (Dr. Collins) the other day tried to slip through the House the special warrants for the negotiating team, the ongoing negotiating team, we were surprised on this side to find out that it required a new commitment not provided in the budget of \$350,000 in consultants fees, \$100,000 in travel. Could the minister tell us whether or not these consultants fees have already been spent? And who the consultants are?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I must say I am most surprised at the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition with respect to this topic because it shows a singular lack of understanding of the way government works. But then again he does not need to understand how government works, because he will never operate it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: But, Mr. Speaker, what this amounts to is a special warrant of \$500,000 was granted by the Cabinet pursuant to the Financial Administration Act with respect to the ongoing offshore negotiations. Now we did not at the time -the reason why there had to be a special warrant obviously is because of the fact that when the Minister of Finance brought down his comprehensive budget, one that we are very proud of, and the way in which the budget has been adhered to despite the financial constraints I think is a model that the rest of Canada can follow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: But even at that time the Minister of Finance did not have the clairvoyance to be able to determine that offshore negotiations were going to occur this year. Because offshore negotiations occurred, it was

MR. MARSHALL: necessary then to form a committee first of all. In order to form a committee, Mr. Speaker, it was also necessary for this committee to have access to information, to experts in the field of taxation, to the experts in field of oil related matters and what have you. Because we believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is necessary in order to give the committee sufficient backup information that all Newfoundlanders would like them to have rather than to find Newfoundland in the same position as it was some years ago with respect to the Upper Churchill contract where there was no committee involved, it was just a case of give it all away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Now in answer to the hon. gentleman's question I can say that the \$500,000 special warrant will be backed up by a bill for supplementary supply and when the bill for supplementary supply comes in complete details will be given. In the meantime, I can give him a general answer that consultants are being engaged. It is absolutely necessary of course for consultants to be engaged to get the best advice

MR. MARSHALL: we possibly can. I am not in a position right now to give a complete breakdown because some of the money has been provided for consultants already engaged, some of it is being provided for the purpose of between now and March engaging other consultants. But I can assure the hon. member that in conformity with the policy of this government that full details will be given when supplementary supply is brought in. In the meantime, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), when he tabled this warrant, indicated that the general purpose of it was for consultants and travelling. It is, Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned, money that has been - which will be well spent and there will be many returns to the Province as a result of these expenditures.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the government's attempt to confuse and mislead, the supplementary supply does not have to be brought in until sometime maybe in March or April, and the minister has already gone on record as saying that he expects these negotiations to be completed by the end of February. A supplementary question to the acting Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall): Could the Minister of Energy tell us whether or not one of the consultants that was retained and reported to this House as the leading consultant in the field and one that the government could be very proud of was a company whose principal was Mr. Pedro Van Murs - it may be called Pedro Van Murs Associates or some other name - could the minister

MR. STIRLING: tell us whether or not Pedro Van Murs and Associates are still retained as consultants to the government?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is talking about that I said the negotiations would end at the end of February. I said no such thing. I do not make any comments on the offshore negotiations. I could point out to the hon. gentleman that his mentor, the person that he is continually making apologies for and supporting, i.e., the people in the federal government were the people who made that statement. We said no such things. We said that the negotiations will go on so far and for so long as it is necessary to secure the interest of the people of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: As to the consultants' fees, as to where they are spent, Mr. Speaker, I can say that with respect to Mr. Pedro Van Murs, I do not believe that any of this money is earmarked for any consulting that Mr. Van Murs is going to give with respect to this. But I would not necessarily like to be held completely to that statement because I would like to emphasize that if in the course of the ongoing investigations and research that is now being performed by this negotiating committee, which is meeting this afternoon and will meet tomorrow and the day after, they determine that there is more information required for the necessity of putting their position to best protect the people of Newfoundland and that Mr. Van Murs is the person whom they feel is the one

MR. MARSHALL: who can best give this information, certainly monies will be expended for the purpose of Mr. Van Murs to recompense him for his services.

In the meantime,
Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. gentleman there opposite that when the Minister of Finance gave the details, as we do in this House, that there is a special warrant of \$500,000, he broke it down generally for the present time between consultants fees and travelling, and we would be more than happy to give in due course, when the money is expended, when supplementary supply is granted, a complete breakdown of it. And I am sure that it would be to the full satisfaction of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Since the minister either does not know, or is refusing to admit, that the contract with Mr. Van Murs has been terminated, would the minister tell this House whether or not he knows whether or not it has been terminated, and by whom was the contract terminated, by the government, or by Mr. Van Murs?

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

MR. MARSHALL: That is another question, Mr. Speaker. At the present time Mr. Van Murs is not giving any ongoing consulting services to this government. As to, Mr. Speaker, the situation of why he is not giving it is at the present time the government has availed of his advice in the past and has valued his advice but at the present time we do not think it is necessary for it to be given on an ongoing basis. If in the future it is necessary to get it on some specific

MR. MARSHALL: topic, I am sure the government will consider it at that particular time.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that Mr. Van Murs has terminated his contract and he was -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, you know all the answers.

MR. TULK: You never ask a question unless you know the answer, stupid.

MR. STIRLING: - brought into this Province as the leading expert, Does the minister feel that the circumstances surrounding Mr. Van Murs' termination of the contract with the government, and the reasons for the termination, will have a serious impact on the government's reputation generally in attracting other consultants in this field?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Absolutely not, Mr. Speaker, any more than the government's performance is affected by the type of questions asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: What arrogance! How you got to dig it out.

MR. FLIGHT: Talk about cover up there.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I must admit that everybody in the Province knew they were doing nothing about the economy generally, but everyone assumed that they were preparing the case. We now have a special warrant for \$500,000 of a panic for consultants, and the leading consultant in this field, recognized world-wide, has terminated his contract with the

December 2, 1981

Tab# No. 3950

NM - 3

MR. STIRLING: government. Would the minister
table, for this House of Assembly, his letter of termination?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman is making statements that contain certain inferences and certain conclusions. The fact of the matter is that --

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentlemen want answers I will give them, but I do not, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the electors of St. John's East elected me to try to out shout the voices of ignorami.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I realize that the minister, the acting minister, part-time lawyer, retreating to being the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) does not want to face the facts and does not want to let the people know. Now would the minister please answer the question? Will he table for this House of Assembly the letter of termination which indicates why Mr. Van Murs terminated his contract with this government?

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

MR. SIMMS: If the hon. gentleman is going to embellish his questions, I will embellish slightly my answers, with your concurrence, to say that to be a part-time energy minister, part-time government house leader, part-time lawyer has considerably more security than being an interim and temporary Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say anything more. I do not think there is any purpose in saying anything more with respect to Mr. Van Murs except to say that he had given some advice to this government which had

MR. MARSHALL: been valued and had been valuable advice. He is now not giving advice on an ongoing basis. In the event that his advice is needed on some specific matter, Mr. Speaker, we will seek his advice. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think—we are talking about ongoing negotiations and what have you—but I have no intention of tabling any correspondence emanating from any consultants touching on the offshore matter at this time.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Terra Nova yields for a supplementary to the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. acting Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) will indicate whether or not the termination of the contract we are discussing is any way relative to the exit, the leaving of the previous Minister of Mines and Energy, Mr. Barry?

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

MR. MARSHALL: I have absolutely no idea whatsoever. I do not expect it did. The previous minister left for reasons that the previous minister gave and which were given to the people of the Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) relating to the allocation of \$20.3 million for the new reorganized high school programme over the next three years.

MR. LUSH: Hon. members will recall, and I hope the hon. the minister will recall, that when questioning her recently on the inadequacy of that amount -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - the minister did indicate that it certainly was an adequate amount to bring in the reorganized high school programme.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: In the interim or since the figure was announced in the budget, I wonder if the minister can indicate to the House whether or not there have been any studies or any surveys or any representation from school boards which indicate that this amount of \$20.3 million is inadequate, woefully inadequate to meet the requirements necessary to implement the reorganized high school programme consistent with, Mr. Speaker, the universally accepted philosophy of providing equal educational opportunity for all of the students in this Province?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the \$20.3 million government funding for high school related construction announced last Spring for the next three years is designed on the advice of experts who looked at all the high school facilities in the Province as being needed to introduce the reorganized high school programme; 40 per cent of that \$20.3 million is designed for extra classroom space to accommodate the Grade XII students coming onstream in 1983 - 1984, and the balance, the other 60 per cent is designed for what are called programme support rooms, multipurpose rooms, libraries, labs, shops,

MS VERGE: art and music, industrial arts rooms and, of course, those programme support facilities will benefit not only the Grade XII students but also students in the lower grades in the same schools, who will be able to take advantage of expanded course offerings.

Some confusion has come into the picture when some school boards and others are saying the \$20.3 million is not enough to cover all our needs. Now, Mr. Speaker, the \$20.3 million was never designed to cover all school construction needs in the Province, it was designed

MS. VERGE: to be specifically for needs because of the introduction of Grade XII and it is over and above what would have been provided for ongoing construction requirements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the question to the minister is since the announcement of that figure, are there any surveys, any studies, anything of any kind to indicate that maybe the government underestimated the amount of money allocated to bring in this new re-organized high school programme?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, since the \$20.3 million for high school construction was announced last Spring there have been a series of meetings between officials of the Department of Education, the Denominational Education Committees and representatives of different school boards, These meetings have actually confirmed the original accuracy of the \$20.3 million estimate for high school related construction. Again I repeat, that \$20.3 million is not to be confused with extra money, the \$10.8 million provided in the present fiscal year, extra money that is going to be provided in the new fiscal year for ongoing construction requirements.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These figures mentioned by the minister are all taking a part of the package that school boards are quite aware of and they

MR. LUSH: know what the monies allocated were, so this is nothing extra. But, Mr. Speaker, I want now to ask the minister a question re the operational grants to school boards. In view of the report by the Federation of School Boards that was made public this morning, Mr. Speaker, indicating that school boards are experiencing severe financial problems, in view of that report, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can indicate to the House what actions she plans to take over the next few months to help school boards to avert and to avoid bankruptcy?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the report to which the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) refers, presented by the Federation of School Boards, addresses mainly operating grants provided by government to school boards. To put education financing in perspective, I think I should point out that by far the biggest part of the cost of education, in fact over seventy per cent is for teachers' salaries which have been and always will be paid by the Provincial Government with respect to all

MS. VERGE: teachers for all school boards in the Province. And the amount which government is paying for teachers' salaries has grown astronomically with more and more teachers being employed who are better qualified with higher rates of pay. So when we look at the operating grants which are the major subject of the Federation of School Boards report, we are talking about the money which was used to pay heat and light bills, bus transportation costs and non-professional salaries. These operating grants are paid by government to the different school boards. Some school boards are quite well off with respect to their operating costs, Mr. Speaker, others are having difficulty. Government has taken action in the past to correct imbalances by giving more money to boards with above average heat and light and bus transportation costs with extra declining enrolment and for boards operating schools in Labrador.

The report has valuable, wide-sweeping recommendations which will be carefully studied when we are preparing the budget for next year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Final supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker; I did not ask the minister to explain to me what operational grants are, I am quite familiar with what they are. But, Mr. Speaker, the question was in view of the tremendous financial squeeze, the financial bind which school boards find themselves in, and in view of the recommendations that the Federation of School Boards made to the government today, is the minister planning any action to assist school boards, to help them in this financial crisis during this school year, Mr. Speaker, when it would appear that many school boards are on the verge of bankruptcy? That is the question, Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, government previously this year and in earlier years has made a tremendous effort to finance education and to co-operate with school boards. The new report of the Federation of School Boards contains many recommendations for fundamental, basic change in our system of providing operating and capital grants. The recommendations

MS. VERGE: will be carefully considered , and will be acted upon where feasible in making the budget for the next year. However, it is premature for me to comment specifically on any of the particular recommendations in the report.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall). Would the minister care to tell consumers of electricity in this Province where they stand now in connection with increases in electricity rates? There is one now just approved by the Public Utilities Board. I presume that one has been approved by the Cabinet. What can consumers of electricity look forward to now in the next few months or next year or so?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I believe that is a matter really of public knowledge because the Public Utilities Board has already given down its ruling. Suffice it to say that the Newfoundland Light and Power asked for an increase of approximately 9.7 per cent, and in effect what they received was an increase of 7.2 per cent. This of course is because of the Public Utilities Board, because the Public Utilities Board has been charged with by this government, particularly in these times, to scrutinize as closely as it possibly can the applications made for rate increases.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) rubber stamp
(inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: No, by no means was it a rubber stamp, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is there are, as everyone knows, everyone is affected by increased cost as a result of oil, increased costs as a result of interest and what have you,

The Public Utilities Board did an indepth scrutiny of it and as a result of which it has made its finding. We are rather proud on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that we have given the Public Utilities Board the latitude to function as it has, We

MR. MARSHALL: have not only extended their jurisdiction with respect to Newfoundland Light and Power but to Newfoundland Hydro as well.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, everyone in the Province knows that the Public Utilities Board merely rubber stamp applications from the government when they want increases, when Newfoundland Hydro ask for increases. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the government would consider placing a freeze for one year on any further increases in electricity in this Province?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, first of all everyone may know, but everyone does not know; everyone recognizes the validity and the effect that the Public Utilities Board has in these matters and it has shown it as a result of its recent deliberations.

With respect to the question, apart from the comment made by the hon. member, this government would love to put a freeze on electrical charges, we would just love to. But unfortunately neither the Province nor the people are unaffected by the economic factors that effect the price of electricity as effect everything else. I can say to the hon. member that in the event that we get our just rights with respect to the offshore oil, in the event that we reclaim the power which the hon. gentlemen so freely gave away, then we will be able to address in a much more meaningful way than we can right now as we would dearly wish to, the problems associated with these price increases.

MR. NEARY: It is a funny thing -

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

MR. NEARY: It is a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, you cannot get anybody on the other side to admit that we had eight years of Tory administration under Mr. Moores, but they accuse the Leader of the Opposition and people on this side for giving something away when they were not even in the House. But the hon. gentleman's party voted for that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the hon. gentleman - because this matter of electricity is crucifying people in this Province, gas prices increase and electricity prices, and the hon. gentleman got up just now and started to play little political games when I asked him about putting a freeze on. Is the hon. gentleman aware that Mr. Young, the Chairman of Newfoundland Hydro, said a week or ten days ago that Newfoundland Hydro was considering placing a freeze on increases in electricity rates in this Province for an indefinite period?

AN HON. MEMBER: A year.

MR. NEARY: I do not think he mentioned a year, he said for an indefinite period.

And would the hon. gentleman, when he is answering the question - because I do not have much more time to ask a supplementary - would the hon. gentleman tell the House if the government is taking any action, taking any steps in order to keep electricity rates in this Province down for consumers who cannot cope with the high electricity rates? Is the government taking any measures or any steps to take over the distribution of electricity in this Province? After all, Mr. Speaker, hon. members know the government owns every kilowatt, the people own every kilowatt of electricity that is

MR. NEARY: generated in this Province.
We provincialized it a few years ago, back in the 1960s.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Now, is the government taking
any steps to take over -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

I believe the hon. member has
put two questions. Now, the hon. the minister might want
to reply and I know there are other members here who wish
to ask questions and there are only three minutes remaining
in Question Period. So would the hon. member put his
question.

MR. NEARY: My question is to ask the hon.
gentleman if the government is taking any action or is
considering provincializing the distribution of electricity
in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon.
gentleman who has all the answers all the time to every
question, no matter what the question may be, has mooted
this from time to time, but the fact of the matter is,
as he should know, when he makes this proposal that
between \$200 million and \$300 million capital are in
Newfoundland Light and Power at the present time. Now,
the government

MR. MARSHALL: just cannot take a private source without giving compensation for it. So if the government gives compensation for it, what it would have to do, Mr. Speaker, is repay the amount owed by the common shareholders. So you get \$200 million or \$300 million on which today you are paying 15, 16, 18 or 19 per cent interest. So, you know, if that is his solution of the problem it is the same old solution of one step forward and two steps backward.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: My question is for the Minister of Fisheries. Does the Minister of Fisheries, can he inform this House as to what the Lake group is going to be doing with their plant in Gaultois, and seeing there is a delegation here in the gallery, could the minister provide this House with some information?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased this afternoon to meet with the delegation from Gaultois. The Premier and myself will meet with them shortly after Question Period. I just came back from meeting with a committee in Fermeuse on the same question and we met yesterday at some length with a delegation from Grand Bank on the same question. And we will continue to meet further and further with other groups and delegations in pursuit of every possible means of resolving the problems in the fishery, including the Lake group of companies.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to Gaultois being on an island, and also Gaultois itself being an isolated community, Mr. Speaker, the question that I wanted to ask -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: I spent many Christmases
down there -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - as well as other visits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: To the point -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - and the Question Period will
soon be over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: The question that I wanted to
ask, where extra money needs to be going in, is this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: - prepared to spend extra money
in modernizing a plant in the location where Gaultois is located?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as a result of
representations which have been made in the last number of weeks
by the member for the area, Mr. Stewart, my colleague -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: - with representations to the
Premier and my colleagues in the government that we will leave
no stone unturned and we will do everything we possibly can to
help the fishery in Gaultois, or in Grand Bank or Fermeuse, or
elsewhere in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Twenty seconds, the hon. member
for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Is the Minister of Fisheries assuring then residents of Gaultois that the plant will be reopened?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing these days how Question Period revolves around the visitors to our gallery, because there has been no question by the Opposition in the last four weeks on Gaultois, not one question on the return of Gaultois, not one question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Not one. Not one.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The members must be having difficulty. Order, please!

I want to advise hon. members that the time for oral questions has expired. At the same time

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I want to make a very timely notice of welcome to a delegation who are visiting us today and seated in the galleries from the community of Gaultois led by Mayor Wayne Kendall. We welcome them here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the eight annual report of the Newfoundland Liquor Licensing Board

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of Section 37 of the Medicare Commission Act, I wish to table the annual report of the Newfoundland Medical Care Commission for the year ending March 31, 1981.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of forty-three residents of St. John's and surrounding areas. In presenting the petition I would first like to read the letter to the House which was addressed to me. "We the undersigned pray that you present the following petition on our behalf to the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador and we pray that you present it verbatim as written." And it is signed by Jill Stoodley, National Action Committee on the Status of Women, the representative of Newfoundland.

The petition, Mr. Speaker: "To the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador. The petition of the undersigned residents of Canada who will now avail themselves of their ancient and undoubted rights thus to present a

MR. HODDER: grievance common to your petitioners in the certain assurance that your hon. House will therefore provide a remedy. Humbly sheweth that on Wednesday, November 18, 1981 the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) gave notice of motion of a constitutional resolution of which part 1 of Schedule B is the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. That clause, 33(1) to 33(5), of the said resolution provides that where there is an expressed declaration by parliament or the legislature of a province certain rights and freedoms guaranteed by the said charter can be over-ridden, that the specific rights and freedoms that may be over-ridden include; freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression including freedom of the press and other media of communication, freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of association, the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice, the right to be secure against unreasonable search or seizure, the right not to be arbitrarily detained or imprisoned, the right on arrest or detention to be informed promptly of the reasons therefore, to retain and instruct counsel without delay and to be informed of that right, and to have the validity of the detention determined by way of habeas corpus and to be released if the detention is not lawful. The right of any person charged with an offence to be informed without unreasonable delay of the the specific offence, to be tried within a reasonable time, not to be compelled to be a witness in proceedings against that person in respect of the offence, to be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to the law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal,

December 2, 1981

Tape No. 3958

hh-3

MR. HODDER: not to be denied reasonable bail without cause except in the case of an offence under military law tried before a military tribunal to the benefit of trial by jury with a maximum punishment for the offence is imprisonment for five years or a more severe punishment.

MR. HODDER: "Not to be found guilty on account of any act or omission unless at the time of the act or omission it constitutes an offense under Canadian or International law or was criminal according to the general principles of law recognized by the Community of Nations. If finally acquitted of the offense, not to be tried for it again, and if finally found guilty and punished for the offense not to be tried and punished for it again, and if found guilty of the offense and if the punishment for the offense has been varied between the time of commission and the time of sentencing to the benefit of the lesser punishment. The right not to be subject to any cruel or unusual treatment or punishment, the right to a witness who testified in any proceedings not to have any discriminating evidence so given used to incriminate the witness in any other proceedings except in a prosecution for perjury or for the giving of contradictory evidence. The right to the assistance of an interpreter for a party or a witness in any proceeding who does not understand or speak the language in which the proceedings are conducted or who is deaf; the right of every individual to be equal before and under the law and to the equal protection and equal benefit of a law without discrimination and in particular without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability and affirmative action programmes to attain equality."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize I only have a half a minute left. It will take me just a few seconds to finish this petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Does the hon. member wish to request leave then rather than be interrupted later on?

MR. HODDER: Well, I think I may make it, Mr. Speaker, but I may need leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): You have ten seconds.

MR. HODDER: Okay. By leave, if I could finish.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: There is leave. Agreed.

MR. HODDER: "That such an override of these rights and freedoms cannot be justified in a democratic society, wherefore your practitioners humbly pray that the said resolution be amended by deleting clause 33 (1) to 33 (5) and that no other provision which would have similar effect be substituted. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray."

Now, this Mr. Speaker, this petition was presented by forty-one - it has also been signed, I have signed it myself and the Leader of the Opposition forty-three members of the - members and supporters, I would say, of the National Action Committee on the Status of Women and I therefore present the petition and ask that it be presented to the department to which it relates.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: To the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the petition, the hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, as hon. members are aware of course the constitution provisions are being voted on in the House of Commons today and the provisions that are there are ones which have resulted from the agreement of the premiers of nine provinces and the Prime Minister. What hon. members should of course recall and should be aware of- no doubt we are aware of but we do not always fully realize it- is that when this series

MR. OTTENHEIMER: of constitutional initiatives, when it is completed, when the constitution is patriated and patriated in terms of the agreement reached by the federal government and nine of the provinces, that is not the end of the constitutional development, of constitutional evolution, of constitutional change in Canada. What is to be realized is that then changes can be made in Canada. It is no longer necessary, the United Kingdom has absolutely then no authority, residual or otherwise, so certainly there will continue to be changes in the constitution in the years ahead. So what is not in it now, or what is not in it to the satisfaction of this group or that group now, does not mean that there will not be change because I would think that there will be much more constitutional change in the next few years than there has been in the last decades, because in the last decades in order to change the constitution you would have had to go through the United Kingdom parliament as well. So that, of course, is one of the great benefits in patriation, that

MR. OTTENHEIMER: any changes which come can be effected in Canada without reference to the United Kingdom or to anybody else. But my understanding is that the resolutions are being presented and are being voted on in the House of Commons today, and certainly if there are to be changes, as the Premier pointed out in a telegram to the Prime Minister and I think copies to the other Premiers and which I think the people of Newfoundland are aware of, you know, one cannot really make changes of such important and serious and complex matters - I know they are important but they are extremely complex too - by conference telephone calls and telexes going back and forth; it has to be the result of conscious and deliberate work and studies. While I would say, you know, it is not really practical to make the changes now, that certainly does not mean that when the Constitution is patriated that further changes will not be made.

MR. STIRLING: To the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the petition, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I signed the petition presented by my colleague, the House Leader (Mr. Hodder), who has been appointed at the request of some of the people involved to co-ordinate the activities dealing with rights generally.

Mr. Speaker, what this clearly is is a request on behalf of people to have their rights put back in the Constitution. When we dealt with the Constitution in this House, the government resolution that was presented did not give any hint that they would take away the rights granted under the Charter. As a matter of fact, they said they would not approve the Constitution until we had offshore guarantees, Labrador guarantees, fishery guarantees, but, Mr. Speaker, instead of getting those things, which they abandoned, they abandoned all of those rights, we had a Charter which was mangled and the mangling took out these rights, these fundamental rights

MR. STIRLING: which these people have presented and which my colleague has presented in a petition, by making certain rights that can be overridden by any province in Canada. Essentially, Mr. Speaker, these rights should be beyond the change of any provincial government.

The women put on a great lobby across Canada and they restored one of the clauses under Section 28. And the native group put on a great lobby and reinstated partially some of their rights, but the government side would not support them fully.

Mr. Speaker, we are having a Constitution brought back to Canada and we will encourage these people to continue their fight because, Mr. Speaker, these rights do not only apply to women; the concerns that these women have expressed are the concerns of all of us. They are the fundamental rights that we all should have under our Charter. And yes, we will have those some day and we will all unite together because there will not be always in this Province a government that takes away people's rights and a government that will not give people the opportunity to be equal Canadians all across this great Dominion. This Province wants to keep unto itself the right to say what a Canadian is in this Province. And we on this side of the House support the idea that once you are a Canadian you are equal to every other Canadian everywhere in Canada and that was what was originally in the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, and that is what we support and that is why we ask the government now to take this petition and make their views known and do another about-face, as they have done so many about-faces in so many areas this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further petitions?

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, "To the hon. the House of Assembly in Parliament assembled, a petition of the undersigned 250 residents of Daniel's Harbour hereby sheweth that we, the residents and students of Daniel's Harbour, feel restricted when it comes to television viewing with only CBC available to us.

"We understand that this is the only region in Newfoundland, the Northern Peninsula, that does not receive a second channel. We also feel that geographical location should not be a cause for discrimination. Therefore, we want a second channel available to us, preferably NTV."

Mr. Speaker, in support of this petition, I would like to point out to the hon. House of Assembly that good television viewing and programming is an accepted way of life in most parts of Canada and indeed most parts of Newfoundland, but we still do not get very good television at all on the Northern Peninsula. We get, in my opinion, sub-standard CBC programming, and we certainly do not have a second channel available to us.

Now, we are presently having ghost stations brought onstream, but these are costly and people can ill-afford to pay extra money for what is readily available free of cost to most parts of the rest of Canada.

Cable television is not readily available to rural Newfoundland. It might be available, Mr. Speaker, to urban Newfoundland where you have the more massive population that you can sell your cable

MR. BENNETT: service to, but in rural Newfoundland it would get to be too costly.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, we have satellite facilities already in place that can be tapped into, and I would hope that the minister responsible on a provincial level, with persuasive powers, would, in his wisdom, most certainly communicate in the not-too-distant future and use those persuasive powers with CRTC and with indeed appropriate NTV officials, and hopefully we can have better television viewing in all parts of Newfoundland, especially in the area where this petition requests better television be provided.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly wholeheartedly support this petition and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

I wish to place this petition on the table of the hon. House of Assembly and have it directed to the department to which it relates.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the petition, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I most certainly sympathize with the hon. the member for St. Barbe. This is a continuing matter in my own district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. I personally have communicated several times with the people responsible and the owners of NTV. As a matter of fact, I have written and communicated with CRTC to the effect that I do not think that that network of television stations should have and own and operate a television licence in Newfoundland claiming what they do do in this Province and where they broadcast.

I do know on the Great Northern Peninsula, the South Coast of Newfoundland and much of

December 2, 1981

Tape 0841

EG - 3

MR. ANDREWS: the Northeast Coast of the
Province that television reception is not available
through that network of stations.

MR. ABRAMS:

I support that petition as I have supported petitions from the South Coast area in general; from the Hermitage area, Harbour Breton area, Port-aux-Basques, Burgeo, Ramea, Bay d'Espoir, and indeed many parts of Newfoundland. I would suspect probably three-quarters of the coastline of Newfoundland, the outlying coastline, does not receive that television network at all. I wonder why the federal government agency CRTC continues to licence that broadcaster.

The hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) made reference to the Minister of Transportation and Communication (Mr. Dawe), the provincial minister; unfortunately because of the BNA Act we have absolutely no control over communications in this Province other than to write letters, which we all do and I am sure the member for St. Barbe does, and to raise a stink. There is possibly, and I would live in dreaded fear if I was the operator and owner of NTV and indeed the CBC with the technology that is becoming available now in television reception and rebroadcasting both by cable and broadcasting; in a very few years both CBC and NTV in this Province will be annihilated by the number of stations that are going to be available to the viewers of Newfoundland, and unless they get on the ball and do their job nobody is going to be watching them because they are not contributing what their licence tells them that they should do in this Province. I support that petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Any further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): This being Wednesday, Private Members' Day, I call Motion No. 3. The debate last day was adjourned by the hon. the Premier who had spoken for about nine minutes.

The hon. the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

So, Mr. Speaker, I take it I have,

how many minutes left?

MR. SPEAKER:

Eleven.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Eleven minutes left. My subtraction

is not too good today.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a resolution here today that was moved by the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle). And last day we were beginning in the debate across the House, from one side to the other, to get into the substance of the matter as it related not only to this resolution but what this resolution focuses in on, and it focused very directly upon the resource development philosophy of the political parties in Newfoundland, and I think the last number of speakers on last day were approaching it from that point of view. And I was beginning to say last day, when I heard some of the hon. members opposite who so loudly tried to proclaim a certain philosophy and tried to attack this government for its lack of a philosophy, that it was about time that the record was put straight, Mr. Speaker, in this House as it relates not only to hydro resource development that this resolution directs itself to, but this is a symbol of the kind of philosophy that has pervaded Newfoundland politics, Newfoundland society for hundreds of years, and especially since the Confederation era, since 1949. And it is interesting, when one looks at it in that perspective, looks at the Five Year Plan of this government, looks at the policy statements that have

PREMIER PECKFORD: made clearly and unmistakably by this party and by this government and looks at what the hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. crowd opposite have done with the resources of Newfoundland, it is very interesting to see how they can stand up and mouth such statements as they have last day.

Mr. Speaker, I have done

PREMIER PECKFORD: some research on the matter and would like today to just indicate that, if we go back and look at what happened from about 1949 through the fifties and sixties, we saw a Liberal Party philosophy and a Liberal Government which believed in down-grading our renewable resources and our fishery, down-grading our forestry and started to bring in the chocolate bar factories, the leather goods factories, the battery factories, the heavy machinery factories, manufacture textiles, the rubber boots and the gloves and so on. And this went on for five or ten years and this party, and the members opposite who now constitute that party, still adhere to that same outmoded policy of resource development of industrialization of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: They link themselves almost daily in Question Period to it. They laud themselves every day when they pronounce again the principles that underlie their development policy, and it is the same.

And then, Mr. Speaker, what the Liberal Party did after the fifties when that miserably failed, they decided to return again to some basic resource development policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were a Liberal then.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And I saw the light very quickly, Mr. Speaker, I saw the light very quickly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: 'While the light holds out to burn/ The vilest sinner may return,' and that goes out to the hon. member opposite.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so they tried to return again to see what they could do. Now let us look at some of the things they went back to after they got out of the chocolate bar factories and out of the battery factories which failed miserably. This is Liberal Party

PREMIER PECKFORD: industrialization. Mining - in the Liberal years, Newfoundland had the highest per capita production of minerals of any Canadian province but benefited financially the least from these resources. In fact, during the 1960's, direct revenues received by the Province from all mining operations were just over 1 per cent of the gross value of mineral shipment. That was less than the royalties received from John C. Doyle from Wabush Iron. By comparison today, because of the PC Government's mining and mineral rights tax act of 1975, Newfoundland now receives 105 per cent more revenues than we did under the Liberals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Under the Liberal administration seventy-seven per cent of the Island was covered by concessions held by eight companies.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: You have to take up the time now, have you not?

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to take up the Premier's time. I was enjoying it.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason I rise on a point of order is because of the relevancy of what I am hearing opposite. The motion which is on the Order Paper deals with hydro power, present sources of electricity, hydro potential, hydro resources - these are all the whereases - Gull Island power, the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, the

MR. HODDER: federal government and the resolved part of the resolution says 'that the House urge the Government of Canada to uphold the province's right to fair and equal treatment to the transmission of its energy resources.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is my contention that - and I did listen to the Speaker's ruling yesterday on a particular bill which we were debating yesterday in which we had to be relevant, and I would ask the Premier to confine his remarks to this particular bill which he certainly is not doing.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, if I may be allowed to address myself just very briefly to it, Last week when the speaking went on in this hon. House, I think it was the consensus of all here that it would be a wide-ranging debate upon the resource management of the Province. Both sides had articulated certain positions on that, not just directly on hydro power, number one. And number two, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that when one looks at the legislation now on the Order Paper which is being debated as it relates to splitting the functions of the Deputy Minister of Finance and the Comptroller General, which the Leader of the Opposition and all members of the Opposition have used as a way of getting at economic problems in the Province, that they are the worst culprits when it comes to irrelevancy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Well, with respect to relevancy, a favourite topic in the last couple of days certainly, and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) brought it into the debate on this particular point of order, and I would caution him not to confuse yesterday's rulings with respect to relevancy with today's rulings.

I have researched and read Hansard of last Wednesday and found that indeed there was a very varied and wide expression of opinion allowed on both sides. In addition the hon. member quotes the WHEREASES; there are also references in the WHEREASES to the development of the Province's resources for the economic and social benefits of the people and so on and so forth, so I think it is fair to say that what has been transpiring over the past few days has been a wide and flexible debate and the hon. the Premier may carry on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, because the Opposition do not want to hear what we have to say today on this matter, Mr. Speaker.

I was getting on to the mining part of it, and I wanted to indicate under the Liberals, under the Liberal administration, this great Liberal Party over there, 77 per cent of the Island - now I have five minutes. Another point of order and I will not have any - was covered with concessions held by only eight companies; and because of the Minerals Act of 1976, the great P.C. reform, the number of companies engaged in exploration in the Province was over 60. In 1978 alone over 9,000 claims were staked. Before 1972 claim staking was non-existent.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, let me just address myself to the forest industry and what happened when the Liberals were in power, when they gave away all the trees. We have been now over ten years trying to get it all back. We now have the concessions gone and management contracts in place for twenty years.

In the fishery, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal years, the 1950s and '60s were marked by a rapid build-up of foreign fishing fleets. During the same period, from '49 to '56, Newfoundland's take of pelagic species, like herring, fell from close to 100 per cent to 12 per cent. The Liberals did nothing to counteract the effort of foreign fleets and protect the livelihood of inshore fishermen. What is really reflected here is the essence of the well-known Liberal policy, 'Burn your boats'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get on into the middle of the '60s and what happened. And I want to show a very startling statistic, in the next four minutes, that comes out of this. Marystown Shipyard, a Liberal policy, total cost to the provincial government since 1967: The Province has provided direct funding in the form of subsidies totalling \$42.5 million and, in addition, another \$11.5 million in guaranteed loans.

The ERCO contract: A twenty-five year contract at 2.5 mils per kilowatt hour. Cost to the province before the P.C's renegotiated it, \$60 million.

Come by Chance Refinery:

Here is Liberal policy for you. The refinery was to have cost \$198 million, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible) ERCO.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: A provincial Crown corporation was to be set up to run the refinery with John Shaheen operator. Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker. He was to operate on a commission basis and once debt was repaid he was to buy the refinery for \$2,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! Shameful!

PREMIER PECKFORD: This, of course, was approved by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neazy) who was in the Cabinet at the time, the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) who was in the Cabinet at the time, and the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe), the same people who inhabit the hallowed halls of the Opposition seats, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shameful! Shameful!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Liberal Linerboard Mill: This is the great Liberal Party that has a vision for the future of this Province. The report of the Economic Council of Canada 1980 said this about the Labrador Linerboard mill: 'A classic illustration of political attempts to overcome economy. The Labrador Linerboard mill was started in '69 with a \$54 million loan guarantee and within three years the loan swelled to \$114 million'. Listen, Mr. Speaker. 'Total cost o Province at the time of the Labrador Linerboard's closure in 1977, \$300 million' - \$300 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame! Shame!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Given away by the Liberal Party.

The Upper Churchill contract,
Mr. Speaker: A sixty-five year contract, the first
forty years at 3 mils

PREMIER PECKFORD: per kilowatt-hour, the first forty years. The next twenty-five years it goes down to 2.5 mils per kilowatt-hour. Lost to Newfoundland taxpayers to date, based on the rate the Province of Quebec is now charging its customers, \$2 billion. A give-away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Now, Mr. Speaker, if you do the figures, if you do the figures on just five Liberal projects, five Liberal projects- Upper Churchill, ERCO, Labrador Linerboard mill, Marystown Shipyard, Come By Chance - how much have they sold down the drain, Mr. Speaker, just on those five- forget the bar factories, the rubbers and all the rest of it- how much? \$2,462,500,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame! Shame!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, what does that work out to in per capita, per capita debt, per capita debt as a result of that? Every man, woman and child, just on those projects, owes \$4,250, just on five Liberal projects. And these gentlemen over here can get up and squeal and bawl, Mr. Speaker, about resource management and long term planning and ask short-term Stirling over there to look for some way out of the morass by throwing more money at it.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party of Newfoundland is still the Liberal Party of the fifties and sixties, and they want to get in power and give away more of this Province's resources. And I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the people of Newfoundland have changed since 1979. They know what the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is made of. They know what the member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) is made of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is a give away party, and we will have no part of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra Nova

has the floor.

MR. FLIGHT:

Talk about our per capita

debt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Terra Nova

has the floor.

MR. FLIGHT:

Our per capita debt has tripled

under the Tories, quadrupled under the Tories.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member for Terra

Nova has the floor.

MR. FLIGHT:

Our per capita debt has tripled

under the Tories.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

Tripled.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker -

MR. STIRLING:

Can I speak again?

MR. SPEAKER:

No. You and the hon. member

for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) have both spoken.

MR. LUSH:

- much of what the Premier has

said does not deserve comment. It is not worthy of commenting

on, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

Nor is the Premier.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the Premier wanted to demonstrate that his party had a philosophy with respect to the development of this Province, with respect to the development of natural resources.

MR. FLIGHT: \$3 billion in eight years.

MR. LUSH: Nobody on this side ever accused the PC Party, or the present government, for a lack of philosophy. Nobody on this side ever did that. Because let me assure hon. members, that is one thing they have, is a philosophy. They have a philosophy, Mr. Speaker, but the difference in the philosophy of the Liberal Party that the Premier was trying to degrade a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, the difference in that philosophy and the difference in the philosophy of the present PC Party today was that the Liberals acted upon their philosophy. They acted upon it, Mr. Speaker. They performed. They did something, Mr. Speaker. They performed.

The Premier did not say, Mr. Speaker, the Premier did not say in all of his denunciation of the Liberals back in the fifties, the Premier did not say that the unemployment rate at that particular time never exceeded 7 per cent. The Premier did not say that. The Premier did not say that the unemployment rate never exceeded 7 per cent. And today it is at 17 per cent. It is at 17 per cent. That is what the Premier did not say. Mr. Speaker, that is performance. That is performance.

MR. LUSH: The Premier talks about the increases in royalties. Mr. Speaker, all of that is relative. My salary in 1965 or my salary today -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are overpaid.

MR. LUSH: I am not getting nearly as much as I could get on the market, which is an awful lot more than hon. members on the other side can say.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should go back to work.

MR. LUSH: I may. But, Mr. Speaker, my salary today is eight times what it was in 1965, and that analogy is sufficient enough, Mr. Speaker, to undermine everything that the Premier said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: The ERCO deal, Mr. Speaker, is not as good as what it was under the Liberal administration; \$13 million a year we are subsidizing ERCO by, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: \$13 million every year.

MR. LUSH: \$13 million. So, Mr. Speaker, all of these figures are just simply relative. Naturally, if one adds up the incomes and the revenues from the royalties and this sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, if this government cannot show an increase from what it was in 1950 - What nonsense! But what does it mean to the government in today's dollars? That is what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, and there has been no change with ERCO. Mr. Speaker, there was no unemployment - He talked about the lack of a forestry policy - there was no unemployment in the forestry, Mr. Speaker, back in the 1950s. Gambo, Mr. Speaker, and Glovertown, communities in my district, were all viable communities with 100 per cent employment. What is it today? What nonsense, Mr. Speaker! The audacity and the effrontery of the Premier to get up and to make such nonsensical statements, Mr. Speaker! It is a wonder he did not get

MR. LUSH: up and talk about the increases in the number of cars that have come around and the increases in the number of refrigerators in people's homes. It is all relative, Mr. Speaker, but in terms of the actual dollars to this Province it does not mean a row of beans. The measure, Mr. Speaker, the criterion by which we measure this government, is take the unemployment statistics and compare them, when under a Liberal administration it never exceeded 7 per cent and today we are talking about 17 per cent. That is where they are, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: - a philosophy they have. We have never said they were without a philosophy. That is what they are expert at, Mr. Speaker. That is what they are good at, formulating philosophy, but they never act upon it. Performance, that is the measure, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the industrial development programme of the Liberals in the 1950s - and I do not want to dwell on that. I was not around, Mr. Speaker, but I was certainly a recipient, and my family and all of my relatives were recipients of the benefits, and they were able to earn a living, a decent living, which is what the people of this Province cannot do today. They were able to obtain employment, Mr. Speaker, which

MR. LUSH: the people of today cannot do, Mr. Speaker. And that is the measure, Mr. Speaker, I am not listening to the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), he does not understand Newfoundland in the slightest, He is one of several of his colleagues who thinks that Newfoundland ends at the overpass, Mr. Speaker. But there is a bigger Newfoundland out there, Mr. Speaker, were the recipients of the benefits of the Liberal Party industrial strategy and their philosophy in the '50s and in the '60, Mr. Speaker, and I would venture to say that they would rather go back to that today than to be suffering under a government that is doing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the Liberal administration will stand up to scrutiny, it will stand up to scrutiny. They could talk about the deal with ERCO, but let them announce some ERCOs in the Province, They are very proud of it today. Let them announce some mines in Labrador City and Wabush, Mr. Speaker, let them talk about the gypsum plant in Corner Brook, let them talk about the great Churchill development, Mr. Speaker, which most of them over there do not have one single clue about, not a single clue. They do not understand the magnitude of the job, not, Mr. Speaker, the first kind of clue. And, Mr. Speaker, by their performance now on this particular bill we are talking about, by their performance now we would never have had the Upper Churchill if these people had to be around. Mr. Speaker, what they are talking about, the Lower Churchill, is not even peanuts compared to the Upper Churchill. They cannot get off the ground with it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: In eight years they spent \$300 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. LUSH: They do not have the slightest idea, Mr. Speaker, what it involves. But, Mr. Speaker, this

MR. LUSH: resolution today, let me talk about this resolution today, Mr. Speaker, and this is another extension of the continuing saga of fed bashing. This is what it is, Mr. Speaker, just another political toy, it is a diversionary tactic, an attempt again to divert the public attention away from the lack of performance by this government. That is what it is, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: And they have been doing it, Mr. Speaker, for the past six or seven years. This is a smokescreen. Mr. Speaker, and the problem is -

MR. FLIGHT: Ask the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. LUSH: Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members - talk about support - they would wish that we would not support this particular bill, Mr. Speaker. That is what they would wish, Mr. Speaker, but we will support any bill, any legislation, any measure, Mr. Speaker, that is going to improve, that is going to be of benefit to the people of this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We will support any measure. Mr. Speaker, we supported all the major issues relating to the development of this Province - offshore, fisheries - we have supported them all. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we pioneered the measures that have been brought here, we pioneered them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: They are just going back, Mr. Speaker, and picking up the loose ends that we left. Back in the '50s, back in the '60s, Mr. Speaker, this was only trivia talking about -

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Fisheries is leaving, as usual. The Minister of Fisheries is going, he cannot stand the truth.

MR. LUSH: One thing, Mr. Speaker, this government has been consistent in, and that is in the enunciation and articulation of a philosophy, point number one. Point number two, which they have been very consistent in and that is, Mr. Speaker, always in a constant confrontation with Ottawa. That is point number two. But the irony of it is, they have never been consistent with respect to the issues that they have been in confrontation with Ottawa about, never consistent about it, Mr. Speaker, never consistent about it at all, just groping in the dark trying to find something whereby they can divert public attention away from their lack of performance, trying to deflect attention, that is what they have been doing, Mr. Speaker, and they have been swinging from one idea to the next - offshore, and that has been elaborated upon. Three items, Mr. Speaker, I thought that would be all over after the Constitution was brought down:

MR. LUSH: The offshore, Mr. Speaker, and the fisheries and the transmission of hydro power through Quebec. I thought, Mr. Speaker, when the constitution was brought down, when the constitution was solved, all of that was going to be over because the Premier made that his point, these three points, these major points as to why he was fearful of what was happening to the constitution. And he was not going to give in to all of those things, he assured us, until all of those things were written in stone within the constitution. And what happened, Mr. Speaker, what has happened? Here we find ourselves today still talking about those items. So the transmission of hydro power, we have come back to it again and we can elaborate on how the government have changed their position on it. But just on the offshore, it was ownership and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, when the Prime Minister of Canada made his offer, the offer by which now we are going to enter into negotiations, two years ago the Prime Minister made the offer, but the government ignored it, they ignored it and went on putting out propoganda, Mr. Speaker, and telling how we were going to get robbed in the offshore by using some figures that nobody knew where they came from. Well, Mr. Speaker, now they are going to go for a settlement, so they turned about-face on that one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the transmission of hydro power. Mr. Speaker, the point of the matter is that these hon. members opposite, they do not know what they are going after. They brought up this issue and they wanted a corridor through Quebec. What did the Prime Minister say? The Prime Minister went along with that. The Prime Minister said that would be done, if they found the markets.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, that was taken care of. But they are still ignoring that. And every issue the federal government has pulled the rug out from under them. What has happened? What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the federal government have been too, too co-operative with them. They have been trying to find an issue on which the federal government will not co-operate. But, Mr. Speaker, they have co-operated too much. They have co-operated on the offshore. And we know we are going to get a settlement on the offshore right along the lines that the Prime Minister mentioned. But now the Premier is trying to psyche up the people of Newfoundland to let them know what a great fight this is going to be.

He was quoted in the press as saying last night, 'We are making progress but do not expect an early settlement. No, no. Do not expect an early settlement. It is going to be Spring.' And in that time, Mr. Speaker, we can expect a beefing up of a campaign; how much work they are doing and how hard it is going to be to nail down an agreement with Ottawa, an agreement, Mr. Speaker, that, when it is in place, will be no different from what the Prime Minister offered.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear; Right on!

MR. LUSH: That is going to be it, Mr. Speaker. So they are wearing thin, Mr. Speaker, these arguments are wearing thin. And how hon. members could get up and put this resolution down today, Mr. Speaker, is incredible. It is incredible, Mr. Speaker, how a party could be groping in the dark, grappling for something to latch on to to try and take up the people's attention. It is absolutely ridiculous, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: absolutely ridiculous.
And as I have said, Mr. Speaker, they have not made clear what it is they want. They know that the corridor through Quebec is not economically feasible. They know that. The only way that power will come out of the Lower Churchill is through the existing power lines. That is the way it is going to be. So what have the federal government done? They have told them that the corridor is there, they will get the corridor when they get the markets, Mr. Speaker. They funded LCDC, \$15 million -

MR. FLIGHT: To the Province's \$10 million.

MR. LUSH: - then, Mr. Speaker, they give them \$200 million, \$200 million awarded in last year's budget, for the financing of the development of the Lower Churchill. Oh, but that is not enough, Mr. Speaker. The federal government, who we thought was a co-operative government in terms of helping this Province, all of a sudden they have become our nemesis, they have become our anathema. That is what happened, Mr. Speaker, to a government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Fisheries
(Mr. Morgan) is back.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) trying to impress (inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Fisheries
is back, he cannot stand the truth.

MR. HOLLETT: He does not understand what
is being said.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) you anyway.

MR. FLIGHT: When the Minister of
Fisheries does not know what a word means, he does not
like it.

MR. MORGAN: You are gone this time,
my boy, you are gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: When the Minister of
Fisheries does not understand a word, or does not know
the meaning of it, he does not like it.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the difference
with me and that hon. gentleman, when I am gone I will
find another job. There will be no difficulty for me
to find another job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: There will be no difficulty,
Mr. Speaker, there will be no difficulty in finding a job.

MR. MORGAN: You were turned down.

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Fisheries,
Mr. Speaker, if he does not understand a word, or he does
not know the meaning, he does not like it when you use it.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. LUSH: If the member wants to know
the truth I can show him two acceptances, if he wants
them.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) in the education
field, they would not have you.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

I would ask the hon. hte
Minister of Fisheries and the member for Windsor - Buchans -
(Mr. Flight) to please restrain themselves. The hon.
the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has the floor.

MR. HOLLETT: Ignore him, 'Tom'.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: the federal government have come through in every instance. They have now, Mr. Speaker, put \$15 million into LCDC. They offered the Province \$200 million but no, Mr. Speaker, that is not enough, that is not enough. They want now the federal government to do their negotiating for them because they know they cannot negotiate. Now they want them to do their negotiation with Premier Levesque, Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, to try and come up with some sort of an arrangement, some sort of a political arrangement to wheel our power through the existing power line. But they do not have the ability, Mr. Speaker, to negotiate and they expect the federal government to do this work for them. How much do they expect the federal government to do, Mr. Speaker? What do they expect them to do? One wonders why we have a government, why we have a provincial government. In 1977, Mr. Speaker, the former Premier announced that -

MR. MOORES: The Premier is back.

MR. FLIGHT: The Premier is back.

MR. MOORES: Come in and sit down with us.

MR. FLIGHT: Timing is everything, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORES: Go for broke.

MR. LUSH: - he had a deal with Premier Levesque, Mr. Speaker, to develop the hydro potential of Labrador jointly, that was in 1977, even though Levesque had said that we have agreed to disagree on certain matters. But it looked like they had something going, it looked like they had laid the foundation. But since this government came in, Mr. Speaker, since this government came in they have agreed to disagree on everything. So, Mr. Speaker, this motion is a lot of nonsense and, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member introduced this motion he demonstrated quite clearly that he did not understand what he was getting into.

MR. FLIGHT: Or what he was talking about.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, he gave figures that were ancient practically, figures that were ancient in terms of what the mil rate would be in developing the Lower Churchill, in terms of what the cost would be. Mr. Speaker, they were so outdated that I think the member did his research back before he got elected.

MR. FLIGHT: He did not talk to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. LUSH: It certainly was not very current, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, certainly the principle of the motion, certainly the principle of the bill we support. It is the tactics, it is the tactics that have been employed - session after session bringing in these issues, Mr. Speaker, that are nothing more than diversionary tactics, red herrings, just to direct public attention away from the lack of performance of this government.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) be looking for a job.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) could go down to my district now, from now until the time the election is called and he will not make one bit of difference. The whole Cabinet could go down, as they did the last time, and I increased my vote, Mr. Speaker, by 400 and this time I expect I will increase it by another 1000.

The hon. minister should be a little bit more concerned about his own district, Mr. Speaker, than talking about other people's district, if he should be a bit more concerned about that. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, this motion, certainly we support its principle, but the motion is not the kind of motion that we should be dealing with in this hon. House at this point in time. Mr. Speaker, there are so many other more important items that we should be dealing with because the hon. member knows why he brought in this motion. As I said it is just a continuation, it is just an extension of the saga that

December 2, 1981

Tape No. 3970

ah-3

MR. LUSH: we have been subjected to in this hon. House the past two or three years, it is just a continuing saga of fed-bashing, that is all, Mr. Speaker, a continuing saga of the confrontation

MR. LUSH: tactics that they have been using with the federal government in an attempt, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to disillusion and deceive the people of this Province. That is what it is all about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: A very poor memory.

MR. MORGAN: Or no memory

at all.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. MOORES: Bay of Islands?

MR. FLIGHT: Ah, the truth will out, 'Jim'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Every great man in history is known for some great deeds. Mr. Speaker, the present hon. Premier will be known in history for the great part he played in the Canadian Constitution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - which is done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Number two, for the offshore rights well underway, hopefully concluded early in the New Year. Number three, Lower Churchill Falls, not too far down the road.

MR. FLIGHT: Who said that in 1971, 'Luke'?

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would love to have the floor to myself, because this is so important a resolution I have prepared something, I am not saying anything off the cuff. So I would if you would be kind enough to let me have the floor, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. WOODROW: I would first of all, Mr. Speaker, like to congratulate my colleague, the member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) for placing this important Private Member's motion before this hon. House for our consideration and discussion.

I would find it very surprising, and I already have, if anyone present here today would disagree with the theme and trust of this resolution. Surely, Mr. Speaker, any Newfoundlander and Labradorian who has followed the ongoing impasse and frustration which has shrouded this issue, would agree with this Province's right to fair and equal treatment in the transmission of its energy resource.

AN HON. MEMBER: A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! There is a quorum call

MR. HOUSE: There were fourteen here when he called the quorum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER I will ask the Clerk to count the members present.

We have a quorum.

The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I will not make any comment on that quorum call.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! We have a point of order?

MR. WOODROW: I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins).

DR. COLLINS: Thank you. I have a very brief point of order, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that a member may call for a quorum call and then he may leave the House, he may not stand in, so I have no quarrel with that. But when the hon. member opposite called for a quorum call not only did he leave but many of his colleagues left too. Now, I

December 2, 1981

Tape 3971

PK - 3

DR. COLLINS: do not think that is according to the rules of this House. I think that is a rather despicable act, it was designed to interfere with my hon. friend's right to speak in this House, and I think that is completely out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To that point of order,

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): the Chair has no control as to who comes and goes in the House, but just to see that there is a quorum present.

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I will not make any comment on the quorum call, I will leave that to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador when the next election is called.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Surely, Mr. Speaker, any Newfoundlander and Labradorian who has followed the ongoing impasse and frustration which has shrouded this issue, would agree with this Province's right to fair and equal treatment in the transmission of its energy resources. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, virtually all of our people have voiced their support of and encouragement for our Premier's diligent stand on resource development and his energetic efforts to put forward our Province's needs and aspirations, which are, Mr. Speaker, unquestionably tied to the development of our rich natural resources.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be associated with this government and I can assure this House that we shall continue, Mr. Speaker, to press ahead until we have secured equality of treatment within the Canadian family, nothing more or nothing less.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, we are living in an energy-hungry world. International economics and politics have demonstrated that foreign oil supplies are not secure and that low-cost energy is a thing of the past.

Whilst most provinces have no other alternative energy supplies and are, for the most

MR. WOODROW: part, dependent on oil and gas and other non-renewable energy sources, Newfoundland and Labrador, as we all know, does possess attractive alternatives. Mr. Speaker, Newfoundland and Labrador is blessed with an abundant supply of hydro-electric power, energy which is renewable, reliable and stable, energy which is in great demand throughout the Province, the nation and the United States.

Despite the tremendous potential offered by the planned development of our hydro resources, it is both alarming and distressing to witness the growing dependence on oil generated electricity. Let members think that one over.

Mr. Speaker, central to our future hydro strategy is the renegotiation of the Upper Churchill contract, of which the Province of Quebec, it appears, our sister province, under the direction of Premier Levesque, is intent on reaping excessive profits - it almost makes me sick and vomit when I have to talk about it - on the backs of the people of our Province!

The existing contract price of Upper Churchill power sold to Quebec is less than 3 mils per kilowatt hour. This price declines slightly over the first forty years of the contract and drops even further for the last twenty-five years of the contract.

Mr. Speaker, this has been said over and over again, but we have to emphasize it. At present the normal market price for power would range within 30 and 40 mils per kilowatt hour -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. WOODROW: - which means that the market value of the electricity sold to Quebec from the Upper Churchill is now between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion annually. Today, if we had our rights, Mr.

MR. WOODROW:

Speaker, we would not have any sales tax in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, -

MR. STIRLING:

And that is our fault? That is our fault?

MR. WOODROW:

Not exactly your fault, no it is not. Many of you were not even around in those days.

Mr. Speaker, the contract gives Quebec the equivalent of 5,000,000 barrels of oil a year at the rate of \$1.80 a barrel, not too bad. Hardly fair and equal treatment. Mr. Speaker, coupled with this unjust and unrealistic situation is Quebec's insistence that any power from Newfoundland must be sold to it or its agents at the border. Is this standard practice for other commodities that are subject to international trade, whether they be oil, automobiles, fish etc.? No, Mr. Speaker. It is an accepted principle that oil and gas can be transported inter-provincially by pipeline free from interference. Who is it then that the federal government - rather, I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, why is it then that the federal government seems unwilling to exercise this authority through the National Energy Board to allow for the transmission of hydro power through neighbouring provinces in the same manner as oil and gas transmission is now present?

MR. HISCOCK:

In what way?

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW:

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman spoke, from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), I did not disrupt him. I did not interfere, excuse me, and not only that but, in fact, I was under the impression that he gave a good speech. But now I think- he is an expert on it. I am not such an expert as he is. I think he should give me

MR. WOODROW: the right—if I am saying anything wrong, well, there is a time for him to correct what I am saying, but not while I am speaking.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!
The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

For the second time, I would ask the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) to restrain himself.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, the question begs to be answered. How can it be that a province with massive undeveloped hydro power must find in excess of 30 per cent of the Island's electrical requirements from expensive imported oil? You know, Mr. Speaker, I think, roughly speaking, we are getting 44 per cent of our energy from the Holyrood station which is run by oil, as you know, forcing escalated -

MR. STAGG: Seventy-seven per cent.

MR. WOODROW: How much, 77 per cent?—forcing escalated electricity rates in the vicinity of 130 per cent from 1973 to 1980. Ask residents who have installed electric heat in their homes if they are finding it increasingly difficult to pay their heating bills.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, in a Province boasting one of the largest hydro electric facilities in the world, boasting unlimited hydro development potential. Mr. Speaker, we must get on with the job. And let me go on to say, Mr. Speaker, I think when it comes to fishery, when it comes to hydro, these things that are so important to all our people, I think we have to lay our political beliefs aside, we have to join together as Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: That is the important thing, join together as Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Get on with the job. If you want to join the NDP or the communists or what have you, that is up to yourselves, but I think when it comes to the important resource of our Province we have to say yes, when we would like to say no.

Mr. Speaker, we must get on with the job of developing our hydro resources to provide the energy required for industrial growth and economic expansion. Mr. Speaker, how in the name of goodness are we going to get an aluminum smelter somewhere in the Province unless we have the power? I would say it is certainly contingent on getting the power, not to mention for providing the homeowner with a secure stable priced energy source.

I know, Mr. Speaker, it is hard for people to listen to the truth but, you know, we are doing very good. We are getting there. As of today there is in excess

MR. WOODROW:

of 5,300 megawatts of energy running into the ocean every day, unused, the equivalent of another 60 million tons of oil a year that could be used to benefit Canada, running away due to federal government inaction.

Mr. Speaker, I am hearing Ottawa bashing. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, what are we going to do? Are we just going to give everything away? If our Premier just went up and said, "Okay, we will take what you offer us." I feel sure if the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) was the Premier of this Province today, I am sure he would want to get a good deal for his Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: That will never happen.

MR. WOODROW: I know it will never happen but, by the same token, I think that our Premier is admired today all over this Province for the continual fight he is putting up -

AN HON. MEMBER: All over Canada too.

MR. WOODROW: All over Canada, absolutely - to get a better deal for his Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: All over the world.

MR. WOODROW: It is obvious, Mr. Speaker that there will not be any movement from the Province of Quebec. To quote Premier Levesque-parle français Mr. Speaker, en anglais-" If we were robbed in 1927, by God it was only simple justice to get some of our own back by getting the lowest possible price for their power." Indeed, what kind of negotiation can we expect from a Premier who hints the possibility of sabotage? He already hinted that he would sabotage the wires, or the power going through Quebec. Should the hydro power move through Quebec -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, real compromise and co-operation. That is some co-operation. Given such intransigence on the part of Quebec, and their obvious indifference to any settlement, Ottawa has the responsibility to remind Quebec that this is a country, not a string of independent nations, and to use its authority to give our Province a transmission corridor for its power. And this is where we all can unite together.

By God, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see the people of this Province down the road starved or anything else. I am sure all members of this House want to see a good deal given them, and on this particular issue why can we not join together and be as one voice going up to the people in Ottawa?

We will not continue to be held up for ransom. Markets are available in the New England States, and other places. Revenues are desperately needed. 120 million barrels of oil a year continue to flow away unused - wasted, Mr. Speaker. I say it is a national disgrace. No where else in the world would it be tolerated. This message has filtered out from one end of this country to the other, yet the inaction continues. The federal draft bill is uncertain, to say the least. It may not be submitted to the House of Commons for some time and in its present form simply does not go far enough. Well, in fact, Mr. Speaker, I think here is a place where we could, especially the members of the Opposition, talk with the hon. Mr. Rompkey. He is one of the Cabinet ministers. In fact, with all the members -

MR. FLIGHT: He is a good man.

MR. WOODROW: Absolutely. I travelled with him recently to Ottawa. I am not saying there is anything wrong with him. But here is, in fact, where he can be very effective in helping this bill get through the House as quickly as possible.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, we will continue to press for an equitable solution. It is too important to the future of this Province to simply rely on the good will of others. We have started to take the initiative and I look forward to unanimous support for this resolution, which is in the interest of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Mr. Speaker, I have said just about all I wanted to say. I am delighted to have had the opportunity -

MR. FLIGHT:

By leave. By leave.

MR. WOODROW:

words.

No. No. - to have a few

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

for Bay of Islands has the floor.

Order, please! The hon. member

MR. WOODROW:

I will say it again, I will keep on saying it, I think that

MR. WOODROW:

there are certain things, you know, in a Province,
where all of us have to unite together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: We have to lay partisan politics
aside -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - and unite to work in the
interests of the people of our Province. That, to my mind,
is what politics is all about, in fact, it is trying to
help people. At least, that is my impression of it, and
I shall continue to use my -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Is the hon. member cluing up his speech?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. WOODROW: Well, I would say to that,
Mr. Speaker, one time when Peter was talking to Christ
he said, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words
of eternal life."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: I do not think there is much to
go to.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) to us.

MR. WOODROW: If that is the end of it -
it is not the end. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to
the Leader of the Opposition that I do not think that
this resolution is any joke, and I wish sometimes,
Mr. Speaker, that we had television in this House so
then the people would really see what is going on here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Well, it probably is. In any
case, Mr. Speaker, I thank you and I hope that this
resolution will be unanimous. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: A good speech, 'Luke'!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. the member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, we thank the hon. the member for Bay of Islands district for his usual good, liberal-minded, open-minded speech. He always makes a very significant contribution to the arguments of our side of the House, in fact.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the substance of my few remarks, that consistently since this debate has started, except for when the Premier spoke, there have been more members from the Opposition side of the House in the House than on the government side, and if that then is the importance, or if that reflects or indicates the importance with which the government views this resolution of one of its own members, then certainly we here on the Opposition side have nothing to be coy about in our remarks.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, where the bastion of intellectualism is, namely, the Premier. He spoke for ten or fifteen minutes and then gallivanted out of the House as quickly as he could go, came in with some specious, spurious remarks about a period of history that I cannot recall. I read about it occasionally in history books. I was not very old at the time, I believe I was in kindergarten or Grade I or something like that, as were most of the members of this new Liberal Party, which presently happens to be in Opposition but will not be for that much longer if the Premier of this Province continues to convey through this hon. House the type of pseudo intellectualism that he has purveyed here this afternoon.

He talked about, for instance - and I have no wish, Mr. Speaker, to defend the Smallwood

December 2, 1981

Tape 3975

EC - 3

MR. MOORES: years in this Province, in
fact, I cannot be identified with it so why should
I wish to identify with it any more than with the
Squires years or the Alderdice years or the Puddester
years?

MR. MOORES: What I would hope to point out though, Mr. Speaker, is that in the Premier's usual zeal to convey insignificant points to mislead and deceive again by establishing some theme, a red-herring theme in his speech, he failed to really understand, when he was talking about rubber plants and chocolate factories and that type of thing, he really failed to understand what the Liberal administration of the time was, in fact, involved in. And very simply what they had done was taken a look at the marketing system of Canada upon their entry into Confederation, and tried to offset the consumption of the Newfoundland consumer - pardon the pun - the consumption by the Newfoundland consumer by the secondary manufacturing provinces of Ontario and Quebec. And Smallwood failed to do that because he did not realize that these powers of capitalism that had been established for hundreds of years in Canada, just could not be overpowered by a small province with a generally unimportant economic policy.

But at least, Mr. Speaker, the Smallwood years provided us with something tangible. Whether it was failure or success, it was something tangible that we can look at today, that we can evaluate and analyze, and that, in fact, we can learn from.

Now in the eight years of Tory administration in this Province, first under Frank Moores, the Machiavelli of all time in Newfoundland politics, and now under the Peckford administration, we have seen no action whatsoever. You cannot learn anything from them except that you can perhaps be successful in doing a lot of talking but actually doing nothing in reality, successful in the sense that for some reason or other I cannot understand why they continue to get re-elected. An objective assessment, not a political assessment but an objective assessment of the way that this PC administration in eight years has handled the hydro development of this Province, will prove to you, Mr. Speaker, that they have done nothing but

MR. MOORES: In this House, in this Province today and talk about chocolate factories and rubber plants the whole of which, the whole loss of which, financial loss to this Province was considered peanuts. And even though it failed it was an exercise well intended, an economic policy that was on a good course but eventually became a failure, ran aground because of extraneous factors, by the way, not because of internal ones. Even the Valdmanis affair could not be considered to be that detrimental to the policy itself.

MR. J. CARTER: Let us hear it for Valdmanis. All stand.

MR. MOORES: What has it cost, Mr. Speaker?
The hon. member for St. John's North (J. Carter) asked what it cost, the Smallwood years. I do not know. You were here. You were a member of the House at the time. I was not here.

MR. FLIGHT: You propped up Frank Moores for a few years, too, when he was costing the Province a few dollars.

MR. MOORES: I was not here. I think there are two or three of the eighteen of us over here who were here at the time and even then my friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) and my friend from Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) were only involved for a few years, three or four or five of twenty-five or thereabout. I fail to see the point of that criticism which tends to be repeated far too often in the year 1981.

MR. ROBERTS: Because they have nothing better to think about.

MR. MOORES: That is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: We want to hear what Alderdice did to drive the country bankrupt in 1932.

MR. MOORES: Sure.

MR. ROBERTS: The last Tory government we had.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: The Minister of Forestry (Mr.Power) might be able to comment on that.

MR.ROBERTS: (inaudible) memoirs has John Carter's name as alive and living.

MR.SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please! I would suggest we are beginning to stray a little bit.

MR. MOORES: It is though, Mr.Speaker, I might add, an experience to sit here and see how members opposite, particularly those who were Liberals for many years in the Smallwood regime, including the Premier by the way - I worked with the Premier in 1969 when he supported John Crosbie for the leadership of the Liberal party.

MR. ROBERTS: When it was convenient to be a Liberal. When it was convenient for him.

MR. MOORES: That is right. And there are a few others, I might add, on the other side of the House, including the member for Harbour Grace (Mr.Young), the member for Gander (Mrs Newhook). The member for Gander was a good Liberal for many, many years.

MR. ROBERTS: The member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) was on the executive over, there was he not?

MR. MOORES: That is true. But the point is, the point that I am trying to make in this conversation is all that is irrelevant, Mr. Speaker, where people were or were not twenty years ago. I am alive and well in this House now and hoping to make some type of contribution as are a number of others here. I am not concerned with the member for St. John's North (J.Carter), with what dribble and old venom he throws out at Smallwood. I mean, how does that concern me? What does it do for education in this Province today? What does it do for the development of hydro power in this Province today? What does it do to

MR. MOORES: help increase the amount of security for our children and our children's children? What kind of old dribble and nonsense do we have to put up with? And I should have known, or at least the Premier should have known better than to get up in this House today and use it. I mean, does the member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) - how can you respect the man -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh he writes his Premier's speech.

MR. MOORES: - when he gets up in the House and uses that kind of defence or that kind of support for your own resolution? I mean, all that it indicated to me, all that it indicated to me, a person who is here on this side of the House listening to the first minister of this Province try to espouse at least some logical explanation for the development of hydro power, it just indicates to me how stupid the man is; he has the mind of a pedagogue rather than one of a statesman. And that is unfortunate, because it is not only the member for Carbonear who has realized that, it is the people of Canada who have seen what is going on in this confrontation attitude with Ottawa. I mean, the man comes down here, the Premier of

MR. MOORES: Newfoundland comes down here - just stop for a minute and see what kind of an ego problem this is, how ego-maniacal this is, for a premier to come down to Newfoundland and take pats on the back from his colleagues, and from anyone else who was foolish enough to give it to him, for the creation of the agreements that led to the constitutional package we have now.

And Macleans magazine - I had them in front of me the other day- in Macleans magazine, the Toronto Globe and Mail and the Montreal paper, the Star or whatever it is, went down through it detailed event by event and do you know what they finally realized?

MR. FLIGHT: You are being led by an ego-maniac, my son.

MR. MOORES: They finally realized that Premier Peckford was the next premier likely to go to the polls.

MR. FLIGHT: Sure. You are being led by an ego-maniac.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: No, it does not matter - listen -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: You are being led by an ego-maniac.

MR. MOORES: That is the one. You just read through it.

But it does not matter, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to argue the point. I mean, you people can continue to believe what you want to believe, it is entirely up to you. What I am trying to point out to you is that you are just as silly as the Premier to believe it when we all know that there were some very important steps in that constitutional crisis that were solved by civil servants, that is to say, people who were backing up the First Ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Inaudible.

MR. MOORES:

No, I rephrase that. McMurtry of Ontario and Romanow of Saskatchewan were not civil servants in the strict sense of the word, but in this case they were support people to the First Ministers. And it is just amazing Mr. Speaker, how the Premier of this Province could get up today on such a significant, in my opinion, significant and important resolution, brought before this House by one of his own colleagues, in fact his Parliamentary Assistant, get up and defend it and/or support it by referring to 1955 or 1957, and then gave all the losses of the Smallwood years without giving the other half of the story. For every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. For every school that was built, for every hospital, every road, etc., etc., for every function there is a disfunction. That is logical. If you do not do anything, how can you do anything wrong?

MR. FLIGHT:

Listen to the Common Room.
Listen to the Government common Room. You can tell how serious they are taking this debate.

MR. MOORES:

Just amazing.

MR. FLIGHT:

Who is passing the wine now? I wonder.

MR. MOORES:

The Premier of this Province will go down in history. Some student from Memorial in fifty years will say he was the Albert Camus of Newfoundland politics -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS:

What have you got against Camus?

MR. MOORES:

- he dealt only with existentialist matters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT:

That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: I think you are being very hard on Camus, he is not here to defend himself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: And that is the Premier, the great existentialist Premier. He created nothing of substance -

MR. ROBERTS: Intellectual incestuosity is what the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MOORES: He created nothing of substance. He talked and he talked and he talked until none could bother to listen.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, after that vicious personal attack I will try and raise the tone of debate a little.

The resolution has been put on the Order Paper by my colleague, 'Mr. Doyle', and since it is about hydro power it is unfortunate that any discussion of hydro power by its very nature has to be somewhat technical. We are dealing with almost another language, we have units of power, amps, ohms, volts, gauss. These are all units that are taken after the names of individuals who have done the pioneer work in the field of electricity. And I thought perhaps for convenience, it might be useful to extend that idea into the realm of politics and we could perhaps have one Lush - the unit of foolishness; one Stirling - the unit of vulgarity; one Tulk - the unit of lowness; one Bennett - a unit of sloth; one Roberts - a unit of hate; I can go on and on and on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: I suggest to members that the list is only as short as their imagination. Our Premier certainly rubbed a nerve in his magnificent and very carefully researched speech that he gave, part last Wednesday and the other part this Wednesday. And I certainly would like to compliment him, but at the same time I would like to point out that I thought the Opposition was very low in its unwillingness to hear him out. Whereas he had gone through a great deal of trouble to prepare a very comprehensive document, because of spurious points of order he was unable to finish it. However, there is enough material there for several speeches, so I am sure the text of it will be heard not only in this House but printed outside. I would recommend that hon. gentlemen read it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CARTER: Yes, it should certainly be sent around. You know, as I say, he certainly rubbed a nerve, because the loud speech from the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) whose name escapes me for the moment - the man who never visits his

MR. CARTER: district - he certainly shouted and roared and one could not get a word - even his own colleagues apparently could not get a word in edgewise.

This resolution -

AN HON. MEMBER: A quorum call, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

We have a quorum call.

MR. CARTER: Do we have a quorum?

AN HON. MEMBER: No quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: I will ask the Clerk to count the members.

We have a quorum.

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

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The only unfortunate thing about this resolution is that when I looked at it I could not help but see that it was introduced by my colleague, 'Mr. Doyle'. And whenever I see the name 'Doyle' I do not think of my colleague, 'Norman Doyle' -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

You refer to members by their district rather than by name.

MR. CARTER: I am sorry, out of order.

I think of the industrialist, the carpetbagger, John C. Doyle. And, of course, I only wish that we had a chance to re-negotiate some of the giveaways we gave him. We could re-negotiate here in Newfoundland or New York, but apparently he is not able to visit that part of the world. In fact -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: - if you look at a map of the world and use a colouring pencil, there are not too many parts of the world he can visit without grave risk to his freedom. And while I am on the subject of Mr. Doyle, the carpetbagger not the member, I would like to wonder aloud why the Memorial University named residences after fugitives from justice. We have a

December 2, 1981

Tape No. 3979

SD - 3

MR. CARTER:

Doyle House - are we later on to have a Alcatraz House and perhaps a Sing Sing House? I think it is high time that name was changed and I do no mind saying it publicly. By the way, speaking of industrialization, today is December 2nd, and I would like to call hon. members' notice to the fact that today is the tenth anniversary of the promise of the fourth mill for the fifth time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: And I think as such it should be noted: The tenth anniversary of the promise of the fourth mill for the fifth time.

MR. FLIGHT: That is the Come By Chance (inaudible).

MR. CARTER: No. No. The fourth mill, which was a paper mill of some kind I believe. I forget. The former, former Premier was never clear. As long as he was strutting and promising he was usually happy. He seemed to require that kind of activity to keep him in health.

MR. STAGG: That was the Liberal philosophy of the '50s.

MR. CARTER: That is right.

MR. STAGG: The member for Terra

Nova -

MR. CARTER: But I would say that the Liberal performance, industrially, is consistent with their philosophy, which is nothing: Believe nothing, listen to nothing, perform nothing. And here I would like to quote from the last part of the Premier's speech which he unfortunately was not able to deliver because of the constraints of time, and the vicious attack by the Opposition. But I certainly give full credit. And this is as follows, quoting. And I am perfectly willing to table it, Mr. Speaker, if necessary.

"The present Liberal Party has never disassociated themselves from this kind of economic development philosophy"-the give-away economic philosophy. "Indeed they have preoccupied themselves with defending the Libera era in this Province and all the failures, waste and corruption associated with it. Moreover, many of the same old,"

MR. CARTER: and I am adding here--tired "faces, are still sitting in the Liberal benches. This is the alternative government that Newfoundlanders have confronting them. God save us. God guard thee Newfoundland." And I have heard nothing from any of the members. You know. I wish, if they wish to clean their record and get up and - I will gladly take my seat if they want to get up and disassociate themselves from the worst aspects of the Liberal government. But however -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order! Order!

AN HON. MEMBER: Confession is good for the soul.

MR. CARTER: Also, while we are talking about this resolution, this resolution deals largely with the transmission of hydro power. Now, by use of high voltage and direct current and various exotic technologies, it is felt it may even be possible some day to transmit power without wires. And I must say, although it seems to be far, far in the future, the notion does appeal to me because not only - there is a certain appeal about not only transmitting power through Quebec, but also through Quebecers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CARTER: And I can think of transmitting power through certain Liberal districts, particularly the Strait of Belle Isle.

One of the big problems facing Newfoundland Hydro apparently -

MR. LUSH: Is that a speech the hon. member is making or what?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I listened patiently and quietly and decently while the hon. gentleman quivered and quaked and reacted to the Premier's - shivered and shook and reacted to the Premier's speech. This is the member, by the

MR. CARTER: way, Mr. Speaker, who apparently never visits his district, who does not know any of the members of his district, does not know them even by name. You know, he does not live in his district. The connection he has with his district is very tenuous. And yet he has the gall to stand up in this House and try to represent it. His name escapes me for the moment. He is sitting opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Hush, I - no, 'Mr. Lush'.
Well, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that I certainly would like to be associated with those who support this resolution, and I hope that in time Quebec will come to its senses. I believe the news is good on the horizon, and I would like to hear from the legal gentlemen in this House, of which we have a fair sprinkling, some efficient, some perhaps not so efficient, some friendly, some not so friendly. However, all of them very learned, and I would like to hear from them what their prediction is of the water reversion rights. As a layman I have to profess that I do not understand all the nuances, but I think that I understand enough to understand that there is some hope at the end of the tunnel, some light at the end of the tunnel. So on that happy note I will take my seat and listen while the members opposite, perhaps, abuse the government a little further.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Mr. Speaker, stimulated by the rousing oratory of the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) with his provocative, deep-ranging insights into the problems of the day - he told us everything he knew about the resolution; it is too bad he did not take an extra minute - we would have given him leave on this side - and told us everything he knows about everything else as well.

MR. CARTER: I tried to raise the tone of the debate.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from Mount Scio tells us he tried to raise the tone, and I have no doubt that in his eyes he did, in fact, try to raise the tone. And I would say to him, compared to his usual performance, that he did in fact raise the tone of what he does.

But let us come back to the debate because the resolution is an important one. It is an important one more for what it does not say than for what it does say, but it is important because it deals with one of the important problems that confronts this Province today and it speaks of one of the important opportunities that lies before us if we can but reach out and grab it.

Now, the resolve part, when we take aside the balderdash, the window dressing, the for once relatively non-partisan - but the preparatory stuff; the gentleman from Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) is much better at drafting than most of his colleagues and he has not filled the preamble with a lot of highfalutin, partisan, nit-picking nonsense, but instead has stated a series of propositions that I think are

MR. ROBERTS: probably generally acceptable, because I believe they are generally regarded as being correct. And he has come to a conclusion that I, for one, adopt and I believe my colleagues on this side have earlier said that they are prepared to support this, to uphold the Province's right to fair and equal treatment in the transmission of its energy resources. Now, that is something that every Newfoundlander and every Labradorian can speak about, it is something that every Newfoundlander and every Labradorian can support. We support it.

A couple of other points ought to be made though, Mr. Speaker. While I do not intend to muck, rake over the past - if gentlemen opposite want me to I can, I can either talk about some of the triumphs, some of the tragedies of the Smallwood administration, and there were both. Or I can talk about some of the triumphs - there were one or two - of the Moores years and talk about the tragedies which were many more.

I am much more concerned with where we go from here and with learning from the lessons of the past.

The gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) spoke of the Water Rights Reversion Act. It is now before our Court of Appeal. It has been argued, the lawyers have had their say and the judges have - as I understand it, I was not over in the court but I was told about it and I read about it in the press - the lawyers have argued the case and the judges have reserved their decision. The three judges heard it, Mr. Justice Morgan, Mr. Justice Gushue and the Chief Justice of Newfoundland, Mr. Justice Mifflin who, of course, is a former member of this House, who sat with distinction for what was then the district of Trinity North. That district was a little different

MR. ROBERTS: from the present district of Trinity North. But Chief Justice Mifflin, of course, sat for, I believe, two terms if memory serves me - elected in 1956 through 1959; he was re-elected in 1962 and then he resigned his seat and Max Lane became the Liberal candidate and was returned in a by-election after the 1962 election.

At any rate, the judges have heard the case and they will give us their opinion when they are ready to do so and that will tell us exactly where we stand. I could only offer my own opinion, for what it is worth; I think it is worth something but there may be those who differ. I think that the act is intra vires the Legislature of this Province, that it is a constitutional enactment and that it is valid legislation.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and I agree on that. It leaves no doubt in our minds that the legislation is good law, it is within the powers of this Legislature, and that is all the courts are looking at. The courts look not at whether it is wise or unwise, that is not their prerogative, that is not their role. What the Chief Justice and his colleagues are examining is whether that legislation is within the constitutional powers of this Legislature. I happen to believe it is and I also happen to believe that it is a wise piece of legislation, that in fact it is -

MR. ROBERTS: that the Water Rights Reversion Act, and we supported it for the kind of reasoning which I am outlining—that it is the way to go. I think it is the way to cut the Gordian knot. It is the way to end a situation that has become manifestly unfair and become intolerable. And while I am as prepared as anybody to believe that a contract is a contract and we must treat contracts with great seriousness and accord them great weight, there do come times when contracts are so inequitable that they ought to be renegotiated. And that is essentially what has happened to the Upper Churchill contract.

I do not think I need to go on at any length. If somebody wants to say oh, well, what about the contract that was signed, and what a terrible mistake it was, I will agree it was a mistake. But I also point out again for the record—and it is worth saying, because it is true—that nobody back in 1966, the parties to the contract, the advisers to the contract, or the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, which was not a party to that contract, nobody foresaw what would happen to the price of energy. And that is what has made the contract inequitable, the fact that the price of energy has skyrocketed. In those days fuel oil was \$1.90 a barrel. I can recall the Come By Chance feasibility studies the independent ones done by Parson's Engineering in Los Angeles, California which pointed out that the price of fuel oil had not changed for thirty odd years, \$1.90 U.S. a barrel. And now, of course, what is it? \$38 or \$40, in round numbers, on the world market. And that is what has happened to the price of energy, it has skyrocketed, it has gone up, say, twenty times over the interval.

So for those who want to de-
cry the Churchill contract, I mean it is a sterile exercise. If it makes them feel better, fine and dandy. It is about as

MR. ROBERTS: useful in any real sense as pulling wings off a fly, and about as relevant. But what we can learn from, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is what went on with the power policy of the administration of this Province after about 1971 -1972. And I think this is relevant, I will say to my friend for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), because before we can urge the Government of Canada, as I believe we ought to urge the Government of Canada, to give us fair and equal treatment in the transmission of the energy resources, we have first of all got to put our own house in order. And let us look back at what was done, what was done by the Government of this Province. Now I have only got twenty minutes, ten, twelve of them are left, I do not know, but not a great deal is left, so I cannot go into it in detail, but let me say, Mr. Speaker, that what I say is supportable in detail, and, in fact, is unarguable either in general or in detail.

What I want to say is that the Moores' administration power policy consisted of two separate actions: One was a deliberate attempt to mislead the people of this Province -

MR. HISCOCK: And they got away with it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, they got a way with it for an election only because a certain elderly gentleman did not have the brains to stay out of the election, otherwise they would not have gotten away with it- but a deliberate attempt to mislead the people in this Province back in 1975, a deliberate attempt to mislead them, To mislead them on what? To mislead them into believing that the development of the Lower Churchill Falls project was about to go ahead. And \$100 odd million was wasted deliberately and knowingly -

MR. CARTER: That is unparliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not unparliamentary, Sir. What the government, of which the hon. gentleman was such a proud adornment, did was unparliamentary. What the government did was deliberately mislead the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Deliberately.

MR. CARTER: They tried and could not pull it off.

MR. ROBERTS: They tried and could not pull it off. No, Sir. They tried - the only reason they pulled it off was a certain elderly gentleman helped them for whatever reasons. He did not help them to help them, he helped them to hurt others, which he may have seen as hurting himself.

We had the spectacle of the mountaintops being blown off on both sides of the Strait of Belle Isle, a \$100 million. And our debt today includes the \$100 million.

MR. CARTER: The explosions did not cost \$100 million.

MR. ROBERTS): I am sorry?

MR. CARTER: The explosions did not cost \$100 million.

MR. ROBERTS: The explosions. The explosions did not cost \$100 million, no, but the whole deliberate attempt to pretend, The government knew full well that the Lower Churchill project could not go ahead and yet they went ahead pretending it, holding it up, and then of course the balloon exploded just two or three days after the election, it had served

MR. ROBERTS: its purpose. But that deliberate attempt to mislead was one of two steps. And I am not saying they were all done with conscious thought. I do not think that is what happened. I think the government in 1975 was desperate to get re-elected, nearly as desperate as this present government will be. You mark my words now. I do not know when the election will come. Whenever the Premier has a brain storm, an aberration in his neurons and he goes down to Government House. And he is entitled to a dissolution, and His Honour, I have no doubt, will give the Premier a dissolution whenever the Premier so advises. And that is the way it ought to be in this system.

MR. CARTER: Your hero torpedoed you in 1975.

MR. ROBERTS: My hero torpedoed me.

MR. CARTER: In 1975.

MR. ROBERTS: What has Beowulf the Ready got to do with the - I say to the gentleman for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Premier Smallwood.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Smallwood in 1975 did -

MR. CARTER: - as an Independent Liberal -

MR. ROBERTS: I have no quarrel with what the gentleman for St. John's North has said. I think the Liberals would have won the election if it had been a straight fight between the Tories and the Liberals.

MR. CARTER: Except for Premier Smallwood.

MR. ROBERTS: Former Premier Smallwood. Mr. Smallwood did what he wanted to do as he always did. He did-what he did, he had the legal right to do, and whatever the wisdom of it, Frank Moores was Premier by virtue of Joseph R. Smallwood. But that is history. I am not trying to rewrite the history. It is only the gentleman for St. John's North who tries to rewrite history.

MR. ROBERTS: What I am saying is that before the 1975 spectacle we had an earlier spectacle, and this is where we have gone astray in the power policy in this Province. Because the government moved to nationalize the Churchill Falls. And of all the stupid blunders, of all the colossal blunders that John Crosbie has bequeathed to this Province - and they are numerous, the list of Mr. Crosbie's sins of blunders, the list of his blunders is a very long one - the decision to buy the Upper Churchill project, actually to buy 57 per cent of the shares of CFLCo, which is what we actually did buy, that decision was one of the great blunders of our time.

The fact is that the money which we paid for that, we the people paid, which is in our debt today, the money which we paid will never be recovered by the people of this Province. It is gone as a monument to colossal bad judgement, and it is gone to an effort to use hydro power and power for electoral purposes - not electrical, electoral.

MR. CARTER: Rubbish!

MR. ROBERTS: Rubbish, is it? Rubbish?

The hon. gentleman for Pleasantville had not surfaced from the bowels of the telephone company at the time all this happened, and the gentleman for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) was part and parcel of it. So I will not hear them.

DR. COLLINS: He did not say anything.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

DR. COLLINS: He did not say anything.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then he can go back to the bowels of the telephone company and good luck to him. I did him a disservice of thinking he said something and I should know better. The Minister of Labour seldom says anything at all. That may be why he does so well compared to the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) who has never learned

MR. ROBERTS: that while there may be thousands who believe he is a fool, nobody is certain of it until he opens his mouth and proves it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying -

DR. COLLINS: I am safe with you.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Finance, if he has anything to say, let him reveal the truth of his mini budget. That is what we want from him. What we want from the Minister of Finance, Sir, is some information.

DR. COLLINS: We did not hear these stories when Mr. Crosbie was in the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman for St. John's South (Dr. Collins) can go back and look at the Hansards and he will find that everything I have said today I have said before at much greater length. And then, as today, Sir, it was exactly as if I was throwing pearls before swine. There is nothing new in what I have said.

DR. COLLINS: That is the fourteenth cliché so far.

MR. ROBERTS: They have the fourteenth cliché, Sir. A cliché is simply a truth that has been repeated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to come back, as I am trying to, to the motion of my friend from Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), which I think is a good motion. Where we went astray - and I think my friend ought to be very careful,

MR. ROBERTS: My friend ought to take heed of what has happened in the past - where we went astray in the past was playing politics, and I have got nothing against politics, that is the way the system works, but playing politics with our hydro power policy, using it simply for political purposes. This administration has not done that yet; they are trying to do it, I fear, and I think it would be a mistake. Because I say to my friend from Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) that I believe - and I think the record supports this - that the Government of Canada are prepared to uphold this Province's right to fair and equal treatment in the transmission of its energy resources. In fact, I would suggest to my friend from Harbour Main - Bell Island that the Government of Canada have announced that they will bring into Parliament a legislative enactment which will enable this Province to move its energy resources across an adjoining province, the Province of Quebec, if, in fact, that is necessary, and I think it is necessary to finance the project.

What the government have to do, Sir, is to come clean, is to stop pretending. They have to start telling us, for example, what it will cost to develop the Lower Churchill, how they propose to raise that money and how they propose to use the power. We have not had a statement on that. We have not had any clear exposition of it. We have not had any clear indication. In fact, I am not sure that the present government have any knowledge or any idea of just what they are doing. And where they have gone astray and where they went astray in the past and where they would go astray in the future, if they are so foolish, is if they try to make cheap, partisan politics of it.

Now my time is nearly gone.

What I want to say to the member, he has the right -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: well, somebody else can speak between now and twenty to six, at twenty to six he gets the floor under the rules and he has the right to close this debate.

What I want to say to him is that if he has put forward this motion in a sensible and straightforward and non-partisan way - as I hope he has, and it appears he has when we look at the wording of it - then I think he will get widespread support. But if he wants to do as some of his colleagues have done, to pretend that this is, you know, an excuse to trot over the alleged sins of the past, then he may do that within the rules I think, but all he is going to do is lead us to get up to point out some even harsher truths than the harsh truths of the Upper Churchill project. Because with the Upper Churchill project the mistake is understandable; the Lower Churchill and the way that the present government and its predecessors have handled it is completely beyond comprehension and is completely beyond defence. The government have taken a couple of hundred million dollars and flung it away. We would have gotten more energy from it if they had piled in a pile 200 million one dollar bills and lit them. We at least would have got some light and some heat, which is more than we have got yet from any of the money that the hon. gentlemen opposite have spent these last eight or nine years on hydro power. There is nothing to show for it, not a scintilla, not a jot, not a tittle, not an iota of electrical energy, or of any kind of energy except a great deal of wind expended by members on the opposite side in this House and outside.

I would say as well to the gentleman from Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) that the most useful role he could play - he is a young

MR. ROBERTS: man, I assume he has political ambitions; he has one foot on the ladder that allegedly leads upward, he is Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier - I would say to him that the greatest service he could perform for this government and the greatest service he could perform for the people of this Province would be to approach this matter seriously and even-handedly and impartially and in an effort to try to make some sense of it. Because the future of this Province in large part is going to be bound up with our hydro resources; this only speaks of energy, but it speaks of hydro - it will be tied up with all our energy resources but particularly with our hydro resources. We have made ghastly mistakes in the past. I think they were understandable mistakes, they were defensible mistakes, but in the hindsight of history they are mistakes. That does not particularly bother me unless we fail to learn from them. Mistakes in themselves do not bother us, we all make mistakes and we all go on making them, and how wise we all are the day after! How many football games we could win on Monday morning after the Sunday afternoon game! What concerns me is learning from what we have done.

I say to my friend - and let these be my closing words:

MR. CARTER: I think he believes (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, how can you pretend, how can you pretend to talk sense to a gentleman like the gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter)? He is not capable of appreciating sense. Now as I was saying, I would say to the gentleman from Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. Doyle), that the best service he could perform for the government of which he is a part, which he supports, of the Province which I have no doubt he cares for very deeply and he wants to serve as best he can, is to ensure that the power policy of this government, and I am not sure there is a power policy right now, there is a policy of diatribe and a policy of mouthing off and running down, but that -

MR. CARTER: There is hatred in that.

MR. ROBERTS: No. There is no hate in that. There is a measure of sadness. I do not even hate the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter). Why would I? A harmless, inoffensive fellow -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I must inform the hon. member that his time now has expired.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you. If I may just conclude the sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. ROBERTS: As I was simply saying- I will just conclude the sentence, which I understood was parliamentary, Mr. Speaker, that one may finish one's sentence - the hon. gentleman from St. John's North is exemplifying what I am decrying, that if we are ever going to get anywhere with power in this Province, if we are going to do it without bankrupting the people in this Province, if we are going to do it in the interest of the people in this Province we have got to do it by being sensible and by being honest, and I would suggest the

MR. ROBERTS: present government, Sir, to date, has been neither with respect to power.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Finance has about three minutes.

DR. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was aware that the mover of the motion, of course, has the right to conclude the debate. I knew that the time available was very brief but I do not need much time. I just wanted to answer some of the points brought up by the last speaker, and one does not really need much time to do that.

He only brought up, to my knowledge, three points, all spurious points, but I thought it would be as well to put on the record, you know, how spurious they were.

Now, if I understand the hon. member correctly, he implied that there was no such thing as inflation up to 1971, that when the Upper Churchill was developed there was no concept of inflation, that this thought had never entered human mind and, therefore, it could not be plugged into the arrangements that were set up to bring the Upper Churchill onstream. Well, I think the hon. member opposite should possibly read a little history, and know that inflation has been going on ever since mankind began to deal with financial matters. It did not create - there was no need to have any great genius to know that inflation was going to go ahead from 1966 when the Upper Churchill was brought on. But that does reflect the absence of thought in the Smallwood Administration of which the hon. member was a prominent part. It just showed the absence of thought in

DR. COLLINS: the Smallwood Administration, that they did not even know that there was such a thing as inflation, and that this should have been built into the contracts, which Mr. Speaker, were put in place for sixty-five years.

Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortune to go down to the United States and meet with some of the financial people down there when the Water Reversion Act was on the go and they were absolutely appalled when it was brought out to them the nature of the arrangements over the Upper Churchill. They were absolutely appalled that any government could have the stupidity to put in place anything approaching a contract that stayed in place not only for sixty-five years, that only had no escalating clause in it but, Mr. Speaker, went the opposite way. The power sold was at diminishing cost as the contract went on. Now, for any administration to have done that, you know, it is just a laughable situation. And for the hon. member to say, "Well, this was a mistake of the heart, it was an understandable mistake," you know, it is so ridiculous, it hardly needs refuting.

I think I have about another
thirty seconds

DR. COLLINS:

perhaps. The hon. member then says that the brave attempt to bring the Lower Churchill on stream was a pure, political gimmick. Well, all I can say to that is that the administration of that time knew it was going to be difficult to bring on the Lower Churchill; it was going to be increasingly difficult as time went on, again because they did have an appreciation of inflation being rampant in our society. So they wanted to bring it on at the earliest possible moment. And that was one of the reasons why they attempted it at that stage, and they had every reason to expect that the federal government would help them do it, but the federal government did not help, it let them down. And it was a federal Liberal government that did that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

It being 5:40 p.m., according to Standing Orders, 53 (3), the hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) now has the right to close the debate.

The hon. member for Harbour

Main-Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to extend to all hon. members my very sincere thanks and appreciation for the submissions and the contributions that were made to this debate last week and this week as well. There is nothing that would give me greater pleasure, Mr. Speaker, than to stand here today and to say that I am going to deal with some of the very pertinent points that were raised by the Opposition last week and this week as well. However, I find that very difficult because I do not think there were any pertinent points raised by the Opposition. I will deal with one or two however. I was somewhat amazed,

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) last week, when he said that if his party was in power he would, in no uncertain terms, be able to create at least 2,000 jobs from the construction of the transmission line for our Churchill Falls power. I find that to be somewhat amazing. I would like to comment on that. I wonder under what conditions, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition would be able to create these jobs? Probably under the same conditions that the jobs were created on the Upper Churchill, and that was under the condition, Mr. Speaker, that the resource be given away. Give the resource away, Mr. Speaker, for a few short-term jobs, and at the same time sign a sixty-five year contract just to ensure that the mess that you are getting into was not going to be an easy one to get out of. And that is why it was done that way, making sure that the few short-term jobs came to the Province and the revenue went to the other provinces.

And these, Mr. Speaker, are the kinds of problems, and these are the kinds of things that this administration is saddled with today in trying to overcome the very huge disparities that exist between the Province of Newfoundland and the rest of Canada. And these disparities, Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, were created by the old Liberal regime whose only claim to fame, incidentally, was that they shut down a number of industries in Newfoundland and signed a sixty-five year

MR. DOYLE:

contract to sell Newfoundland's power at 2 mils a kilowatt hour. Now, as I mentioned last week, Mr. Speaker, there are thirty-five billion kilowatts of power created every single year by this Upper Churchill and this power is sold, as all hon. members realize, for three-tenths of one cent a kilowatt hour, And I do not believe for one minute, not for one second, Mr. Speaker, should the people of this Province be allowed to forget what happened back a few years ago on that grim day, on that black day in Newfoundland's history a few years ago -

I do not believe that the people of this Province should be allowed to forget that for one minute. And I do not think you can make up for that, Mr. Speaker, by standing in this hon. House and saying, 'Oh, yes, we made some mistakes, but everybody makes mistakes.' It is no point in trying to tell that to the world money market people, Mr. Speaker, when you go down looking for money on Wall Street. There is no point in saying, 'We made mistakes a few years ago, we signed a sixty-five year contract, but give us a credit rating that the Province can live with in spite of that.'

Make no mistake about it,

Mr. Speaker, the history books of Newfoundland will deal with the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the history books will deal with the hon. gentlemen quite harshly for what they did back then. Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, the inequities in this contract; that Newfoundland in forty years from now will be receiving the equivalent of \$1.50 a barrel for oil?

MR. MORGAN:

How much?

MR. DOYLE:

One dollar and fifty cents a barrel for oil - in what year, Mr. Speaker? In the year 2016 Newfoundland will be receiving the equivalent of

MR. DOYLE: \$1.50 a barrel for oil. Why? Because the Liberals back a few years ago, signed a sixty-five year contract that gets progressively better for the Province of Quebec, progressively worse for the Province of Newfoundland, and as a result we will be selling that power for 2 mils a kilowatt hour in the year 2016. However, Mr. Speaker, and quite fortunately for the people of Newfoundland, these mistakes are never going to be allowed to be repeated in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: This government, Mr. Speaker, will ensure that Newfoundland's offshore oil resources will not receive similar treatment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: We will negotiate that contract, Mr. Speaker, so that it is not a give-away for the Province of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: It will be a fair deal. It will not be a one-sided deal, it will be a contract that the Province of Newfoundland can be very, very proud of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: When we negotiate that revenue sharing deal with the federal government, Mr. Speaker, it will be a deal that the Province of Newfoundland and the Government of Newfoundland can be very, very proud of indeed. And therein, Mr. Speaker, is the basic difference between the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the P.C. Party of Newfoundland. Therein lies the basic difference in philosophy between these two parties, one party, a party which gives it all away, the other party, a party which is anxious to make fair and equitable deals for the Province of Newfoundland.

So again, Mr. Speaker, in the middle of all this, we have turned our attention, as you

MR. DOYLE: know, to the federal government,
in the hope, as I said in my resolution, that they will
ensure that Newfoundland receives fair and equal treatment
in the transmission of its hydro energy across neighbouring

MR. DOYLE: provinces, Mr. Speaker, in the very same way that Alberta is allowed to transmit its oil and gas across Saskatchewan and Manitoba and Ontario, down into the Province of Quebec. Now can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, anybody trying to stop the Province of Alberta from doing that? It would be unthinkable. The federal government would quickly come to their aid, Mr. Speaker, and see that this wrong was righted immediately. But not so, Mr. Speaker, for the Province of Newfoundland. They have refused to take a similar stand on the transmission of hydro-electric energy and therein lies the problem that Newfoundland is experiencing today. Can you believe, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government should sit idly by and allow this to happen? As my hon. colleague, the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) mentioned a few minutes ago, in the middle of an energy-hungry world, in the middle of an energy-hungry nation this is going on and the federal government has refused to allow Newfoundland the same basic rights as other provinces now have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: An energy-hungry world is getting the power from Churchill Falls.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. DOYLE: Now, Mr. Speaker, in the few seconds that I do have left -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island.

MR. DOYLE: Now, Mr. Speaker, in the few seconds that I do have left I will try to deal with some of the points that the hon. members have raised. And it gives me a great deal of pleasure indeed to deal -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. member should take
his seat by the way.

MR. DOYLE: Oh, I am sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor
Buchans (Mr. Flight) has spoken, I believe, in the debate
already.

The hon. member for Harbour
Main-Bell Island.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes
that I do have available to me I am going to try and deal
with at least one or two points that were raised by the
Opposition. As I have said, most of the points that they did
raise were totally irrelevant, but there were one or two
things that I would like to respond to.

First of all, the member for
Carbonear (Mr. Moores), I was quite appalled at what he
said, Mr. Speaker, that the mainland press has dealt harshly
with the Premier with respect to the constitution. I would
like to turn his attention for a moment to what was
reported just recently in The Montreal Gazette by one
Keith Spicer, Mr. Speaker. And some of the things that were
said in that, I think, are quite relevant to this debate
and I think that it should be mentioned here today.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DOYLE: Now, Mr. Speaker, just one
or two paragraphs I would like to read so that the hon.
gentlemen will realize how the press are dealing with the
Premier of this Province with respect to his stand on the
constitution and the great contribution that he made to this
nation. "In the salons of the city's oldest families you
see winks about Peckford, the nation saver, being just a
front man for Ontario's Roy McMurtry, Saskatchewan's Roy
Romanow and Ottawa's Jean Chretien. But the pride

MR. DOYLE: there is the same you hear in the pubs and the fish and chip parlors, the Premier is honest, he is gutsy and he is the mirror of our hope".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: Now, Mr. Speaker, listen to this one. You will be really, really -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order!

I cannot hear.

MR. DOYLE: You will be really, really happy to hear this one, Mr. Speaker. "Voters watch Peckford hold up in endless economic meetings and lay down the law on what Newfoundland wants, jobs, royalties, control. They believe that they have seen the last of the big talking carpetbaggers who have sucked in Smallwood and littered the landscape"-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: - Mr. Speaker, "with abandoned factories and refineries." And it goes on to say - just one more paragraph - "Peckford has made most of his noise about oil, about owning the awesome offshore fields around Hibernia where new discoveries burst only last week, but he looks back to firm up the forests and especially fisheries, to renegotiate the Smallwood giveaway of Labrador electric power to Quebec".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: Now, Mr. Speaker, that says it all.

It goes on to say as well, "He looks ahead to giving its due to tourism. For decades Newfoundlanders have watched tourism and its adjunct of fine local cuisine and traditional design as a window on the shame of their poverty. You know, Peckford's economy

MR. DOYLE: promises to be rich and resilient. When the oil comes on stream a half a decade hence, it may fuel the prosperity offering careers from high tech oil and power transmission to fresh ways of marketing the centuries old staple of fish."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: "The third pillar of confidence is the willingness to collect and showcase Newfoundland's long depreciated past." Now, Mr. Speaker, is that a cruel and a ruthless way for the press, The Montreal Gazette, to deal with the Premier? No, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: Now, it might be of interest to hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to hear what one of the St. John's newspapers recently had to say about transmission of hydro power and the Upper Churchill contract. "The contract on Churchill Falls hydro-electric power that was made between the agents of Newfoundland and Quebec governments"-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot continue like this with hon. gentlemen opposite interrupting me constantly.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member for
Harbour Main-Bell Island.

MR. DOYLE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to read just one paragraph of an editorial, I do not know if it was The Daily News or The Evening Telegram, but it is quite pertinent to this debate. "The contract on Upper Churchill Falls hydro-electric power that was made between the agents of Newfoundland and Quebec governments in the 1960s, as almost everyone now agrees, was made under duress notwithstanding the bland assertion that a contract is a contract is a contract. This paper condemned that contract from the day

MR. DOYLE: it was published. Not only that, we condemned what was happening while the negotiations were taking place, and called for the federal government to look at Churchill Falls power as being developed in the national interest, especially when it was evident Quebec was not going to permit Newfoundland to get that power through Quebec territory only on the latter's terms."

"However, with the coming to office of the PC party in Newfoundland -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE : "the first decisive steps were taken to redress that great wrong. Subsequently, more and more sources across Canada came to recognize that wrong and eventually things reached a point where the Trudeau administration announced a year or more ago that unless the two provinces could sort out that dispute themselves, they would be prepared to pass legislation in the Commons to enable Newfoundland to build a line or otherwise arrange transmission of Churchill Falls power through La Belle Province for delivery and sale in other parts of Canada and the U.S."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: And that, Mr. Speaker, says it all. Every single thing that I wanted to say in that debate has been summed up in that article in one of the St. John's papers.

So, Mr. Speaker, we ask the Liberal Opposition to support this motion and to show the federal government and to show Newfoundland's fickle five, Mr. Speaker, that you are not afraid to stand up and be counted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. DOYLE: You are not afraid to stand up and be counted -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. DOYLE:

- you are not afraid to stand up and be counted for the Province of Newfoundland, to stand up and show, Mr. Tobin, Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rompkey, Mr. Baker that although they do not have the intestinal fortitude to speak out for Newfoundland, that you do. So I will call upon all Liberal members to vote for this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

Is it agreed to dispense with the reading of the motion?

Is it agreed to dispense with

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

Those in favour of the motion signify by saying "Aye".

Those in favour of the motion

AN HON. MEMBER:

"Aye".

MR. SPEAKER:

Contrary "Nay". I declare the motion carried.

Contrary "Nay". I declare

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Premier.

A point of order, the hon. the

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, I am just wondering-for the record I would like to know what the -

Yes, I am just wondering-for

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!. Order!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, for the record, I was looking across the House and I did not see the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), nor the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), nor the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) vocalize at all, so I am just wondering, is it abstentions or is it negations and so on?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Division.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Or division.

Division, Mr. Speaker,

division.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! On division,
Call in the members.

DIVISION

MR. SPEAKER: We will now take the votes.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those in favour of the motion

please rise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

The hon. the Premier -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

- the hon. Minister of Forest,

Resources and Lands -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please, so we can

hear the Clerk.

MR. STIRLING:

Where is the Energy Minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Where is the hon. Minister of Social Services?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order! Order,

please! We are having difficulty hearing the Clerk and perhaps

hon. members would like to -

- the hon. the Minister of

Fisheries, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and

Housing, the hon. Minister of Public Works and Services,

Mr. Butt, the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and

Youth, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower, the hon.

the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Justice,

the hon. the Minister of Transportation, the hon. the Minister

of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, the hon. the

Minister of Health, Mr. Brett, Mr. Baird, Mr. Stagg, Mr. Carter,

Dr. Twomey, Mr. Doyle, Mr. Aylward, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Stewart,

the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Flight, Mr. Lush,

Mr. Hodder, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hollett, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Hiscock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please! The results of the voting on the motion, the 'ayes' thirty, the 'nays' nil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the motion carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! It being six o'clock I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday -

MR. FLIGHT:

(Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:

The clock automatically stops at six.

I leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock.