

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as indicated during the Estimate Committee hearings, my department recently conducted a study of the impact of offshore petroleum development on the fishery. This study was discussed by government and my colleagues directed that it be tabled in the House of Assembly and subsequently released to the public. This undertaking should be of special interest to those individuals and groups who, in the past, have accused government of paying too much attention to offshore oil and gas with insufficient thought to the needs of our traditional industries, particularly the fishery.

The study is a result of considerable research by my officials in the Department of Labour and Manpower and also involving the Department of Fisheries, Development, the Petroleum Directorate, and the College of Fisheries, Navigation-Marine Engineering and Electronics. It concludes that, while competition for skilled marine personnel between the petroleum and fishing industries will be keen, severe shortages in the fishery are not expected during the next five years. The present personnel for offshore oil and gas and the fishery will be adequate for our short term needs.

I would like to point out to the House, however, that manpower projections for development and production activities associated with the offshore indicate

June 15, 1982

Tape 1279

PK - 2

MR. DINN: that marine occupations will
continue to be in relatively high demand over the next twenty
year period.

MR. DINN: The study concludes, therefore, that long-term manpower needs in marine occupations cannot be met by existing training facilities at the College of Fisheries. The present facilities and instructors are even now operating at or near capacity. Considering the expected attrition rate in highly skilled marine occupations in the coming years and the possibility of increased manpower mobility because of major oil developments in the North and other East coast locations, it is obvious that changes must be made in the medium and long term.

Late last year Brian Tobin, the Liberal member of Parliament for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe and a member of the Parliamentary Task Force on Employment Opportunities for the '80s, was quoted by the media during a news conference at Stephenville as saying that federal capital funding was available to the Province for facilities and equipment and this funding would apply to construction of a College of Fisheries, Navigation-Marine Engineering and Electronics.

Following Mr. Tobin's announcement, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and I, who were obviously very pleased, held a press conference at which time we indicated that we were pleased about the capital funding and that it would be available from the federal government under the new federal/provincial adult occupational training agreements. This new fund was to be called a skills growth fund.

During a meeting, however, of Manpower ministers in January, I raised the question with the hon. Lloyd Axworthy, who informed me that funding was not available through the federal Department of Employment and Immigration, and that the funds were allocated through another government department, and at that time he indicated the Department of DREE. It is my understanding that this

MR. DINN: is still under consideration by various departments and committees within the federal government.

The skills growth fund announced by Mr. Axworth restricts capital funds to institution where the training offered constitutes a national concern. I am extremely concerned that, despite the obvious importance of properly trained people to meet the future needs of industry in this Province, particularly in those marine occupations referred to in the study, it may not be perceived by the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission as constituting a national concern. My department, in consultation with the Department of Education, are now finalizing a proposal for submission to Canada Employment and Immigration detailing capital requirements which we feel are crucial to the training of Newfoundlanders. In fact, many of the training problems we presently face originate with the need for improved equipment and facilities. We will anxiously await the response of the federal government to this carefully prepared proposal.

And, Mr. Speaker, I table with the statement a summary of the study that was conducted by the various departments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, this Ministerial Statement is basically in two parts, one relating to the study that the Department of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) conducted to ascertain the labour demands with respect to petroleum and how that was going to affect the fisheries, and the study came up with nothing new insomuch as many studies have indicated in the past that the offshore type work does not take skilled people from the fisheries. So it is more or less a confirmation of findings of other studies. And also, of course, again it is a known fact that we are lacking in training facilities at the College of Fisheries; of course not only at the College of Fisheries but at other post-secondary institutions as well. I would venture to say that we are down in facilities at the College of Trades and Technology as well. Many of these facilities were started a good many years ago, ten to fifteen years ago, the College of Trades of course going back further than that, and in that length of time their facilities have become obsolete. They have not kept up with modern technology so there is no question that all of our post-secondary educational institutions certainly need better facilities to keep up with the technology of today, and that we certainly agree with.

And secondly the minister alludes to the skills growth fund, a programme that was going to be made available to help train our people better and provide money for facilities. I must say I do not express the same concern as the minister does in this area. He is afraid that the only institutions that will receive funding are those institutions which can be determined to be training people for the nation, those skills that would have a national concern. And I would suggest, Sir, that any training that benefits the Province will benefit the nation. And I do not think that there is going to be a narrow interpretation of this at all. I think

June 15, 1982

Tape 1281

NM - 2

MR. LUSH: there is going to be a broad interpretation. And when we are talking about training people for any kind of marine development, when we look at Canada I think we will find out that that certainly encompasses a large part of Canada, British Columbia and parts of the North, and all of the Atlantic Provinces, and the Yukon. So I would suggest that, you know, anything that is of a

MR. LUSH:

marine development, anything that is going to affect the offshore, can certainly be interpreted as a national concern. So, Mr. Speaker, again, I think, expressing a rather narrow viewpoint of the federal government and I believe that the proposal submitted by the hon. gentleman, whatever they might be, I think will be received very favourably by the federal government and certainly perceived in the view of meeting the national interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Well, I do not have the names of the people, but I would like to welcome to the galleries today the mayor and two councillors and the town manager from the town of Hare Bay. I welcome you to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other statements by ministers?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question or two for the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) in connection with the administrations's energy policy in this Province. I would like to start out by asking the hon. gentleman if it is correct, if he can confirm or deny, that within the next eighteen to twenty-four months a new source of electricity, a new source of power will have to be found in this Province to take care of the load growth?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is the anticipation insofar as projections are at the present time, that is the anticipated situation although the time for new sources of energy may be widened a little bit, but it is approximately that, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary. The hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman care to elaborate on that answer, Mr. Speaker? In the light of the decline in the economy, a decline in the use of electricity because no new industries have been established in this Province, old industries are shutting down, would the hon. gentleman care to indicate what is bringing on this crisis, that a major decision will have to be made by the administration in anywhere from eighteen to twenty-four months to find a new source of power? What is the reason behind this?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not take the rather depressed view of the future of this Province and the future of the economy that obviously the hon. gentleman does. The

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1283

MJ - 1

MR. MARSHALL: fact of the matter is at the present time we are in a recessionary cycle -

MR. NEARY: A depression.

MR. MARSHALL: - a cycle, by the way, that is being felt very severely here in the Province of Newfoundland as all over Canada. But we have anticipation, we have hopes that we will come out of that recessionary trend, and that the normal rate of development can continue on. As the hon. gentleman is well aware the Gross Domestic Product in this Province prior to the recession - I believe even now as it presently stands, although it is nothing to brag about at the present time - but prior to the onslaught of this recession, which was brought about by the high interest rates and the inflationary condition of the national economy, that this Province was beginning to turn the corner, and turn the corner in relation to other provinces with respect to its proportionate increase in its Gross Domestic Product. So we are looking forward to that type of activity in the future. And also, of course, the hon. gentleman will be aware that with proper management of our resources, such as have been evidenced so plainly in the Budget that was presented by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), that we have reason to be optimistic about the future. We prefer to be optimistic rather than pessimistic, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: It is a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, this administration seems to accept the responsibility for nothing. They have not created one new industry in this Province in the last several years and I can only base my

MR. S. NEARY: questions on the track record of the administration. And I have news for the hon. gentleman; when the Liberal were in power here there was always a new project on the go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: That was a great comment, Mr. Speaker, The Muppet Show is on the move again.

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House what the alternatives are for a new source of power? Is the administration looking at a new source of power by developing rivers here on the Island of Newfoundland? Do they intend to install a fourth unit at the Thermo-Generating Station in Holyrod, which is very expensive? Do they intend to build a coal-fire generating plant? - which again is rather expensive, and we can deal with that later. Or does the administration intend to use gas turbines similar to the one out in Stephenville to take care of the load at peak periods? Would the hon. gentleman tell the House

MR. NEARY: which one of these three alternatives the administration is considering?

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

MR. MARSHALL: To the first part of the hon. gentleman's preamble, I neither wish to contemplate the Liberals returning to power any more than I like to remember the pain that fastened on the people of this Province while they were in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, with respect to his other question, all of these alternatives are in process of active assessment and consideration. It suffices to say though that it is pathetic really, I think that is the proper description, to note that this Province must consider such other sources in the future as oil fired generation and coal generation of electric power when we have such an abundance of resources on our own within the boundaries of our own Province, which we should be able to use for our own purposes. And we would have been able to use them, Mr. Speaker, but for the fact that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues gave them away in the 1960s.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, yes, the answer is yes. Very, very sadly as a result of the actions of the hon. gentlemen there opposite and as a result of the continued oppression by the Liberal Government in Ottawa with respect to Newfoundland to deny us our legitimate rights, we are forced to consider these other alternatives. We would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would not be forced to use oil and to use coal and to use these other mechanisms other than hydro power. And I think, Mr. Speaker, as I say, we anticipate, the hon. gentleman knows, getting justice and equity for the people in Newfoundland from the Upper Churchill in the reversion

MR. MARSHALL: case. We would expect the reversion case to be decided in the very near future wherein we will be in a most better position to formulate our policies. We certainly expect it to be considered very early in the calendar of the Supreme Court of Canada, because after all the Supreme Court of Canada decided that the urgency expressed by the federal government in the offshore case was enough to take the unprecedented stance of setting the matter on the offshore down for trial on November 29, but we will inform the Supreme Court of Canada that equally urgent to us, even moreso, is the resolution of the Upper Churchill situation and we will expect a hearing of that

MR. W. MARSHALL: before the offshore case, because after all we had that before their Lordships before the federal government made its unprecedented move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is an awful lot of people beginning to realize in this Province that may - be the thing to do is to return to the good old days. If the Upper Churchill had not been developed or the ERCO plant had not been built. -

MR. BARRETT: They did not think that on April 6th.

MR. NEARY: - then the administration -

MR. HODDER: Or the Linerboard mill.

MR. NEARY: - or the Linerboard mill, this present administration would have nothing to build on, they would have nothing to renegotiate, there would be no projects because they have not started -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - they have not started a single industry, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. gentleman about three alternatives, and the hon. gentleman elected to start playing little political games again with somebody gave something away. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is aware that 100 per cent of the power generated on the Upper Churchill was not given away, it belongs Newfoundland, and we have recall rights on that power, and we can recall eight hundred megawatts immediately. And so what I am going to ask -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman's impression of the facts as he gives them might be interesting to his colleagues.

MR. MARSHALL: there opposite, but this is not the time for making a speech. The purpose of the Question Period is to ask questions and respond to them. The hon. gentleman is making a speech and thus is out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

Will the hon. Leader of the Opposition direct his question precisely to the hon. minister, please?

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, did I understand from the hon. gentleman's answer to my previous question that the administration have not yet decided, yet they are telling us that they have an energy policy, they have not yet decided what alternative they intend to use to get this additional power 18 to 24 months from now to take care of the load growth? Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying, that no decision has been made even though we are drawing rapidly near a crisis in electrical power in this Province? A decision must be made within 18 to 24 months according to the hon. gentleman, and no decision made yet by the administration as to what alternatives we intend to use to get that power?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, we are weighing the alternatives. This is a government that assesses alternatives before it makes a reputable decision of this particular nature. And, you know, I can guarantee the hon. gentleman that the lights will not go off in Newfoundland, they will probably go off in Quebec before they go off in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: But they will not be going off in Newfoundland under the stewardship of this government.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I do not know if it is the final one or not, but the hon. gentleman told us, the administration told us, when the Cat Arm development was announced that that was the last source of hydro power on the Island of Newfoundland, so it would appear to me that the hon. gentleman is running out of options. Is it correct that Cat Arm is the last source and, if so, which one of the two alternatives, to build a fourth unit at the thermo-generating station at Holyrood or to build a coal fired generating plant, which one of these alternatives is the administration looking at?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in response to that, the alternative which we select will be, if it is required to be selected, the least expensive one to the people of Newfoundland because we will regard it as only a temporary remedy until we obtain the resource of the Upper Churchill and are able to commit it to the use of the people of this Province.

MR. NEARY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon.

gentleman indicate whether it is necessary at all to look at the two alternatives that I outlined? Would it not be more feasible for the administration to look at the recall of 800 megawatts of power from the Churchill Falls and transmit it across the Strait of Belle Isle to the Island of Newfoundland? Would not the obvious conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to this whole problem be for the administration to put together a package to develop Labrador power, to build a transmission line to bring the power down through the Strait of Belle Isle and bring it across on the floor of the ocean to the Island of Newfoundland, and to develop the other sources of power in Labrador and transmit the surplus power to markets on the mainland and in the United States? Would that not be the best solution to this problem? And why is it that the administration is not looking at this possibility and not starting a transmission line immediately which I understand would be partly funded by the Government of Canada; and the Lower Churchill Development Corporation, as hon. members know is a 50/50 deal - why would the government not look seriously at that proposal rather than go into expensive makeshift sources of expensive power here on the Island of Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I may not have caught all of the questions of the hon. gentleman because while he was speaking with me -

MR. NEARY: You were getting your nomination fee back.

MR. MARSHALL: - my nomination fee returned, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Actually I think on behalf of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I should extend thanks to the Liberal Party for their preponderate contribution to the coffers of the treasury from the last election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So I may not, Mr. Speaker, have gotten all of the question. As I understand the hon. member's question, he was asking why are we considering this when we have 800 megawatts of power that we can take. Because as the hon. gentleman knows the position with respect to the reclamation or recall of 800 megawatts of power is a matter that is under consideration by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland at the present time. It has been an on-going trial, it has been going on for numbers of years. It has been going on for such a long period of time because the Province of Quebec used the mechanisms of the court, by going up and down to the Supreme Court of Canada on preliminary motions, to thwart the will and the intention of the people of this Province and the agreement that they entered into which has forced us into the reversion. So it is not so simple as saying that, you know, these 800 megawatts of power we have to have. It probably would have been slightly more simpler, Mr. Speaker, if the attitude of the hon. gentleman's colleagues in Ottawa had been a little bit different and they had recognized the fact that we have, as a matter of right, the right to a transmission corridor which would put up in an equal position with Quebec for the purpose of bargaining with Quebec rather than having the federal government deal all the cards out to the Province of Quebec once again.

MR. MARSHALL: Because when you sit down to negotiate with anyone on an unequal basis inequalities result and these inequalities were never more manifest than we see in this Upper Churchill contract to which he refers.

So the answer to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is quite obvious that he can talk about this, why do we not use those 800 megawatts of power. We have to get that 800 megawatts of power. We have to get it through the court and we have to get the right to do it first. I would dare say and predict that what is going to happen is that we will succeed in the reversion case before the recall case goes to its full extent. In that case we will have the whole 5,223 megawatts and we will commit them to the use in this Province as it wishes. In the meantime if there is a necessity, as there very likely will be, a hiatus in the middle from the time when we build the transmission line and what have you, we will have to rely on these other sources of energy generation which we are in the process of assessing, if in fact they are necessary. And if in fact, Mr. Speaker, they are necessary, the amount that the hon. gentleman contributed to the Treasury will not in any ways equal the amount that has been skinned out of the Treasury of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: as a result of their poor stewardship of the affairs of the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the political statements made by the hon. gentleman later on this afternoon in connection with the corridor across the province of Quebec and the misleading statements that are being made about that situation. I will deal with the later on this afternoon. I want to deal now with the emergency situation of what kind of a source of electricity the administration is going to implement in order to get the power needed to take care of the load growth in this Province. I would gather from the last statement made by the hon. gentleman that the recalling of Labrador power - if I can get the hon. minister's attention for a moment - the recalling of Labrador power, power on the Upper Churchill of 800 megawatts, and the development of the Lower Churchill or Muskrat Falls is far removed from the hon. gentleman's mind and from the minds of the administration, that they are looking more at the -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) speech, speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Bugs Bunny would just keep quite for a minute - is the administration looking more at building a fourth unit at Holyrood or a coal fired generator or the gas turbines, are they looking more at that proposal than they are at bringing Labrador power to the Island of Newfoundland?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The cardinal policy of this government is to reclaim for the people of Newfoundland the hydroresources that are in Labrador. I think this

MR. MARSHALL: is well known. We have done this through the Reversion Act. He speaks of the Lower Churchill. He knows full well that the Lower Churchill cannot be developed without some means of selling the excess power, and he knows that the actions that were recently taken set that back quite a distance, so that is the situation. For the hon. gentleman to pretend or to give any insinuation that the government is not firmly committed to this policy, as it has been in the past and it will be in the future and is now bringing results, is entirely and completely without foundation. On the other side of the coin, I can only reiterate the answer initially given to the hon. member, that these, shall I say foreign or artificial means—because that is really what they are; they are not part of our natural resources, not yet. There is oil out there and we will get that eventually but with the hydro resources we have we can put the oil to other use—but these other means of the production of electricity will be viewed by us as temporary. And at the present time what we are doing is assessing the situation and we are assessing it very, very carefully and the hon. gentleman need not be afraid, Mr. Speaker, as I say, no matter how much he wallows in the dark daily, day by day, Newfoundland will not be in the dark during the stewardship of this particular administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary. A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could pin the hon. gentleman down on telling us now

MR. NEARY: if the administration has already made a decision on this new source of electricity, and what will it be? Will it be the fourth unit at Holyrood, will it be the coal fired generator, will it be gas turbines? What source of electricity does the hon. gentleman intend to develop to try to get this extra power that they need? Which one of these alternatives? Because I get the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the administration have no firm energy policy at all. They are flying by the seat of their pants and they are just merely sticking their finger into the dike.

The hon. gentleman has admitted that this will be a temporary arrangement. It is going to be pretty expensive for the people of this Province and probably drive up the cost of electricity. But which alternative is it that the administration intend to use?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman has obviously had a very bad weekend, he is not his usual bouyant self as I see, but not only that he is repeating questions, asking the same question over and over again. And I can only give the hon. gentleman, with a great smile on my face, exactly the same answer. And that answer, Mr. Speaker, is that these alternatives are in the process of assessment by this government.

MR. NEARY: You have not made up your mind yet.

MR. MARSHALL: We do not jump in and make snap decisions just like that, Mr. Speaker, we weigh and we assess everything and that is exactly what we are in the process of doing. No wonder I see, Mr. Speaker, certain people in the galleries yawning, It is not because they are bored, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: They are laughing at the hon. gentleman who does not make snap decisions -

MR. MARSHALL: - it has to be because of the question.

MR. NEARY: - off the cuff and snap decisions.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the President of the Council, House Leader, and Deputy Premier (Mr. Marshall). Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is appropriate to ask the question at this time, the day that our nomination fees were returned.

Mr. Speaker, as the House Leader is aware, prior to the last general election the Election Expenses Committee was working. It has always been my feeling that we were not meant to have election expenses in the last election, although it was the avowed aim of the government that the last election we would be under a new Election Expenses Act. But in light of the fact that we have some of the most antiquated election expenses legislation in Canada - and I have asked the member this privately on a couple of occasions and have not gotten

MR. J. HODDER:

a satisfactory answer- So I now ask him publicly when will the Election Expenses Committee be struck?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, very shortly. It is intended, of course, to have the Election Expenses Committee reconstituted and reconvened, and we will get on to that very, very shortly. Because the matter is of great concern, electoral reform is a great concern to this government and, as I say, in the very near future we will do it. I cannot give him a specified date but certainly before the end of this sitting we will have the Committee on the new Electoral Act reconvened.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the old Election Expenses Committee are all back here in this House. We were in the midst of deliberations before the last sitting of the House. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, in looking at other jurisdictions and looking at the type of legislation and the type of committees that other jurisdictions use when setting up their election expenses, many of these jurisdictions had larger committees than we had. We had just five members on the committee. Would the House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) consider enlarging the number of people on the Election Expenses Committee? And I will ask one more question: Why are we waiting until the end of this session? Why cannot we just get on with our work because it is quite a time-consuming process? And I think the aim of this government, if they really do want to have an election reform, is to start as soon as possible so we have the best possible act.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, as to the first part of the question, we will certainly take that under advisement, increasing the numbers, the size of the Committee. Our main concern is that the bill that has been presented during the last Assembly in draft form be given a thorough vetting and assessment. So if that needs more members we are perfectly amenable to considering that. I did not say it was going to be the end of the sitting. I said, you know, within the very near future, before the end of this sitting, and I would hope to be able to get that put together in the not too distant future. As the hon. gentleman knows, so he can take a certain amount of solace in that question, we do not expect an election in the real immediate future. So there is going to be plenty of time, Mr. Speaker, for the Committee.

MR. S. NEARY: You never know. You never know.

MR. MARSHALL: No, you never know.

MR. NEARY: With the behavior of the Premier you never know. He is likely to do anything, the mad hatter is likely to do anything.

MR. MARSHALL: You never know when we are going to flush the hon. member over to Sidney. He jettisoned across the Conception Bay and Trinity Bay over to Lapoile. In the next election he will jettisoned over to the Mainland.

So that is that. We can look at it and, you know, we are very serious about that Committee and we will be amenable to any suggestions, particularly of the hon. gentleman who asked the question, because he has been very interested in it and has made a valuable contribution to it.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Pogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Environment (Mr. H. Andrews), but since he is not

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1290

MJ - 3

MR. B. TULK: in his seat I will ask the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall). The question relates, Mr. Speaker, to the announced decision of Abitibi-Price

MR. TULK: to spray the herbicide 24D on 100 hectares of forest land near Red Indian Lake around the Millertown area. I understand this is being done to protect the softwood growth from the faster growing hardwoods. The question for the minister is has the government been contacted by Abitibi-Price regarding this experiment? If so, what was the government's reaction and have you given the green light to go ahead with that experiment?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I understand that government, of course, has been in communication with Abitibi-Price with respect to this. To my knowledge the area involved is going to be very small and the Department of the Environment and the provincial government will be monitoring it very, very carefully.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, this government has passed an Environmental Assessment Act. I would like to ask the minister another question. Upon whose advice did the government give the okay to Abitibi-Price to go ahead with this? Did they go through the Pesticide Advisory Board or did they form another committee to hold public hearings or just what did they do?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I would not be able to answer that immediately, I could take notice of the question. The only thing that I can say is that I do not know whether it was necessary to go through the agencies that the hon. gentleman referred to. All I know is that we have a very competent staff down in the Department of the Environment who are involved in this, who went over

MR. MARSHALL: the situation, and certainly if it were necessary for any referral to that committee it would have been done, but to my knowledge there has been no referral. Nevertheless, this does not indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we are not very much aware of the situation, very much on top of it, and have had our very competent officials monitoring it now as they will in the future.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed to hear that the government has said you can go ahead with spraying the herbicide without holding any public hearings or indeed going back to the population itself. Mr. Speaker, the Millertown area and the Red Indian Lake area is one of the most densely populated areas in terms of wildlife that you will find in this Province, especially the moose population. I am wondering if the government has done any assessment of the effect of the spraying of this herbicide 24D on the wildlife in that area?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again that this is a very very small area involved, an extremely small area and that this -

MR. TULK: How small?

MR. MARSHALL: - well it is -

MR. TULK: 250 acres.

MR. MARSHALL: - it is extremely small. We are given the impression and the assurances that we do not anticipate, shall we say, that it is going to affect wildlife at all or otherwise there would be another result to the situation. But even though we do not anticipate it, as I say, that is part of the monitoring process. You know, we will monitor it and we will monitor it very, very carefully and closely.

MR. TULK: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): A supplementary, the hon.
member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: I would like to ask the
minister to come back to another part of the question
which he has failed to answer, and that is: Has he received
any complaints from communities in that area or from people
in that area concerning the spray programme itself, the
spraying of this herbicide? And if he gets complaints from
those residents, or if he has had complaints from them, will
he indeed hold public hearings to ensure that the wishes
of the people of that area are met in this new kind
of herbicide that is being sprayed?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypo-
thetical question and in the first place I can answer it
by saying that obviously just merely the complaint -

MR. TULK: Have you received any complaints?

MR. MARSHALL: If we receive a complaint, Mr.
Speaker, we will look into it and we will assess it very,
very carefully. If the complaint appears to be legitimate,
appropriate action will be taken. That may involve the sus-
pension of the spraying, it may involve the deminishment
of the concentration of the spraying, or it may involve
public hearings, it may involve getting in further ex-
perts to look at the situation. I cannot answer that
unequivocally right now. Obviously one complaint is
not going to trigger public hearings. We would have to
hear the nature of the complaint and assess its veracity.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: The minister has said that they have no complaints or one complaint, he is not sure how many complaints they have, and yet they are monitoring the situation. I would like to ask the minister to repeat for this House if indeed he is satisfied with the affects of that herbicide on the wildlife? Secondly, how are they monitoring the situation? And thirdly, how many complaints - it is not a hypothetical question - how many complaints? Has the government received any complaints from any people in that area?

MR. NEARY: And who are they from?

MR. TULK: And who are they from?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate the situation. I am not going to say to the hon. gentleman unequivocally right now that I have gone out and I have personally tested the affect of this herbicide on moose or on wildlife or anything. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that that proposal has been assessed by officials of the Department of the Environment and, as any action of that type, has been weighed and weighed very carefully and it will be monitored and monitored very carefully.

MR. TULK: By whom?

MR. MARSHALL: By the appropriate officials in the Department of Environment and by any other expert opinion that we need to engage. We will be looking at it and looking at it very carefully. But in the meantime, as far as any complaints, I do not know myself, I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that there have been any complaints. There might be some questions that have been raised by people by way of apprehension with respect to the situation, and if we receive that type of observation we will try to deal with it as I have tried to deal with the questions of the hon. member, to allay it and to say that it is a very small area, we will do everything we can to see that there is no damage, and we will keep an eye on it. In other words, we will monitor it very carefully.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: I am pleased to report that the Government Services Committee on estimates, which had referred to it five departments, namely Heading IV - Finance; Heading V - Public Works; XI - Transportation; XVI - Labour and Manpower; XVII - Municipal Affairs, the Committee has considered all those headings and have passed them without amendment.

I would like to say thank you to all members of the Committee, the Vice-Chairman, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews), the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), the hon. member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward), and the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. McLennon). I would like also to say thank you to the ministers and their officials for their co-operation

MR. CROSS: during the debates.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
On motion report received and adopted.
MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Any other reports of standing and special committees?

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.
MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act."
MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.
MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act, 1975."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.
DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to question 47, from the hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), which was asked on May the 13th.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Bellevue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 4,281 concerned citizens - now there were 4,280 until I affixed my own signature a few moments ago - so there are 4,281 signatures on this petition, Mr. Speaker, signatures of concerned citizens who are served by the Cottage Hospital at Markland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those people in the galleries, I might mention that we are only entitled to speak for five minutes in presenting a petition, and then someone on the other side, if he or she wishes, can also speak in support of the petition or whatever.

Mr. Speaker, 4,281 signatures is not a common petition to be presented in this House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: You can say that again.

MR. CALLAN: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is pretty uncommon to have a petition with that many signatures presented in this House. I believe perhaps the last time that I can remember that a petition of this size had been presented is when we presented petitions regarding the high rates of electricity back a few years ago.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. CALLAN: We all know, of course, these petitions accomplished nothing.

Mr. Speaker, let me read the prayer of the petition: "It is the intention of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to begin phasing out Markland Cottage Hospital to be completed by September 1, 1982. We the undersigned are in total disagreement with this government

June 15, 1982

Tape 1294

PK - 2

MR. CALLAN:

action and we will not tolerate any action on the part of the government that endangers the lives, health, and safety, nor the jobs of the Newfoundland people. It is certain that the mortality rate of those suffering from severe injury or illness will increase significantly. Markland Hospital offers a valuable and most needed service. Therefore, we demand that Premier Peckford keep his promise made publicly on the 30th of March, 1982, that an out-patient clinic will be constructed during the term of his administration and that the said clinic would be constructed adjoining the Markland Hospital." So that is the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, containing 4,281 names.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can refer back to the latter part of the prayer in the petition - the petition has referred to a public promise that was made by the Premier on March 30. In this House

MR. CALLAN:

of Assembly a couple of weeks ago I asked a couple of questions about that public promise and the Premier said that he knew nothing about it, that he had made no such public promise or even a private promise. But, Mr. Speaker, and this is the larger issue concerning this whole affair, it is the larger issue, the issue of whether or not people can take the word of the Premier, whether it is in private or in public. That is the larger issue which concerns a very important issue, the downgrading of the Markland cottage hospital.

Mr. Speaker, many, several people have written and they have been heard in the media, they have been heard at public meetings, to reiterate what this petition just said, that the Premier has perpetrated on the people in that area, he has perpetrated a breach of trust. A breach of trust has been perpetrated on the people. Mr. Speaker, the people served by the Markland cottage hospital are not solely resident in the district of Bellevue, which I represent. The hospital is also serving the health needs of people who live in the district of Placentia West and the member who was there earlier has left his seat now and it also serves many, many people, hundreds of people - Placentia East, I am sorry, and for the benefit of the people in the galleries I must also mention that we are not allowed to use members names. We refer to members by their districts. And also, of course, seven or eight communities in the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde also need and require and trust to -

DR. COLLINS: Are those the same communities that will be served by the clinic?

MR. CALLAN: Yes, that is correct, they will be served by the clinic. There are eleven, of the thirty-five

MR. CALLAN: communities in the district of Bellevue , only eleven are served by the Markland cottage hospital, only eleven of the thirty-five. But you also have a couple in the district of Placentia East and you also have seven or eight in the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, there is a larger issue here than the downgrading of a cottage hospital, but there is something just as important as that , I believe, the fact that this petition is signed by residents who live

MR. CALLAN: in Placentia East, in Trinity - Bay de Verde and in the district of Bellevue. Mr. Speaker, I see from the note just handed me my time is up. Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition. I hope that when the Premier gets back from his sojourn in Ottawa, or wherever he is gone, that the Premier and his colleague, the Minister of Health (Mr. House), and the other two gentlemen who represent districts on that side of the House served by the cottage hospital in Markland, that they will all sit down together, also with the Cottage Hospital Improvement Committee and any other concerned people who want to sit in on this meeting, that they will sit down, have a second look - or a third or a fourth, or whatever is is - at this decision of government and that hopefully government will see that a mistake has been made when all of the facts and figures are presented to the Premier, to the Minister of Health and the others attending this meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I thought that the

Minister of Health -

MR. HOUSE:

You did not think, did you?

MR. NEARY:

would comment on the petition just presented because it directly affects the hon. gentleman's department and the health of the people in three electoral districts in this Province. The hon. gentleman obviously does not have the courage to get up and speak his mind on this petition, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HOUSE:

I can still get up.

MR. NEARY:

Well, the hon. gentleman has the opportunity because it is back and forth. After my hon. colleague took his seat, then you -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. HOUSE:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I understand when a person stands to speak to a petition he supports the petition and does not take on the people across the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair's understanding of the rule is that one member from either side of the hon. House has the right to rise and speak in support of the petition, and I am assuming that hon. members will support the petition.

MR. NEARY:

What a cowardly point of order just made by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Speaker. He did not have the courage to get up and speak in support of this petition. I want to congratulate my colleague, Mr. Speaker, for the role that he has played in this matter so far of the closing of the Markland Hospital. And I want to congratulate all those people who have been holding public meetings and circulating petitions to try to save their hospital, Mr. Speaker. Not only are they trying to save the hospital for Markland, but they are probably in the process, if they can save that hospital, of saving the cottage hospital scheme throughout Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. Because if the minister succeeds in closing the Markland Hospital, then I would say the days are numbered for the hospitals at Come By Chance, at Botwood, at Placentia and various other parts of Newfoundland where they have a cottage hospital.

MR. NEARY: So these people, Mr. Speaker, are fighting for Newfoundland, not only for the three districts where people signed this petition, they are fighting for Newfoundland and they are fighting to try to maintain peace and health services for the people of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen petitions brought into this House with less number of names on them. We saw a petition recently tabled by the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall), the Minister of Energy, with forty-three names on it-

MR. CALLAN: Forty-three.

MR. NEARY: - and the government acted quickly on forty-three names. They moved swiftly, Mr. Speaker, to correct that situation. And here we have one of the largest petitions ever presented in this House, as indicated by my hon. colleague. The only other petition that was larger was the one that had to do with electricity rates, and that was Province wide. This is a large petition. And, Mr. Speaker, if the government have not become too arrogant and too dictatorial, they should pay attention to that petition because every signature that went on that petition did not go on it very lightly. The people knew what they were doing when they signed that petition. They knew, Mr. Speaker, that this was an important matter for residents of three electoral districts in this Province.

DR. COLLINS: The Opposition knows (inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: Long Harbour and the ERCO plant.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as a doctor I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman make a silly remark like that across the House.

Mr. Speaker, the statements that have been made about the closing of the Markland Hospital are frightening. The doctor has been silenced down there, he is not allowed to express his views, and that doctor is certainly

MR. NEARY: a person who knows the situation in that area. He has been silenced by the administration.

MR. CALLAN: He is gagged.

MR. NEARY: He is gagged. He stands to lose his job if he speaks out. Then we hear statements from people in the know, people in authority in St. John's, who say that the St. John's hospitals cannot handle the work that will come to them as a result of the closing of the Markland Hospital. That is frightening, Mr. Speaker.

And we all know, Mr. Speaker,
about

MR. NEARY: the way that the Markland Hospital and the Come By Chance Hospital, we know how they deal with trauma cases in these hospitals, we know how they deal with accidents. They have as good a reputation for dealing with trauma and accidents on the Trans-Canada Highway, and there seem to be a lot of accidents in that area and in the Come By Chance area that have to be taken to the Markland Hospital and to the Come By Chance Hospital and they have an excellent reputation of dealing with those cases, Mr. Speaker.

And then we hear statements from other medical sources telling us about the possibility of children dying, senior citizens dying as a result of the closing of this hospital. And the hon. gentleman can sneer all he likes at that, Mr. Speaker, but it is true.

So the closing down of this hospital is a very serious matter, a very serious matter indeed. And I also, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat, I also have to say this, that the Premier of this Province will never be believed again. His integrity and his honesty has been brought into play in this whole matter. Because he told the people, March 30th., that that hospital would not be closed, that any clinic would be built adjacent to the hospital, in addition to the hospital facilities. And it is a double-cross, Mr. Speaker, of the worst kind.

DR. COLLINS: Are you telling the truth? Is this the truth?

MR. NEARY: I would advise the government to reconsider the decision to close this hospital, Mr. Speaker. It is a very serious matter.

DR. COLLINS: Are we hearing the truth now?

MR. NEARY: And instead of my hon. friend, who should know better, instead of the hon. gentleman making snide remarks across this House, it would be far better if the hon. gentleman asked his colleagues to reconsider this matter, because the hon. gentleman knows the consequences as a medical man, what will happen in this area if this hospital is closed.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!
I hate to interrupt the hon. the Leader of the Opposition(Mr. Neary), but his time has expired.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, we got him up.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it was not the opposition that got me up, I had planned to address this particular petition. Mr. Speaker, I support the right of people to petition. Obviously that is a fundamental right and I support that, and I support the right of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to adequate medical services.

The petition talks about danger of health and life safety. These are not the facts of course, as given to me by the expertise that I have discussed it with. But I do say I support the right of people to have adequate medical services, but that does not necessarily mean, Mr. Speaker, that we have to continue with what we have always had.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: My understanding, Mr. Speaker, of the rules of this House is that when a petition is presented you can only rise in your place to support a petition. My impression of what the hon. gentleman is saying is that he is not supporting the prayer of the petition, If the hon. gentleman is not supporting the prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, then he is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has not heard the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House) to the effect that he is not supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the hon. gentleman who can get up there and enunciate half-truths all the way and then gets up and tries to rule somebody else out of order.

MR. NEARY: Are you supporting the petition?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the people's right to adequate medical services. I have stated that and I have told the people that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HOUSE: - some of the things that they are worried about, some of their concerns that they are worried about, the trauma that the hon. member just mentioned too, nothing will change in that respect. We have talked about a clinic that is going to provide what I call essential emergency services and this is what seems to be the fear of people. And I have had good grounds from medical people that we will adequately handle these trauma situations just as we always have.

MR. HOUSE: The other thing is we have been catering in that particular community and area to 16,000 out-patient people over the number of years and that is going to be improved with the new facility. The other thing is we had 457 people admitted to that institution last year for an average of 4.2 days, and that shows a certain pattern and we believe that the particular facility is not adequate for in-patient facilities, so we are offering certainly a good facility.

The other thing I want to mention, I am accepting the petition, Mr. Speaker, I am up to accept the petition, and I will meet with the people in the area to discuss the whole matter.

MR. YOUNG: Hear, hear! Right on there.

MR. HOUSE: What I mean by the people of the area, Mr. Speaker, is the constituted committee.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. MARSHALL: Committee of the Whole,

Mr. Speaker.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE:

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1300

ah-1

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Unified Family Court Act". (Bill No. 43).

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

MR. MARSHALL:

Order 5, Bill No. 2.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act". (Bill No. 2).

On motion clauses(I) through (20), carried.

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

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

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has read and considered the matters to them referred and directed me to report having passed Bill No. 43 and Bill No. 2 without amendment.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 2, Committee of Supply.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
Head 302-01, the Premier's Office.

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned our consideration of the estimates last time, it was suggested that the contract of Mr. Cabot Martin should be tabled, and I have pleasure now in tabling the Order in Council dated September 9, 1981, which reads: "Order that the hon. the Premier on behalf of the Province being as hereby authorized to enter into a one-year contract for the employment of Mr. Cabot Martin as Senior Policy Advisor to the Premier with effect from August 26, 1981, at a salary of \$57,000 per annum, a draft copy of the said contract being on file with the Clerk of the Executive Council."

I table, Mr. Chairman, a copy of the contract which is exactly the same as the contract under which Mr. Martin's original employment was entered into with the exception, of course, of the

June 15, 1982, Tape 1301, Page 2 -- apb

MR. MARSHALL: difference in the salary.

I could point out, Mr. Chairman, that the contract, as the hon. gentlemen will see, although The Order in Council

MR. MARSHALL:

is here and this is the intent of the thing, the contract was not signed, but it is what was passed in Cabinet, because really it was just an oversight and it was thought really not necessary because Mr. Martin had signed a contract before which was exactly the same terms here with the exception of the fifty-seven thousand dollars. And the commitment of the Province, the extent of the obligation of the Province, is recorded in the Order in Council. So, I have much pleasure in tabling this documentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, we welcome the tabling of Mr. Martin's contract. I am at a loss still, even though the hon. gentleman gave a brief explanation as to why it was not signed. The hon. minister said it was not signed because there was a previous contract. Well, Mr. Chairman, that strikes me as a very flimsy excuse for not having the document properly signed and complete. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to dwell on that matter any longer. I want to deal with statements that are being made repeatedly day in and day out by the Premier of this Province that go unchallenged, statements that are irresponsible, statements that are misleading, statements that are not true made by the Premier of this Province both inside of this House and outside of the House, Mr. Chairman. And the most recent example of these misleading and irresponsible statements have to do with the power corridor across the Province of Quebec. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say this: The hon. gentleman this morning was on the open line programme, and the hon. gentleman said that it was an initiative that was taken by this Province that brought the legislation before the Parliament of Canada. Now, Mr. Chairman, let me set the record straight. It was not because of the initiative of

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1302

RA - 2

MR. NEARY: this Province, like the Premier has been saying. It was not, and let hon. gentlemen not be fooled or duped by the Premiers misleading statements. The reason the legislation granting a power corridor across any province- it did not deal exclusively with the Province of Quebec, it did not give this Province exclusive rights to have the power corridor across Quebec and all the other provinces not have a corridor across each other's province - Mr. Chairman, this legislation was of universal application and the reason it came before the Parliament of Canada had nothing to do with this administration here or the Premier of this Province,

MR. NEARY: and the hon. gentleman knows that, Mr. Chairman, and it was stated in a letter that was written to the Minister of Energy in Quebec on June 10th, last week. Mr. Lalonde says, 'We recognize that regulating the interprovincial or international transmission of electricity raises particular problems. That is why our proposals do not go as far as those related to gas and oil. The initiative' - listen to this, Mr. Chairman, and let this -

MR. MARSHALL: Are you going to table it?

MR. NEARY: I certainly am going to table it, Mr. Chairman. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, listen to this; hon. gentlemen should listen - 'The initiative of the Government of Canada in this instance' - meaning bringing in legislation for a power corridor across various provinces - 'results from representation made by Calgary Power, now Trans-Sultra Utilities, concerning electricity sales to the United States.' Now, Mr. Chairman, let us put that statement to bed forever; it is untrue that it was this Province that initiated the legislation before the Parliament of Canada. It was Calgary Power that initiated it, and if Calgary Power had not taken the initiative there would be no legislation before the Parliament of Canada.

DR. COLLINS: Where were they going to send the power.

MR. NEARY: To the United States.

DR. COLLINS: Across what province?

MR. NEARY: I do not know what province they wanted to go across, I presume it was -

DR. COLLINS: Alberta is right on the border.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I can only go on the information supplied by the minister. And so, Mr. Chairman, the initiative did not come from this Province, and so that is the first statement that is not true. Now,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, also the hon.

Premier plays with words when he talks about rights and privileges, the people of Newfoundland do not have the same rights and privileges as other Canadians. Mr. Chairman, that also is a misleading and irresponsible statement. As far as pipelines are concerned, we have the same rights and privileges in this Province as any other Canadian. That is a myth. Mr. Chairman, as far as the transmission of electricity is concerned, every province of Canada has the same problems as we have in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY:
all equal.

And so in that regard we are

And, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. member is doing is comparing apples and oranges. To my knowledge not one Province of Canada has ever objected to a pipeline, whether it be for gas or oil. Not one Province has ever objected, to my knowledge. And if there was an objective, Mr. Chairman, you would have the same problem, problems with pipelines, as you have with transmission lines. But every Province of Canada would welcome a pipeline, would welcome it. They would give their right arm to have a pipeline bring oil and gas into their province. And that is why there has never been an objection.

And, Mr. Chairman, if you ever get an objection about a pipeline from any province, you are going to have the same problems as you have with the transmission line.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman also makes this irresponsible statement, that what Mr. Lalonde and the Government of Canada suggested to the two Provinces, Quebec and Newfoundland, was that they sit down and negotiate a power corridor. That was not the suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. gentleman knows the difference. That is not what Ottawa suggested. What Mr. Lalonde suggested was that the two governments sit down and try to resolve their differences on (a) the reopening of the Upper Churchill contract, or (b) the transmission of power from the Lower Churchill to markets on the Canadian Mainland and in the United States; and (c) that they look at the possibility of joint development of five rivers that flow from Newfoundland Labrador into the -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was referring to a letter just a moment ago allegedly coming from Mr. Lalonde to Mr. Duhaime and he said he would table it at the time. And I ask how that he table the letter because -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not finished with the letters yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order?

MR. NEARY: I will table the letter. I have every intention, Mr. Chairman, of tabling it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says he will table the letter.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact I am going to table the letter to the hon. gentleman too, but I am not finished with the letters yet, Mr. Chairman, and I only have one copy in front of me. So if that is in order,-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. There is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, the third thing was that Mr. Lalonde suggested and

MR. NEARY:

what he was talking about was a package deal. He was not talking about the two provinces negotiating a corridor across the province of Quebec, that is false and misleading and irresponsible, that is not what the Government of Canada recommended. The Government of Canada recommended three things: Sit down and resolve your differences on the reopening of the Upper Churchill contract; the development of five rivers where the headwaters are in the Newfoundland part of Labrador with the downstream in the province of Quebec Labrador; and the transmission of electricity either on the present transmission lines, Hydro Quebec's transmission lines, or a new transmission line across the province of Quebec. That is what was recommended, because neither one of these provinces would have the authority to negotiate a corridor. They can come to some kind of a mutual agreement on how they would wheel the power across the province of Quebec. And let me say this, Mr. Chairman, let me say this, that I was completely amazed when I read both letters, a letter to the hon. gentleman and a letter to Mr. Duhaime, the Minister of Energy in the province of Quebec, where the federal Minister of Energy says on page two just listen to this, Mr. Chairman, he is saying to the minister in Quebec, "Thank you for the efforts you have made to facilitate the reopening of negotiations. I have communicated today with our colleague in Newfoundland, Mr. Marshall, again to inform him that the Government of Canada is of the opinion that the only real solution satisfying all legal points separating the two provinces is a comprehensive agreement covering production and transmission of electricity in Labrador and on the North shore. In our discussions," Mr. Lalonde says to his colleague in Quebec, "you have emphasized

MR. NEARY: your feeling that some delay in implementing the sections of the Bill C108 would be helpful in encouraging a negotiated settlement between the two provinces. You mentioned a period of six months".

DR. COLLINS: It puts too much pressure on the Newfoundland government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it puts more pressure on the Quebec government because that act is going to be proclaimed in six months time.

DR. COLLINS: And you are against the delay, are you?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, further in the seventh paragraph, and this, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion is the key paragraph, it says, "The Government of Canada is of the view that we should give another chance to the negotiations processed. A settlement between the two governments would be substantially beneficial for both,

MR. S. NEARY: "Both would gain revenues and both would benefit from the creation of thousands of jobs, something both provinces need at this time. The regrettable" - listen to this, Mr. Chairman - "the regrettable and possible futile alternative risks being the continuation of years of litigation between the two provincial governments."

DR. COLLINS: Is that Mr. Duhaime's letter or Mr. Lalonde's?

MR. NEARY: That is Mr. Lalonde writing Mr. Duhaime.

DR. COLLINS: It sounded like Mr. Duhaime.

MR. NEARY: Well, so what!

Mr. Chairman, for some reason or other that I do not understand and that people of this Province cannot comprehend is why, after this offer is laid on the table, Quebec is flexible, why the Minister of Energy (Mr. W. Marshall) or the administration in this Province will not sit down and negotiate and try to resolve these matters in good faith?

Mr. Chairman, why is the Minister of Energy in this Province trying to be difficult? Why is he going out of his way to be difficult? The hon. gentleman says, 'We are not going to negotiate.' Mr. Chairman, even if that act had been proclaimed on the night that it went through third reading in Parliament, negotiations would have to take place. You have to have a certain amount of good will. And if you did not have that, we would be tied up for the next 100 years in litigation. And if a transmission line was forced to cross the Province of Quebec, you would have to have a battalion to watch each tower, because, Mr. Chairman, if Newfoundland put the shoe on the other foot - if Newfoundland did not want a transmission line or a pipe line, would we allow it to go there? Would we?

MR. CARTER: Sure we would.

MR. NEARY: How does the hon. gentleman know?

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) because

Newfoundlanders are reasonable people.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the first thing that would happen is that we would be tied up, we would be tied up in litigation for the next 100 years. There would be problems about the environment, we would be in the court. We would be in the courts for the next 100 years. And hon. gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, they can dig in and they can tell the world, 'If you do not do it our way you do not do it at all.' In that case the water from the Lower Churchill will flow into the Atlantic forever, there will be a dead end on the reopening of the Upper Churchill contract- it will never be reopened-and there will be no other rivers in Labrador developed. That is the consequences of the policy that the hon. gentleman is following.

DR. COLLINS: That is a good summary of the Quebec case.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would say this, Mr. Chairman, that negotiations, otherwise you would have a Falkland Islands situation - if you want a Falkland Islands situation where Argentina - and I compare this Province now to the junta in Argentina -

MR. DINN: Oh, good.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - where the junta refused to negotiate -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - and what happened?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. Leader of the Opposition's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: I will come back to it again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. President of Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Chairman, at least we do have something that the hon. gentleman has said that we can reply to. First of all I assume the hon. gentleman is going to table that letter, and I would observe and I think that this should be observed, and this is one of the problems we have with the federal government, it is rather unusual that the hon. gentleman could come into possession of a letter flowing between the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Lalonde) for the federal government, and the Minister of Energy Resources of the Province of Quebec, allegedly setting forth the position of the federal government when we have not been given the courtesy of receiving a copy of that same letter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: That is true. So I think that fact alone, Mr. Chairman, indicates to me that the hon. gentleman is in league with the hon. Energy Minister in Ottawa and the Federal Liberal Party to the same degree as the Federal Liberal Party to the same degree as the Federal Liberal Party is so obviously in league with colleagues in the Province of Quebec.

DR. COLLINS: The federal government will not communicate with the government of Newfoundland.

MR. MARSHALL: That is a fact, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has indicated, that obviously the federal government again, just as they did when they came down on the offshore case, communicated with the provincial opposition Liberal caucus, they are also giving them correspondence which we have not had the benefit of seeing, but we will see it because the hon. gentleman is going to table it.

MR. NEARY: I have no hesitation.

MR. HOUSE: That is one of the reasons they got wiped out in the last election.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman always gets up and speaks with great authority, but nobody really challenges him to any great degree because he is an aggressive speaker and because he puts his sentences together the way he does that sometimes they take it that he understands what he is talking about. But if you listen, Mr. Speaker, to the substance of what the hon. gentleman says, you will realize that this is entirely to the contrary.

He talks about we not having the same rights as other provinces of Canada, and the

MR. MARSHALL:

matter with respect to the transmission of power. Is the hon. gentleman not familiar with the provisions of Bill C-108? Is not the hon. gentleman familiar with Section 12, which is Section 43, which has one of the Sections which has been deferred, postponed, cancelled, whichever way one wishes to express it, and it says, 'The provisions of part 5 that apply in respect of a pipeline and power rights, duties and liabilities of a company to set out in that part in respect of a pipeline, apply in respect of international power line of a person as if the reference in that part were accordingly.' So, Mr. Chairman, it is so that they do have the right to apply to the National Energy Board for power lines and these things. And it is so, no matter what the hon. gentleman says, that we are not being treated when we are not given that particular right by the Government of Canada. Now, one of the main problems that we have with respect to the message given by the hon. Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources—and I am in the process of responding to that today, and unlike him I will give him the courtesy of receipt of the reply before I make it public—his own telex, Mr. Chairman, was sent after business hours on Thursday and was not received until later on Friday morning, never came to our attention. The first thing that we were aware of the situation was we read it in the press. But that does not surprise me today after I see that the hon. gentleman, cosy, cosy with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), is giving him information in really a distasteful manner, to do this, to deal with the Opposition rather than the government. How does the hon. gentleman in Ottawa ever expect to be able to sit down and negotiate on a reasonable basis if he continues to operate in those tactics?

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1308

RA - 2

MR. MARSHALL: Now let me make it plain. There is no government that has ever negotiated as much as this government has. On the offshore, we have wanted to negotiate on the offshore. We have put a proposal before the federal government on the offshore; they have not responded to it. The subject before consideration now is with respect to the transmission lines. For seven years we have negotiated, for eight years we have negotiated, and we have negotiated hard with the Province of Quebec. And they have not put anything substantial to any degree whatsoever on the table. The last meeting with the Province of Quebec occurred in September of last year between myself and Mr. Duhaime, about ten days before the beginning of the reversion case before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. The meeting was at his request because he wanted us to postpone the reversion case, to which we

MR. MARSHALL: replied in the negative because, as I say, this matter had been going on for such a long period of time it had to be brought to a resolution. Subsequent to that meeting I wrote him a letter, a three page letter, recounting the meeting and recounting the fact that nothing of substance was put on the table, indicating to him that we are always prepared to negotiate, but I had to candidly tell him that if he was not prepared to put something substantial on the table that there would appear to be no basis of talks and negotiations. His response to me some six weeks later was a four line letter, five or six line letter, which say, 'Thank you for your letter of such-and-such. You raised some very interesting points and perhaps we can discuss them at some time'. Now does that sound like the action of a gentleman or a government that was interested in negotiations? I say not. So this government is always prepared to negotiate, But we will not and we will never, Mr. Chairman, negotiate inherent, basic rights which we possess as Canadian citizens. These rights, and this right which we contend is an inherent, basic right, is a right which is this right for the transmission of hydro, to get this power. It was promised to us, the federal government is now reneging on it, and it reneges on it on the basis of -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: - if I could, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: It reneges on it on the basis, Mr. Chairman, of having negotiations. They want to negotiate, they will not put the corridor through until we negotiate. In other words, they are saying to us that we will not give you your basic rights until you negotiate with the Province of Quebec. Now our position quite simply, Mr. Chairman, is this, that our rights in

MR. MARSHALL: the Canadian Confederation do not depend upon our negotiations with the Province of Quebec or with anyone else. We have these rights and what the federal government is doing by this particular action is dealing out a deck of cards with all of the cards being dealt to the Province of Quebec. There were negotiations before, Mr. Chairman, on that basis and we know what the results were. Indeed, if there had been a recognition, if the federal government of the day had been prepared to implement the right which Newfoundlanders have to this power corridor in 1960, the government of the day would have been in a much better position with respect to their bargaining and they would not be at a disadvantage or an unequal position. And I think with the personnel of that government we would have still had the same mistakes anyway because they were so consummately stupid in their handling of the affairs of this Province, but at least they would have felt in a more equal position and possibly something better would come. I say to the hon. gentlemen there opposite when you have people put in unequal positions what is going to happen is you are going to have inequalities that are going to result.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: And that is what the federal government was doing in this particular case. I will get back to it later on, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have every intention of tabling these two letters. I have a copy of the letter that was also sent

MR. NEARY: to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, And can you imagine the hon. gentleman getting up and criticizing me for having copies of these letters when I asked Ottawa to let me have all the information in connection with this matter so that the truth would come out, and not just one side of the story, as we have been hearing from the hon. the Premier, making irresponsible and inflammatory statements.

Mr. Chairman, can you understand the minister who just took his seat criticizing us for having these letters before the hon. gentleman received the one from Quebec, when on Friday - and the hon. gentleman knew there was a letter on the way to him from Mr. Lalonde.

MR. MARSHALL: I did not know.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman did know there was a letter on the way to him he received since Friday.

MR. MARSHALL: That is untrue.

MR. NEARY: It is not untrue, Mr. Chairman. And he jumped the gun on Friday and brought in a resolution before he had all the facts at his fingertips, before he knew what had happened in connection with the postponement of the proclamation. Before he knew that the Premier brought a resolution into the House condemning Ottawa. He does not know why he was condemning Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: He condemned Ottawa, Mr. Chairman, brought in a resolution that was inflammatory, insulting, rude, irresponsible and smelled of warmongering, before the hon. gentlemen had the facts at their fingertips, and a letter on the way to the hon. gentleman explaining the whole thing. And the letter, Mr. Chairman, in my

MR. NEARY: opinion, is a reasonable proposal, reasonable and fair -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - reasonable and fair in every respect. And the whole trouble is, Mr. Chairman, that is anybody was being discourteous, it was not me or members of this side of the House, it was the hon. gentleman and the Premier, the Siamese twins who were being discourteous, and not only being discourteous but being

MR. NEARY:

unfair to Newfoundland and to Newfoundlanders because they did not tell the truth about this situation to the people of this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I would ask the hon. gentleman to retract it.

MR. NEARY: I withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: The fact of the matter is that there was no communication, we had no communication. If we had had that communication on Friday morning, Mr. Chairman, that resolution that this House passed would have been infinitely stronger than it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. That is just a difference of opinion.

MR. MARSHALL: It is a point of order.

MR. NEARY: It is not a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: It has been legitimately raised.

MR. NEARY: It is not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order.

MR. NEARY: Rule, Your Honour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will reserve ruling on that point of order because I did not hear what the hon. Leader of the Opposition said.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, let me read the letter written to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) in this Province in case hon. gentlemen have not heard it or have not seen it, and let us see who is telling the truth and let us see who is fair and let us see who the real culprit is in this whole matter. Let us see who is

MR. NEARY: being difficult to get along with and being unreasonable. I will read the letter and then I will table it after. "Dear Sir," it says to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall). To, "Hon. William Marshall, Minister of Energy, St. John's, Newfoundland. Dear Sir: During the last few months I have had the privilege of discussing with you and your predecessor, Mr. Barry, the dispute between the Newfoundland and Quebec Governments over the transmission of electricity. As you know, the Government of Canada tabled in Parliament last June a draft bill and in February of this year a bill entitled, "The Energy Security Act". This bill contains legislative amendments to the National Energy Board Act which will permit the designation of certain interprovincial power lines as falling under the regulatory power of that board, and which will grant the board authority to permit expropriation for these designated interprovincial and international electricity transmission lines. Our government has already indicated very clearly its willingness to exercise its constitutional authority to regulate certain aspects of interprovincial and international electricity transmission.

"As you know, the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party have voted against those provisions in Parliament." Mr. Chairman, I hope hon. gentlemen got that. "As you know, the Conservative Party of Canada and the New Democratic Party have voted against those provisions in Parliament. You will also remember that in my previous correspondence with you and your predecessor, as well as in numerous public statements, I have repeatedly stated that the federal government

MR. NEARY:

"strongly favours a negotiated settlement between the two provincial governments. For technical as well as economic reasons, a negotiated settlement provided for intergrated movement of Labrador power through the Quebec Hydro system is infinitely superior to any system of dedicated line transmitting power through Quebec. Since the publication of our proposed amendments to the National Energy Board Act, I have had discussions with the Minister of Energy for Quebec, Mr. Yves Duhaime. We have reviewed together the dispute between Quebec and Newfoundland concerning the transmission of electricity. From these discussions I have a strong preception that the Government of Quebec is anxious to arrive at a negotiated settlement that would be advantageous to both parties.' Listen to this, Mr. Chairman, 'In particular, I have a clear indication' - I will repeat that, Mr. Chairman - 'In particular, I have a clear indication that as a part of negotiations extending to the development of the Lower Churchill River as well as to the Quebec North shore rivers, the Quebec government would be willing to improve appreciatively the payments relating to the Upper Churchill power. In addition, the Quebec government would be willing to discuss arrangements under which Quebec Hydro would not be the exclusive buyer of additional electricity produced in Labrador.' Can I repeat that again in case the hon. bearded wonder from Grand Bank (Mr. Matthews) does not understand it? 'The Government of Quebec would be willing to discuss arrangements under which Hydro Quebec would not be the exclusive buyer of additional electricity produced in Labrador.'

DR. COLLINS: They would not take all of our resources, they would only take half of it.

MR. NEARY: "It is clear from these proposals" -

DR. COLLINS: Very impressive.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman
has such a buttoned-down, narrow mind. Look, in
Newfoundland and in this House you have Tories and you
have Progressive Conservatives,

MR. NEARY: and there is a vast difference, Mr. Chairman, in Progressive Conservatives and Tories, the real blue bloods. And the real blue bloods are sitting right there in the front seats, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), real Tories. They are the ultimate in Toryism.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Now the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) could be anything, a Progressive Conservative, or a Liberal, or even an NDP, but I do not think he could be a red roaring Tory. There is the original red roaring Tory right there.

DR. COLLINS: The Opposition are either naive or (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, "It is clear from these proposals that the Quebec Government is genuinely interested in proceeding with dispatch to serious negotiations of the issues dividing the two provinces concerning the production and distribution of electrical power. Moreover, it is the view of the Government of Canada that the only truly satisfactory way to resolve the dispute between the two provinces is through negotiations covering a broad range of issues"- not the corridors the Premier is talking about- "a broad range of issues dealing with the production and the transmission of electricity!"

"The experience of the past ten years clearly shows that exclusive concentration on the contract between Quebec Hydro and the Newfoundland and Labrador Government will only lead to a dead end. In the circumstances we believe that we should give one more chance to the process of negotiations to succeed. An amicable resolution of the conflict between the two provinces is the best guarantee of large, additional revenues to the Government of Newfoundland, as well as the early creation of major economic

MR. NEARY: activity, which both provinces are sorely needing at the present time. The alternative" - Mr. Chairman, just listen to this - "the alternative will be more years of endless and possibly fruitless litigation between the two provinces," That is the alternative.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is another key sentence."In spite of the opposition of the Conservative and the New Democratic parties, the government of Canada has decided to ask parliament to pass bill C-108, including the provisions concerning electrical power transmission. However, in order to encourage both provincial governments to return in good faith

MR. S. NEARY: "to the bargaining table, the Government of Canada has also decided to ask Parliament to amend Bill C 108 so that any part of the legislation concerning the movement of electricity would come into effect six months after proclamation".

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition's time has elapsed.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I have to have another go at it as well.

First of all, there are so many things that, you know, that could be said about that telex. I will be responding to that telex. I am in the process of responding and I will be making it public tomorrow. Perhaps I will make it public in a press conference and then afterwards in the House. Because quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, in matters respecting the federal government with the hon. gentleman there over so assiduously wishing to protect them, it is very difficult to make a reasoned statement without being flooded with interruptions. I will be responding to that telex tomorrow. Suffice it to say, Mr. Chairman, that when you look at that telex and you read it the only way I can describe it is as dripping and sopping with cynicism of a nature that we have not even experienced from the federal government before. You will note in the telex, an analysis of what the hon. gentleman read in the telex, where the hon. gentleman indicates that he has discussions with Mr. Duhaime. 'Since the publication of our proposed amendments to the National Energy Board Act, I have discussions with the Minister of Energy for Quebec, Mr. Duhaime, We have reviewed together the

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1314

MJ - 2

MR. MARSHALL: dispute between Quebec and Newfoundland concerning the transmission and electricity." Now how nice and cosy, cosy, Mr. Chairman, Almost as cosy, cosy, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the Minister of Energy Mines and Resources for Canada. How nice and cosy, cosy and how, Mr. Chairman, we should atleast weigh the fact that the hon. gentleman is indicating in his telex of consultations with the Province of Quebec when they never had the courtesy to record us the same type of consultation. Now that is the first point, Mr. Chairman, and that has to be a very real point, And his statements in that telex the meat really and meaning to the statements, the intemperate remarks, that were made by the Premier of Quebec in the National Assembly of Quebec some ten days before that, you will recall

MR. MARSHALL: he was quoted as saying, Mr. Chairman, that the government - he did not say it in these words, he said it in much more abrasive words - in effect that the Government of this Province better learn, 'better learn', that they were going to have to negotiate. And what were the next words he said? He was reported as saying, 'And sooner than they think'. 'Sooner than they think'. Yes, Mr. Chairman, in his mind, 'sooner than they think', because, you see, he had already been in consultation at the time, quite obviously, with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Duhaime) who has a seat in the Province of Quebec, and he obviously knew from that statement what the decision was. It has been verified and corroborated by this cynical telegram that was sent.

Another point that the hon. gentleman should be well aware of as well is that my understanding of the provision of that bill was not that the sections with respect to the power corridor would come into effect six months hence, Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, that was not the wording, The wording that was there was, "These sections will come into effect on a date to be proclaimed by the Governor in Council" - that is the Cabinet - "which shall not happen in any event earlier than six months time". Now, no guarantee. What assurances have we, in six months time, that this power corridor legislation will go through, Mr. Chairman? What possible assurance? We had assurances before that we would get the power corridor, and we can remember the hon. gentlemen on the other side beating their breasts and singing, 'How great they art', and how great the federal powers were to at last give us the power corridor. We had it promised to us and the promise is foregone and they have reneged on it. So what confidence can we have that this is going to be proclaimed in six months? What

MR. MARSHALL: confidence can we have
when we know there are seventy-four members of the
Quebec caucus in the Federal Liberal Party? What
confidence can we have when we hear their

MR. MARSHALL:

bosom buddy and colleague, Mr. Levesque, who is not known, Mr. Chairman, for reposing great confidence in the way that Confederation works. What more can we think when he uses such statements as 'Hell will freeze over before they will get the power line'? Was he repeating in effect the information that he had from the federal government? I rather think so, Mr. Chairman, and until proven to the contrary, will accept that as the position. The whole way in which we have seen treated and the way in which this is going on is absolutely disgraceful. What has happened here, let there be no mistake about it, is we have once again been denied our rights for a power corridor and in place of that Newfoundland's basic rights are being put up on the pyre again, at the mercy of the Province of Quebec. What is to say - this Province now, if you operate in what the federal government would wish us to do, would go in and negotiate as to whether we had the same rights as other Canadians, which is something which we will not do. And will they use that in a guise, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of saying, 'Oh, we need more negotiations', because Newfoundlanders refuse to negotiate their basic rights? Now as for negotiations, we have negotiated and we have negotiated in good faith for the past seven or eight years on the matter of the hydro power. We have done everything with Quebec to try to get Quebec mobile. There has been no movement, but now we are to take the word of Mr. Lalonde that he thinks that there is movement. Why does he think there is movement? I am surprised that the hon. gentleman there opposite would be prepared now to take the word of Mr. Lalonde, when he indicated in this House not so long ago that Mr. Lalonde was not to be trusted.

MR. SIMMS:

Right on!

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1316

RA - 2

MR. MARSHALL: I would say that the hon. gentleman has probably been drawn into line by Mr. Lalonde, and Mr. Lalonde's colleagues, and being told by the Leader outside the House to toe the line and to adopt whatever the federal government want, which is what the Leader outside the House did to his sorrow during the last Provincial election. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we have no confidence in the way this thing has been handled. I mean, here the federal government obviously has imparted its decision

MR. MARSHALL: to the province of Quebec before it imparted it to this Province. It is obviously said if they put such credence, by the way, in what the Conservatives and the New Democratic Party said, why did they not keep the whole bill? Why did they bother to proclaim any of the bill if they were going to put such weight in the criticisms? Because the opposition parties in the House of Commons criticized the entire provisions of bill C 100. So they need not give us that. And, Mr. Chairman, it is just a little bit too serious for Mr. Lalonde to be entering into his political gamesmanship.

Now, the situation, as I say, with respect to negotiations, to hear a Newfoundlander stand on the floor and to say he agrees with Mr. Lalonde and the process, Mr. Lalonde, make no mistake about it, is repeating the same argument and the same proposition that has been made by the government in Quebec over and over and again, month after month, and year after year, for the purpose of stonewalling and stymieing any progress being made. Because as each day goes by they get millions of dollars. What does that telex say? It repeats exactly the same thing and the hon. gentleman agrees with it. He agrees with this so-called 'package deal' which, incidentally, involves the Province of Quebec getting a slice out of the Lower Churchill. Now, the people of Quebec have no more rights to the benefits and the resources of the Lower Churchill, Mr. Chairman, then we have to the rights of what is derived from James Bay. That is a right of this Province and the only way that we can realize that right, the only way that we can, if there are any negotiations, can deal

MR. MARSHALL: on an equal basis with Quebec is if we have the same rights as they have, as any other province of Canada. How can you sit down with somebody and even negotiate - this is why the Upper Churchill occurred, this is why we made no progress over seven or eight years, because you sit down with the Province of Quebec and they know that Ottawa is behind them and Ottawa is going to block the transmission of power. And this is what Ottawa is doing in this particular case, believe you me, it is taking steps to block the transmission of power.

They have made no meaningful proposals with respect to the Upper Churchill. And I say also, Mr. Chairman, that one of the purposes of this move, I believe, is to counteract the effect of the Reversion Case. Because this government had the courage to bring in the Act which it did, and has brought it to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, it has been ruled to be valid in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, it only awaits an adjudication of the Supreme Court of Canada, the people of Quebec and the Government of Quebec all of a sudden now are getting concerned. So they say to their friends in Ottawa, "Well, we have got to have something to counteract that, so what can we do?"

MR. MARSHALL: So their friends in Ottawa say, "Well, we will not give them the transmission rights, so that will bring them back at least a way and put up the border again". Mr. Chairman, the basic rights of the people of - we are prepared to negotiate on any fair basis with anybody, on an equal basis. We want the federal government to negotiate on the offshore on a reasonable basis to protect the interests of the people of this Province, but we have had no success with respect to it. We have tried to negotiate with the Province of Quebec over and over again but we will never, Mr. Chairman, and the same hell will freeze over as Premier Levesque referred to, because hell will freeze over before this Province will ever, ever negotiate basic rights which -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - it has within confederation. Otherwise, that is all we can do. You know, the hon. gentleman is prepared to accept Mr. Lalonde saying that the Quebec government is prepared to improve the offer, he is prepared to accept what Mr. Duhaime says about improving the offer despite the experience of the past seven or eight years, despite the results of that meeting, despite the cavalier attitude of Mr. Duhaime. So, you know, he can accept that, I have no doubt he would accept it, because he is a part and parcel of that same group of people who accepted everything to the loss now of \$500 million to \$600 million a year. Well, that is not going to happen again, Mr. Chairman. And no matter what happens this Province is not going to be subjected to the tender mercies of Quebec, as to whether it has the rights to live as equal Canadian Citizens or as something less. That will never occur. And the proposal which is in this telex, this message from

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Duhaime, which is really one that the cynicism could be wrung out of, if you consider all the factors in it, the very fact that the hon. gentleman consulted with Mr. Levesque - this is what he did, he consulted with Rene Levesque, He did not consult with the people of this Province, he consults with the Leader of the Opposition and gives him the information. They refuse, themselves, to negotiate themselves on the offshore. All of these factors are harmful to the people of this Province, and how he ever expects the people of Newfoundland to accept this, I do not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: And it sounds so reasonable people will say, "Oh, why do you not negotiate"? Because-

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - negotiate sounds fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order.

MR. MARSHALL: What we have been is trapped into it, Mr. Chairman, with the connivance collusion of Ottawa with Quebec, and the hon. weaklings on the other side will go along with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is a classic example of the kind of bile and poison that we have been hearing now in this Province for ten years. The actual fact of the matter

MR. NEARY: is, Mr. Chairman, there have never been any meaningful negotiations carried on by this Province.

MR. TULK: There he goes now, look.

MR. NEARY: Now the hon. gentleman runs away. Mr. Chairman, the only time that negotiations had any chance at all was when the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), the former Minister of Energy was involved in the negotiations. Then they had a half a chance. If the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) was involved in the negotiations the matter would have been resolved years ago. The hon. minister is a gentleman and a negotiator, a skilled negotiator. But what we have here, Mr. Chairman, is a skinful of hate, a skinful of hate, Mr. Chairman, aiding and abetting and advising the Premier who is listening to the hon. gentleman, who is putting Newfoundland down the economic drain. And, Mr. Chairman, I will submit to this House that nothing will happen in the way of meaningful negotiations, or the resolving of the problems between Ottawa and this Province, between Quebec and this Province, between anyone else and this Province, until the hon. gentleman is put out to pasture. The hon. gentleman got the flick once before out of the Cabinet.

You know, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman just made statements that were absolutely unbelievable. The hon. gentleman was accusing the Opposition of cosyng up to this one, in this one's pocket, their friends here and their friends there, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, these statements had absolutely no foundation. They were a figment of the hon. gentleman's narrow-mindedness and his bigotry. They were figments of his little buttoned-down mind. They were figments of his little narrow mind and his buttoned-down Tory mind. Mr. Chairman, they had nothing to do with fact, nothing to do with reality, they had to do

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1319

IB-2

MR. NEARY: with some kind of a little vicious mind that the hon. gentleman has, a vicious buttoned-down mind and bigotry on the part of the hon. gentleman.

The hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford), by the way, Mr. Chairman, cannot refer to residents of Quebec as Canadians. The hon. the Premier has repeatedly referred

MR. NEARY: to residents of Quebec as French Canadians. They do not refer to us as English speaking Canadians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no?

MR. NEARY: No they do not.

MR. RIDEOUT: What do you call them?

MR. NEARY: And you talk about poison and venom, Mr. Chairman, who was it said in this House that the water of the Lower Churchill will flow into the Atlantic until hell freezes over.

MR. DINN: Rene Levesque said we will not have a transmission line until hell freezes over.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, that hon. gentleman has a little narrow, buttoned-down, bigoted mind, and there have never been any meaningful negotiations carried on. And what upsets the hon. gentleman so much is this, that these letters, I hope, will be made public. Now, what I would like to see, Mr. Chairman, are those two letters published side by side with the statements, the irresponsible statements made by the Premier of this Province (Mr. Peckford) and made by his Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), the Siamese twins.

MR. TULK: The real thing.

MR. NEARY: Publish the letters side by side with the statements made by the great pretender and by the real Premier, the Minister of Energy, and let the people decide who the real culprit is in these matters, let the people.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman is upset because the hon. gentleman is afraid that the people of this Province will see the truth and they will see through the gigantic bluff that has been carried on by this administration for the last ten years.

MR. NEARY: And what a bluff it has been, Mr. Chairman. They are afraid they are going to be exposed for perpetrating a gigantic fraud on the people of this Province, that is what they are afraid of. Mr. Chairman, here are the two letters. Any fair-minded Canadian, any fair-minded resident of Quebec or Newfoundland reading these two letters would say, 'There you go, that is a reasonable and fair proposition. Now why do the parties not go back to the bargaining table and negotiate in good faith and after six months, if they do not resolve their problems, then the act will be proclaimed!'

DR. COLLINS: Oh, who said that?

MR. NEARY: Who said it? Mr. Lalonde said it right in his letters.

MR. TOBIN: The newspapers would not publish them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this is a very realistic and reasonable proposal. And what it is asking is both parties - it is not only asking this government, it is also treating the government of Quebec in exactly the same manner as it is treating this

MR. NEARY: government in saying, 'Let us get back to the bargaining table and let us negotiate a settlement. And after three months, if you cannot resolve your problems, then we will proclaim the legislation'. Now, Mr. Chairman, who does that put at a disadvantage? The hon. gentleman tries to leave the impression it puts the negotiating team from Newfoundland at a disadvantage. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think it puts this Province at an advantage, because they are going into negotiations with an assurance in their pocket, in their hip pocket, that if Quebec does not come to their senses and bargain in good faith, that the act will be proclaimed forcing a power corridor across the Province of Quebec. Now that is a nice little thing to have in your back pocket when you go to the negotiating table, Mr. Chairman.

So I would appeal to this administration to stop squirting their venom and their poison, to stop their hatred and their prejudice, to stop making inflammatory remarks, stop their warmongering, stop their insulting and rude remarks. And the hon. gentleman is an expert at it, the ultimate in nastiness. Mr. Chairman, if you want to prolong the war in the Falkland Islands, send down the hon. gentleman. If you want to prolong the war in Palestine, between Palestine and Israel, send over the hon. gentleman. And if you want to start the third world war, I would suggest that you make the hon. gentleman Minister of Defence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Send the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) to the United Nations and I guarantee you within twenty-four hours you will have a third world war started, Mr. Chairman. And, Mr. Chairman, this accomplishes nothing for Newfoundland or for the people of this Province, no more than it accomplishes anything for the Province of

MR. NEARY: Quebec.

MR. STAGG: Sit down now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what are negotiations?

Do I have to go through that again? What are negotiations?

Are negotiations the way that the Premier and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) want it done? You do it our way or you do not do it at all, is that negotiations?

MR. TOBIN: It is our right. It is our right.

MR. NEARY: What is our right?

MR. TOBIN: You know what is our right.

MR. NEARY: What is it? I challenge the hon. gentleman to get up and tell us what is our right. What is our right? What is our right?

MR. TOBIN: To transport power through Quebec.

MR. NEARY: Oh, it is our right, I see. The Province of Quebec does not have any rights.

MR. TOBIN: What about the rights of Alberta?

MR. NEARY: Yes, what about it?

MR. TOBIN: The right to go through the rest of the provinces.

MR. NEARY: On what? On what?

MR. TOBIN: To transmit power.

MR. NEARY: On a pipeline.

MR. TOBIN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Province of Alberta can run a pipeline, a gas pipeline or an oil pipeline through a province only if the province agrees to it.

MR. TOBIN: What is Confederation all about?

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman trying to tell me that if Newfoundland did not want a pipeline, if Newfoundland -

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1322

MLeP-1

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order please! The hon. gentlemans
time has elapsed.

MR. S. NEARY: Oh. I will be back on it again,
Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Member for Stephenville.
(Mr. Stagg).

MR. F. STAGG: Mr. Chairman-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: - I have been away for awhile from
the Legislature-

MR. BAIRD: How lucky you are.

MR. STAGG: and I certainly-

MR. BAIRD: Running away. Running away.

MR. STAGG: - certainly believe that very
little has changed here so far as the Opposition's position is
concerned. We have the same old story from the Opposition Liberals,
on the one hand they say they the Province, they have supported
a resolution put forward recently condemning the federal
government in there actions concerning the reference of the
offshore dispute to the Supreme Court. So that is what they did,
they did the vote but, unfortunately, every other action that
they take in the House of Assembly is subversive. They are a
group of subversives, Mr. Chairman-

MR. STAGG: - they are apologists for the
federal liberals, they are apologists for Mr. Chretien and
Mr. Lalonde and especially Mr . Rompkey, who appears to be the
only source of employment for defeated Liberals. All the Liberals
who were defeated in the provincial election of April 6th, are
now on Mr. Rompkey;s door looking for a job, and I understand
Mr. Rompkey is coming through in some respects.

MR. F. STAGG: Now, Mr. Chairman, what I would like for the Opposition to deal with in this debate since it has turned into an energy debate, and I understand that we are on the Premier's Office, on the estimates concerning the Premier's Office- is that not correct?- but, as usual, debate is far-ranging and relevance is stretched to the extremes, so the order of the day has been to attack the energy policy of the Province. Can you imagine the Opposition Liberals in this House attacking the energy policy of this government? The people of this Province in no uncertain terms told everyone- they spoke, and they said, ' We support the valiant courageous efforts of this government and this group-

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: - of individuals in their fight for there resources of this Province.' They said it in no uncertain terms. This is the ultimate gallop poll, Mr. Chairman, the ultimate gallop poll, when the government puts itself on the line and goes out and says, ' Do you support us or do you not?' And the people have said in no uncertain terms that they do. Now, Mr. Chiarman, the Opposition Liberals have,

MR. STAGG: on many occasions, come to the rescue, or their version of the rescue, of the federal Liberals and it is something that they will regret. I would say they do regret it. But their sense of partisanship is such that when they are confronted with someone attacking a Liberal, their first response is a sort of a 'need your response', someone attacks a Liberal, 'I must defend him'.

Now, there was a spontaneous declaration by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) early in the session, something that he would like to have gone unrecorded. But when one of our members here indicated - I believe it may have been the Premier who indicated that he would not trust Mr. Lalonde as far as he could throw him,

MR. RIDEOUT: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STAGG: The Leader of the Opposition spontaneously said that himself, did he not?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, that is right.

MR. STAGG: Yes. He said, "I would not trust Mr. Lalonde any further than I could throw him".

MR. RIDEOUT: Now he preaches by him.

MR. STAGG: Now he puts forward in this Legislature a letter that he somehow got. He has in his possession a letter from Mr. Lalonde to Mr. Bérubé - is that his name? - the Quebec minister. And we are supposed to trust Mr. Lalonde, according to the arguments given by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lalonde and Mr. Chretien, a man who comes down to Newfoundland, does not deal with the elected government in Newfoundland, sits down and has dinner with and converses with and buys dinner for, undoubtedly, the defeated group of rag-tag artillery across the way.

Now, this is the sort of thing, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot tolerate. How can you expect us to react, when we are asked to support a man and support

MR. STAGG: the word of a man who is not even supported, really, by his political colleagues here in this Province? We are said to be undermining Canada. We are called bigots on this side, warmongers and so on. What I say to hon. members of this House is that I have heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) today make the same kind of speech that his predecessor, the former Leader of the Opposition made as his campaign slogan when he was running for the leadership of the Liberal Party, as it then was in 1980, in November of 1980.

MR. PEACH: The out-house leader?

MR. STAGG: That is the former leader.

That is the outside-of-the-House Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PEACH: Out-house leader. In-house and out-house.

MR. STAGG: Some of my hon. colleagues have shortened the name to the in-house leader and the other fellow who is not in the House, that leader.

MR. STAGG: I would not do that, Mr. Chairman. What we have been witnessing here today, and he has made it on several occasions, is a Stirling speech, it if the Stirling speech of the present Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), it is a Stirling speech. It is the speech that Mr. Stirling, who is the Leader of the Opposition outside the House, it is the same speech that he made in his acceptance when he defeated Mr. Thom's for the Leadership of the Liberal Party in November. I believe it was 1980 that he did so. His speech revolved around that he was a great Canadian and the rest of the people, the Tories, not only were they not great Canadians, but they were separatists and they were the type of people to tear the country apart. Now the ultimate decision in these matters, Mr. Chairman, lies with the people, and there is no more sterling test of whether you have the support of the people than to go to them in an election, and to even be more forward than that, to put a one issue election before the people, which is what happened in March and April of this year. It is something that strategists might say, 'That is a terrible thing to do. You have bitten off more than you can chew this time, and you are really going to be hoisted on your own petard, to have a one issue election in March of a year in which unemployment is high and they are having the worst winter in years.' And certainly sthe people of the Province had every reason to say, 'No, we do not have what it takes, we do not have the sense of idealism and the sense of Newfoundland that the Premier asks us to have, and that his party and his candidates asks us to have. And what did they answer? Well, they answerer loud and clear that they support the government and its position on these major issues. And what do we get from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) in the House? We get a Stirling speech, we get a rerun, a rerun, of the speech that Mr. Stirling made both in the House and outside the House, it was his -

MR. SIMMS: A Stirling speech.

MR. NEARY: Yes, a Stirling speech. I must put the

MR. STAGG: rabbit ears up around it, because it was a Sterling speech with a capital S. It was not a sterling speech as far as content is concerned, it has been proved to be one of the most specious, the most specious arguments and the most specious speeches that Newfoundlanders have ever been subjected to.

So that is the sort of thing that we are being subjected to here. We are being given nothing constructive from the members of the Opposition. They get little papers, they get the letters from abroad, letters from other jurisdictions that they try to spring on the government to try to embarrass the government. They have no sense of history, they have no sense of dedication to the Province, their only desire, Mr. Chairman, is to get into power, to get into power so that they can have the perks of power. They are not interested in the exercise of power, except as it pertains to the comforts that allegedly accrue with power, they are interested in the posturing of government.

And, Mr. Chairman, it is my submission that as long as this position is perpetuated by the present in-House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) as he is giving the Stirling speech that we have heard for many years, that the people have flatly rejected. And even more importantly, Mr. Chairman, the people in his own district of Bonavista North flatly rejected the Leader of the Opposition, they thought his Stirling speech lacked luster, that it needed shining up. And of course, we have the present member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), who, to some extent, was the benefactor of that poor, illtimed strategy on the part of the then in-House Leader of the Opposition.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just suggest to any other members opposite who might be frantically putting pen to paper to get together a few notes with which to reply,

June 15, 1982

Tape 1325

TM - 2

MR. STAGG: and with which to lodge themselves into this debate, that they could

MR. F. STAGG: be a little more constructive, that they could give a speech that is not the regurgitation of an old discredited and defeated position-

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right.

MR. STAGG: - what the Opposition needs now, they need to out-Peckford 'Peckford'. I will give the Opposition a little bit of strategy. Rather than saying that the government here is intransigent and will not debate and so on, their position should be that this government is about to give away the shop, that we here are being less than good stewards of the economy. Unfortunately these words of wisdom, and I have given them to hon. members opposite many times, they do not appear to fall on very receptive ears. The last time I gave them there were eighteen members opposite-

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. STAGG: We had eighteen members opposite and now there are only eight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: And I must say that if hon. members do not buck up-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - they are going to have some difficulty in remaining in the House of Assembly. So, Mr. Chairman, I will probably have another go at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I should demean myself by replying to the member's remarks, but, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite would rather fight than eat. And when the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) talks about old records, both him and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) are much the same, very much the same, the same type of mentality, the chip on the shoulder, separatist, rather fight than eat mentality. Now, Mr. Chairman, when we have to sit

MR. HODDER: here in the Opposition and ask questions about the government's energy policy with regards to the transmission of electrical energy across the Province of Quebec and we get back innuendo and talk of the Opposition and what happened in the election that sort of thing, I keep wondering is this government bankrupt of ideas? And is its policy just to fight and see how much trouble they can stir up? Because, Mr. Chairman, we are certainly not moving forward in any way in this Province, either with the offshore or with the hydro-electric transmission of power across Quebec. What happened on April 6th, Mr. Chairman, in this Province was that the people of this Province told the government, 'Yes, if you want to negotiate with Ottawa'- it was a one issue campaign- 'if you want to negotiate with Ottawa, then we will give you that bargaining tool, we will give you the support that you ask, now go and negotiate'.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: But, since April 6th, Mr. Chairman, there have been an awful lot of changes in this Province, because

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1327

RA - 1

MR. J. HODDER: suddenly and so quickly it is mind boggling, the people of this Province have realized that this government does not have any intention of negotiating on the offshore, or negotiating with Quebec or anyone else.

MR. STAGG: We will never surrender.

MR. NEARY: That is what the Argentinians said.

MR. PATTERSON: We are not in Argentina.

MR. NEARY: That is what they said in Argentina.

MR. HODDER: People have suddenly realized that this government has used this issue in order to perpetuate their political skins and are now using it to try and attack - they are looking forward to the next federal election.

MR. TULK: The Argentinians said, 'We will never surrender' and then they waved their flags.

MR. STAGG: Give the hon. member a white flag -

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman says that on the one hand we support the Province and on the other hand we are subversives. Well, Mr. Chairman, I take great exception to that. What the hon. member is trying to say is that we must go along, if the government says that this is our policy, we must go along with the policy. What we are asking, Mr. Chairmsn, is what is the government's policy?

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: Because we have not seen a government policy yet.

MR. STAGG: Well, if you read the proposal.

MR. HODDER: So, if I have to be a subversive, Mr. Chairman, to ask questions of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall), or if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is a subversive because he asks the minister why we cannot sit down and negotiate properly with Quebec, or we cannot ask questions or question the -

MR. STAGG: You are afraid to read it, because you will all be stampeding over here.

MR. NEARY: He is out of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HODDER: I hear something yapping over in the corner, Mr. Chairman, but if the -

MR. TULK: Tell him to go kiss the picture.

MR. HODDER: The hon. member, when he spoke, was listened to in silence.

MR. NEARY: Go out boy, you have not kissed the picture in the last half hour.

MR. HODDER: Although he said nothing, Mr. Chairman, he was listened to in silence.

MR. NEARY: When was the last time you kissed the picture?

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Chairman, whatever happened on April 6, I certainly was not sent to this House of Assembly to go along with this government's policies, nor was anyone on this side. And, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentlemen opposite ever think that we will be cap in hand with them, they have another think coming. Because, Mr. Chairman, this Opposition, for the rest of the time that we are here, until we move over to the other side of the House,

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: will be making sure that this government, or trying to point out the flaws, and, Mr. Chairman, there are so many flaws emanating from the other side of this House recently, we do not have time to bring them all up. We may have to keep the House open until October or November.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the tabling of those letters in the House of Assembly has pointed out today is that it is not that it is unusual that letters should come from the Opposition. What is unusual, Mr. Chairman, is that there is such a breakdown in negotiations, and a breakdown in federal/provincial relations, and a breakdown in relations between the Province of Newfoundland and the Province of Quebec that no one is speaking to anyone else anymore, and that this government is no longer trusted

MR. HODDER: to do anything. There is a total, absolute confrontation. There have never been such bad federal/provincial relations in this Province ever, perhaps since 1957. But, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the National Energy Board giving the right to Newfoundlanders to transmit electricity across the Quebec border, I would like to ask members opposite what would happen if this situation were reversed, if the federal government were bringing in legislation in the House of Commons in Canada to transmit hydro power, Quebec lines across Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY: Yes, what would happen?

MR. HODDER: What would happen, Mr. Chairman, if we woke up some morning and found out that the federal government, without our agreement with Quebec -

MR. STAGG: There is one. There is one.

MR. HODDER: If the member opposite will allow - without any agreement with Quebec, that if we woke up one morning and they said that their Quebec power lines would be going across this Province?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I thought that the letter from the federal Minister of Energy was a sound and legitimate letter. What the federal government have done is they have said to this government, 'We have given you a tool. We have this legislation. We have taken it to its final stage and we have given a six month notice in order to let the two governments get together and negotiate'. Because, Mr. Chairman, they realize that with the hardening of feelings between the Province of Newfoundland and the Province of Quebec, that this is a negotiating tool in the hands of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The amazing thing, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite would not understand a negotiating tool if they saw it. Because when the negotiating tool is in their hands - the

MR. HODDER: President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the Minister of Energy, earlier today when he was speaking, spoke about the last negotiations we had with Quebec and mentioned a four or five line letter which he had received from the Minister of Energy in Quebec which had said, 'Well, let us sit down and talk about it'. But that particular letter was written before this particular legislation was passed in the House of Commons in Ottawa. And I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is reasonable and incumbent on this government to open negotiations with Quebec.

MR. STAGG: He does not believe a word he is saying.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member thinks that we are going to be able to push a hydro line across Quebec without some sort of an agreement and understanding from Quebec, and the good will of Quebec, then the hon. gentleman should sit down and think about

MR. HODDER: what would happen if a similar thing were happening to us. We would see a different light on negotiations at that particular time. Mr. Chairman, you know, the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) when he was speaking said we had negotiated hard for eight years with the Province of Quebec. But, Mr. Chairman, all I would say to the minister is in negotiations you do not have to sell what you have, or the Province, down the drain in order to negotiate. As long as no one is talking, and as long as we are shooting thunderbolts from this Legislature to the legislature in Quebec, and from this legislature to the House of Commons in Ottawa, all we will achieve is a hardening of positions. Mr. Chairman, with this federal legislation, and with the opportunity that the government has now to sit down with their counterparts in Quebec, and the chance that the Premier has, it is incumbent on the Premier to sit down with Mr. Levesque. After all, their views on Canada are the same. So, perhaps they can work out a settlement on the electrical power issue. But certainly with this legislation over the heads of Quebec, and it is over the heads of Quebec -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: - that is certainly a negotiating tool which this Province can use-

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: -in order to bring about a settlement and to transmit our power across Quebec.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Dr. McNicholas): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will just have one more flick at it before we

MR. MARSHALL: Attacked me while I was on the phone.

MR. NEARY:

I beg your pardon?

MR. SIMMS:

about the Falkland Islands war was coming to him. I mean, he was outside.

MR. NEARY:

No. What I said was, in case the hon. gentleman is not aware of what I said when the hon. gentleman was out, if we want to have a third world war, the thing to do is to appoint the hon. gentleman to the United Nations. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this is a very realistic, sensible and fair approach to a long standing problem. And we have not heard one statement made by spokesmen for the administration today to indicate otherwise. They viciously attacked members of the opposition. They have made all kinds of irresponsible statements.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what he just said, he called your attacks vicious.

MR. NEARY:

No, the attacks came from that side first.

MR. TULK:

They always do. Always do.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, all we have to do in this House is ask ourselves a question. Who is the ultimate in nastiness in this House? Who is the ultimate in nastiness in this Province? When you get the answer to that, then you have the answer to the problem, you have 90 per cent of the answer to the real problem in this Province. The fact of the matter is that the administration, Mr. Chairman, the administration is paranoid. They are paranoid. They think that somehow or

MR. NEARY: another negotiations is giving something away.

DR. COLLINS: Check the Liberals, there are not too many of them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chariman, the red-roaring Tory, I thought I adequately took care of him this afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Just in case I did not,

MR. TOBIN: You will have to pay more attention to yourself.

MR. NEARY: Just in case I did not, Mr. Chairman, we have two groups in this House and we have two groups in this Province. We have Tories and Progressive Conservatives. The hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is what I would put in the category of a Progressive Conservative. The hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is a Tory. And there is a vast difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBERS: A red headed one.

MR. DINN: Do you not think that this is repetitious?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) is a red-roaring tory.

AN HON. MEMBER: And he is a red headed tory.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentlemen can try to be as snarky and as nasty as he wants, and he is quite capable of that. The fact of the matter is, we have a proposal, we have a proposal before us. And the hon. gentlemen can hurl insults and they can talk about the election, and they can be rude and nasty, and they can be insulting and irresponsible, they can be all of that, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that they will not negotiate. Now, why will they not negotiate?

MR. DINN: We will not give it away like you gave away the Upper Churchill.

MR. NEARY: Oh, now the hon. gentleman just provided the answer. Why are they being difficult? The hon. gentleman says they will not negotiate because they do not want to give anything away.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, if they are not capable, if the job is too big for them, if the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) or the Premier cannot negotiate, if the job is too big for them, well, then, what I fear, Mr. Chairman, is this -

MR. DINN: We will let you do it.

MR. NEARY: - that nothing will ever be done.

MR. HODDER: Yes, we will do it.

MR. DINN: Let you do like you did in the Department of Social Services.

MR. NEARY: They have a five year mandate, Mr. Chairman, they do not intend to negotiate. Now, Mr. Chairman, how are problems in the world resolved?

MR. NEARY: And how are problems in labour/management relations resolved? How are they resolved?

Does the hon. gentleman know how they are resolved?

MR. DINN: Negotiations.

MR. NEARY: Negotiations. Well, there you have the answer again, from the chipmunk. You got the answer from the chipmunk again. Even when shots are fired, how are problems resolved? Does the hon. gentleman for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) know how? How?

MR. SIMMS: I am not going to tell you.

MR. NEARY: Oh, I see. The hon. gentleman is afraid to bare his soul in front of his colleagues. The hon. gentleman is afraid that his colleagues might look at him and say, 'Traitor' as was said the other day in this House. And, Mr. Chairman, when we get the Hansard on the member for Menihek (Mr. Walsh) -

MR. TULK: The member for Green Bay.

MR. NEARY: The member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), we were all traitors. Mr. Chairman, I would think that members on this side of the House are as good Newfoundlanders and as good Canadians as the hon. gentleman or anybody who flung that remark across the House.

MR. SIMMS: I got a confession. I think you are all right, myself.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. SIMMS: I have a confession. I think you are all right, myself.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman, I put a question to him. I put a question to the hon. member for Grand Falls and I ask him this, how will these matters between Ottawa and the Province, between Quebec and the Province, how will they be resolved?

MR. SIMMS: A few years from now they will be all gone away.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if they think that Mr. Clark if he becomes Prime Minister is going to resolve the problem, all they have to do is look at this piece of legislation. Mr. Clark and the Tory Party were against putting a corridor across Quebec. So if through some fluke he became Prime Minister, is he going to change his mind then and force a corridor across Quebec? Is he?

MR. SIMMS: You wait and see. He was not just against that, and you know it.

MR. NEARY: He was against it, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, he and his party specifically were against that cause. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? There was a special committee established on that bill, C 108, a special committee of Parliament. Okay? And in that special committee of Parliament the spokesman for the Tory Party, Mr. Roch Lasalle -

MR. SIMMS: Is he the energy spokesman?

MR. NEARY: He was the spokesman for the Tory Party on this Committee. And do you know what he said? I have it here. I can read it for the hon. - I think I have it here. Would the hon. gentleman care to hear what his party's position was on this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Lasalle - this is a transcript of May 27th - Mr. Lasalle, and here is what he is saying -

DR. COLLINS: What does he represent?

MR. NEARY: He represents the Tory caucus on this committee.

DR. COLLINS: No, no. What else does he represent?

MR. NEARY: What else does he represent?

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1331

IB-3

DR. COLLINS: He must be an MP. Now, where
is his district?

MR. NEARY: He is a big Tory MP. Here is
what he says. Now this is a Tory MP.

DR. COLLINS: What district though? What district?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Lasalle:

MR. NEARY: "I say to you, Mr. Minister, that if you accept to suspend implementation of this bill for six months, I have every reason to believe that very special efforts are going to be made, and that an agreement can be reached between the two provinces which will be of benefit to both of them. Technically, yesterday, and I am not the first one to be telling you this, the Chairman of Hydro Quebec taught us a lot. As for politics, that is a horse of another colour. The president of Hydro did not want to get into that. It was quite his right to refuse that kind of discussion. And he did very well in avoiding that." Now listen to this, he said, "I can say quite categorically and without hesitation, that if you are ready to put back the implementation of this bill for six months, my party would not hesitate of voting in favour of that amendment." That is the spokesman, the chief spokesman for the Tory Party on that committee.

MR. COLLINS: And where is he from?

MR. NEARY: Now, if hon. gentlemen think that if Mr. Clark, through some freak of nature-

MR. HODDER: Clark has said that himself.

MR. NEARY: And Clark said that himself - became Prime Minister of Canada, that they are going to force Quebec to give this Province a corridor across Quebec without negotiation, without goodwill, without bargaining in good faith, then they had better think again. There is the answer there, Mr. Chairman, for the hon. member for Stephenville, when he hinted that maybe that is what they are waiting for.

DR. COLLINS: And where is that MP from?
Is he from Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, there were more -

MR. HODDER: There was more Tory caucus going into it.

MR NEARY: - there were more Tory MPs in the House of Commons, and there is only one or two in Quebec, voted against that particular clause in bill C 108. The Tory caucus took a decision, a policy decision in their caucus to vote against that bill, particularly this part of the bill, as indicated by the Tory MP who was the spokesman for the Tory caucus.

Now, Mr. Chairman, so the proposition we have before us is this, if there are no negotiations in the next

DR. COLLINS: Six months after Trudeau goes it will be all settled.

MR. NEARY: I see. Oh, that is what the hon. gentleman thinks. Mr. Chairman, if that is what they are holding out for, they are gambling the future of Newfoundland, Mr Chairman, they are gambling.

MR. HODDER: Oh, yes.

MR. NEARY: And if they lose that gamble, which they probably will -

DR. COLLINS: What was that they plowed through there?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman,

MR. HODDER: That is where you are wrong. That is your only chance to get it settled.

MR. NEARY: They are prepared to put Newfoundland down the tubes -

MR HODDER: We have got another Churchill Falls going.

MR. NEARY: - down the tubes and gamble
on Mr. Clark becoming the next Prime Minister of
Canada. That is a pretty risky game they are playing, Mr.
Chairman. It is pretty risky.

MR. TOBIN: Do you trust Lalonde?

MR. HODDER: Do you trust Clark?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would
trust Mr. Lalonde further that I could throw the member
for Burin Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

MR. TOBIN: That is not very far.

MR. S. NEARY: No, you could say that again.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. Leader's time is up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will probably get back up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 302-01 carry?

MR. HODDER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: The much toted letter from Mr. Clark to Mr. Peckford prior to the election, and while Mr. Clark was Prime Minister of Canada, if one , and I am dealing with the offshore now, if one were to read the letter carefully, and there has been excerpts of the letter, and I do not have it here, but if one were to read the letter carefully, there are a number of very significant phrases in that letter which would lead one to believe that whether there was a Tory government in Ottawa or a Liberal governemnt in Ottawa, we would be in the same position on the offshore as we are on the fisheries dispute when we had a Tory Government in Ottawa, and Mr. McGrath, was the fisheries spokesman. But, Mr. Chiarman, when we look at this power corridor legislation and we see the reaction of the Tory Party to this legislation, and we see two of our own MP's abstaining from voting-

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: - in the House of Commons, and then when we realize that the Federal Liberal Government have brought this particular piece of legislation in, they have suspended it for six months so that the Minister of Energy(Mr. Marshall) in Newfoundland and the Minister of Energy in Quebec(Mr. Duhaime) can get together, when you realize

MR. HODDER: that they have done this and when you look at the other side, it was not Mr. Clark alone who made the decision, Mr. Chairman. It was not Mr. Clark alone, it was the PC caucus in Ottawa which made this decision. And, Mr. Chairman, what we may have here and what we may look back at in ten years to come, we may have another Churchill Falls in the making.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: Because, Mr. Chairman -

MR. BAIRD: You do not have to worry, you will not be around then.

MR. HODDER: - because this government is hoping and waiting, and -

MR. NEARY: Listen to the croaking bullfrog down there.

MR. HODDER: - as we hear from some of the lesser lights on the government side of the House, they are waiting until such time as, they hope, the Federal Liberals are out and the Tories are in. And they are going to do their part, they are using there negotiatings, their stance - their whole stance is aimed at trying to change the Government of Canada. But, Mr. Chairman, this particular stance could back fire in the faces of the government. I mean, we already have an example of Mr. Clark, who is trying too garner support in Quebec. He is trying to get the Quebec vote. He knows if he is going to be Prime Minister of Canada again, he has to give concessions to Quebec. And he is willing to sacrifice this Province in order to get concessions and be able to win seats in Quebec in the next federal election. He still wants to stay on, Mr. Chairman, as Leader of the Tory Party of Canada. But what is more frightening, Mr. Chairman, is that

MR. HODDER: the P.C. Party of Canada- it was not Mr. Clark alone or Mr. Lasalle alone, it was also Mr. Crosbie and Mr. McGrath -

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: - who could not stand up and who did not stand up. It was, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said, a decision of caucus.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: And when we see the hon. minister over there flinging out his poison and the members throwing their dirt across the House, and we realize that this government was told that when this piece of legislation was going through that they should be in Ottawa lobbying, that they should be doing everything, particularly with their own counterparts in Ottawa, to ensure that this legislation went through, the federal Liberal Government bravely went on and the piece of legislation will become law. All they have asked is for the Newfoundland Government and the Quebec Government - they have said that negotiations are better than war. And for the federal government to drive, to say, 'Go ahead Newfoundland and put a power corridor across Quebec, and Quebec, you just sit there and pay attention', then, Mr. Chairman, I will come back to my point again, it is far better that the Quebec Government agree, particularly in light of the negotiating tool that this Province has with this piece of legislation being held over - this piece of legislation is not being held over the heads of this government here in this Province -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: - it is being held over the heads of the Quebec Government.

MR. NEARY: That is correct.

MR. HODDER: So I would say again to the minister, 'Use the opportunity that you have to negotiate, because your pipe dreams of a change in government may only

MR. HODDER: exacerbate the problems which we presently have.'

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, two or three of the members of the Opposition have spoken and I have got to respond to them. First of all, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and he indicating about the MPs abstaining from voting, and they have made a great deal about that. But I am going to repeat again, the hon. gentleman is obviously not familiar with the act.

Now, here are two members of Parliament both of whom have fought long and hard

MR. MARSHALL:

for power corridor or legislation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and equal rights of Newfoundlanders in Confederation, one of which, and the major one of which has been the transmission of hydro power. And the hon. gentleman cannot, as much as he tries, in any way derogate from the bona fides and the intentions of the hon. gentlemen and their drive with respect to this power corridor. He obviously does not know what was presented to these gentlemen. If I were presented with this particular bill, I think I would probably make exactly the same decision. On the one hand it is a bill for the power corridor, but it is a bill for the power corridor, I might say - there are still hurdles to go over after it was past, the National Energy Board and what have you, but it was a very positive move, which we never realized. On the other hand, if the hon. gentleman would care to read it, he would also see another part of the bill itself, Sections 87 and 88, which confer on the Governor in Council jurisdiction of the offshore of this Province. So what are the hon. gentlemen going to do? If they vote for the bill, they are voting for the power corridor and they are voting for the federal government to get control of the offshore. If they vote against the bill, they are voting against the power corridor and they are voting against the federal government getting control over the offshore. So what are loyal Newfoundlanders to do in a situation like that other than adopt the course of action which the hon. gentleman did?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: Perfectly understand the reason why they did it, cannot understand though, Mr. Chairman, cannot understand the actions and the continued actions

MR. MARSHALL: against this Province of the five quiet quislings who sit in the Liberal caucus, who do not open their mouths at any stage about Newfoundland. You remember they were promising us this power corridor? Now they are not being held and called to account with respect to it at all. They just weakly and meekly follow the line of Mr. Lalonde of the Federal Cabinet, of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) with his new-found faith in Mr. Lalonde. They just meekly follow along, Mr. Chairman, to the detriment of the people of this Province. Because the fact of the matter is, and the fact of the matter, it has to be said again, we have a right under the Constitution of Canada to the transmission of hydro power in the same way as other provinces have the right, and the legitimate right, for the transmission of oil and gas. Indeed, we have the same right for the transmission of hydro power, to sell our resources, as the breadbasket of Southern Ontario has to sell the commodities which it makes in its extensive industries without having to sell them from one province to the other. We have that right. Now, how do you acquire that right? That right was given us under the British North America Act,

MR. MARSHALL: it has been confirmed in the Canada Constitution, but in order for that act to be realized, it has to be implemented. And the only concern that can implement it is the Parliament of Canada. We had hoped and we were given the promise that they would give us this under this bill C108. We received a promise that at long last, after the pressure that had been exerted over a period of years - and the hon. gentleman, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) refers to some Calgary company as being the source of the pressure. That is not so. And he takes a great deal of pride in this. I would have thought, when he was saying that it was not this government and its successor government and the people in the Conservative Party that caused the pressure, that he was going to exhibit a certain amount of pride and try to twist it around and say the Liberal Party. But, no, he could not do that. So what he does, he meekly says some Calgary company. But that is not so. We have pressured, we have asked for it, we have demanded it. The federal government, in effect, was embarrassed into bringing this legislation in. We received an undertaking from the federal government that it would be enacted.

They brought in a bill which had many provisions. They gave to the Newfoundland members, you know, a Hobson's choice, as it were, as I have already indicated. But there are other provisions in this bill that they brought in. It covered not only power corridor, it covered extensive discretion given to the federal minister. It covered jurisdiction of the offshore, and it covered many other things as well. All of those other things are law. Every single other section pertaining is law. The accumulation of power to the minister, the taking of power by the federal government, the legislative assumption of jurisdiction on the offshore, that does not await proclamation.

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1336

IB-2

MR. MARSHALL: But the operative provisions of
that act with respect to the power corridor are not law.
And it is not so,

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, for anyone to get up and say it will be law in six months. The provision in the bill says -

AN HON. MEMBER: It will be. It will be.

MR. MARSHALL: Oh, yes, we received those assurances, that there was going to be law when this bill was passed. But we have not received it. But the fact of the matter is, what has been said is that they will not become law. The power corridor will not become law until the federal government decides it is going to bring it into law but, in any event, that can not be earlier than six months time. So, it is incorrect to say there are six months. So, people may say, 'Well, they are going to bring it in in six months'. But what guarantee have we that they will bring it in in six months? What reasonable expectation do we have? They have already reneged on a commitment that was given us, to give it to us now, when the bill was put in. What security do we have? Should Newfoundlanders feel secure that it will be in six months? I think not, not when you balance up the fact of the influence and the preponderance interest, influence of the 74 Quebec members that were responsible for the delay of this, in a way, partly, to a great degree. Not when you consider the fact that Mr. Lalonde, who is a member from the Province of Quebec himself, obviously chose to consult with the Quebec government with respect to it, without informing us about it or consulting us, just informing us after the decision was made. So what possible confidence can we have? And what damage does it do? The name of the game, Mr. Chairman, is to, and let there be no mistake about it, is to either do one thing or the other, is to deny Newfoundland its inherent right to transmit power, number one, or to give them that right at such time when that line becomes uneconomical. Because the hon. gentlemen there opposite know full well, with the rate of inflation and the

MR. MARSHALL: costs that are accelerating not just yearly or monthly but daily, there will come a time when the economics of this line, of putting this line through are going to be questionable. And this is one of the aims. If it is not the aim to delay it and to delay it forever and a day, it is the aim to keep it to such an extent that the line then becomes uneconomic, and that we are not being able to get the practical realization of the rights which we have and which we are entitled to as Canadian Citizens. This whole story of the relationships of federal government not just with this Province but with the all of the Provinces, is a sorry, sorry sight, and it is a sorry plight it has got Canada in. And nowhere do we see anymore manifestation of it than the actions which were taken. The telex which was sent by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Duhaime), as I say, just drips with sarcasm, just drips with cynicism and it is an action, really, against this Province. The hon. gentleman there opposite compares

MR. MARSHALL: us to Argentina. Well, he would. Because that is the perception that the hon. gentleman has of this Province within the Canadian Confederation. He has a perception of this Province as being a weaker Province, not entitled to the rights. What we should do is we should grovel and snivel and be thankful for the great blessings that Ottawa is prepared to bestow on us. That is his philosophy, and that is why the Upper Churchill is in the state it is now. This government will never desist, Mr. Chairman, or will never depart from the position that we have inherent rights in Confederation. We have the same quality of rights as Ottawa, Ontario, as Quebec, we have the same as the Western provinces or any province in Canada. We ask for no more and we ask for no less. And it is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentlemen there opposite cannot see it. They cannot see that what is being done is to attempt to force us to negotiate basic, inherent rights. This attempt will be in vain. The unfortunate part about it is that we have people who are toadies to the federal government in the caucus in Ottawa, and there opposite here, who are prepared to do their bidding at any turn to the eternal detriment of the people of this Province.

Now, they can talk all they want to about the attitude and the relationship between this Province and Ottawa. But the fact of the matter is, it was not this Province who reneged on its promises. All this Province wants are basic rights. And if the hon. gentlemen and their friend, Mr. Lalonde, and his friend, Mr. Trudeau, who have gotten Canada in such a mess think that we are going to bow down once again and make the rights of this Province subject to the tender mercies of the Province of Quebec, they, Mr. Lalonde, Mr. Trudeau and the people in the Province of Quebec have another thought coming to them.

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: What a gigantic bluff, Mr.

Chairman! The hon. gentleman has shown us once again, Mr. Chairman, why there are no negotiations. The hon. gentleman just could not resist the temptation to give Mr. Trudeau and the Liberal Government of Canada a broadsides. The hon. gentleman hates everything that is Libeal. He keeps referring - what is it he says about this side of the House? -

MR. TULK: He should settle for a new phrase.

MR. NEARY: Yes, he should get a new phrase.

MR. TULK: The hon. gentlemen there opposite.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentlemen there opposite.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that we are getting the upper hand of the hon. gentleman in this debate. And, Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the hon. gentleman, that that debate on Friday, we could have saved it for today. What was the urgency of that debate on Friday?

MR. DINN: You did not want to debate it anyway.

MR. NEARY: I see, we did not want to debate it. We wanted to debate it, Mr. Chairman, but we wanted to debate it under the rules of this House. The hon. gentleman had

MR. NEARY: two major debates in front of him, he had the estimates, he had the Budget Speech and he had the Throne Speech, and the hon. gentleman, when he could not get his own way, sulked. When the Premier could not get unanimous consent of the House he sulked like a little baby, like a little child and he brought in Standing Order 23.

MR. HODDER: That is right. Hear, hear!
That is exactly what happened.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, what was accomplished?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!
A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if you could ask the hon. gentleman to speak up, I am having difficulty hearing him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what was so urgent about the matter of Friday, and what was accomplished by that debate on Friday? I ask the hon. gentleman, what was accomplished?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: There was nothing accomplished, except it gave the administration another platform to squirt out their venom and their poison against Ottawa and against the Province of Quebec.

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, that matter of whether or not it was a proper ruling, that matter has been resolved to our satisfaction, I am happy to say, and we will not have to do what we said we were going to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: What is so funny?

MR. BAIRD: You are!

MR. NEARY: Is that so?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, that matter has been resolved to our satisfaction, but let us hope that the Premier will not again try to bend the rules of this House just because he could not get his own way, just because he sulked.

The hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) knows what I am talking about. There are precedents piled upon precedents, rulings given by Speakers, three Speakers of this House, rulings given by - no, two Speakers.

MR. SIMMS: You have that resolved now.

MR. NEARY: We have that resolved and I am prepared to drop it. That is right. It is a very delicate matter, as the hon. gentleman knows, and I have no intention of pursuing it. I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, the adjournment of the debate, and I would like to move that the Committee rise and report no progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Chairman of Committees.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered the matters to it referred, has directed me to report some progress and asks leave to sit again.

On motion, report received and adopted.

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

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 16, 1982, at 3:00 p.m.

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, JUNE 15, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, as indicated during the Estimate Committee hearings, my department recently conducted a study of the impact of offshore petroleum development on the fishery. This study was discussed by government and my colleagues directed that it be tabled in the House of Assembly and subsequently released to the public. This undertaking should be of special interest to those individuals and groups who, in the past, have accused government of paying too much attention to offshore oil and gas with insufficient thought to the needs of our traditional industries, particularly the fishery.

The study is a result of considerable research by my officials in the Department of Labour and Manpower and also involving the Department of Fisheries, Development, the Petroleum Directorate, and the College of Fisheries, Navigation-Marine Engineering and Electronics. It concludes that, while competition for skilled marine personnel between the petroleum and fishing industries will be keen, severe shortages in the fishery are not expected during the next five years. The present personnel for offshore oil and gas and the fishery will be adequate for our short term needs.

I would like to point out to the House, however, that manpower projections for development and production activities associated with the offshore indicate

MR. DINN: The study concludes, therefore, that long-term manpower needs in marine occupations cannot be met by existing training facilities at the College of Fisheries. The present facilities and instructors are even now operating at or near capacity. Considering the expected attrition rate in highly skilled marine occupations in the coming years and the possibility of increased manpower mobility because of major oil developments in the North and other East coast locations, it is obvious that changes must be made in the medium and long term.

Late last year Brian Tobin, the Liberal member of Parliament for Humber-Port au Port-St. Barbe and a member of the Parliamentary Task Force on Employment Opportunities for the '80s, was quoted by the media during a news conference at Stephenville as saying that federal capital funding was available to the Province for facilities and equipment and this funding would apply to construction of a College of Fisheries, Navigation-Marine Engineering and Electronics.

Following Mr. Tobin's announcement, the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and I, who were obviously very pleased, held a press conference at which time we indicated that we were pleased about the capital funding and that it would be available from the federal government under the new federal/provincial adult occupational training agreements. This new fund was to be called a skills growth fund.

During a meeting, however, of Manpower ministers in January, I raised the question with the hon. Lloyd Axworthy, who informed me that funding was not available through the federal Department of Employment and Immigration, and that the funds were allocated through another government department, and at that time he indicated the Department of DREE. It is my understanding that this

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, this Ministerial Statement is basically in two parts, one relating to the study that the Department of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) conducted to ascertain the labour demands with respect to petroleum and how that was going to affect the fisheries, and the study came up with nothing new insomuch as many studies have indicated in the past that the offshore type work does not take skilled people from the fisheries. So it is more or less a confirmation of findings of other studies. And also, of course, again it is a known fact that we are lacking in training facilities at the College of Fisheries; of course not only at the College of Fisheries but at other post-secondary institutions as well. I would venture to say that we are down in facilities at the College of Trades and Technology as well. Many of these facilities were started a good many years ago, ten to fifteen years ago, the College of Trades of course going back further than that, and in that length of time their facilities have become obsolete. They have not kept up with modern technology so there is no question that all of our post-secondary educational institutions certainly need better facilities to keep up with the technology of today, and that we certainly agree with.

And secondly the minister alludes to the skills growth fund, a programme that was going to be made available to help train our people better and provide money for facilities. I must say I do not express the same concern as the minister does in this area. He is afraid that the only institutions that will receive funding are those institutions which can be determined to be training people for the nation, those skills that would have a national concern. And I would suggest, Sir, that any training that benefits the Province will benefit the nation. And I do not think that there is going to be a narrow interpretation of this at all. I think

MR. LUSH:

marine development, anything that is going to affect the offshore, can certainly be interpreted as a national concern. So, Mr. Speaker, again, I think, expressing a rather narrow viewpoint of the federal government and I believe that the proposal submitted by the hon. gentleman, whatever they might be, I think will be received very favourably by the federal government and certainly perceived in the view of meeting the national interest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Well, I do not have the names of the people, but I would like to welcome to the galleries today the mayor and two councillors and the town manager from the town of Hare Bay. I welcome you to the galleries today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other statements by ministers?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question or two for the hon. Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) in connection with the administrations's energy policy in this Province. I would like to start out by asking the hon. gentleman if it is correct, if he can confirm or deny, that within the next eighteen to twenty-four months a new source of electricity, a new source of power will have to be found in this Province to take care of the load growth?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is the anticipation insofar as projections are at the present time, that is the anticipated situation although the time for new sources of energy may be widened a little bit, but it is approximately that, yes.

June 15, 1982

Tapc No. 1283

MJ - 1

MR. MARSHALL: fact of the matter is at the present time we are in a recessionary cycle -

MR. NEARY: A depression.

MR. MARSHALL: - a cycle, by the way, that is being felt very severely here in the Province of Newfoundland as all over Canada. But we have anticipation, we have hopes that we will come out of that recessionary trend, and that the normal rate of development can continue on. As the hon. gentleman is well aware, the Gross Domestic Product in this Province prior to the recession - I believe even now as it presently stands, although it is nothing to brag about at the present time - but prior to the onslaught of this recession, which was brought about by the high interest rates and the inflationary condition of the national economy, that this Province was beginning to turn the corner, and turn the corner in relation to other provinces with respect to its proportionate increase in its Gross Domestic Product. So we are looking forward to that type of activity in the future. And also, of course, the hon. gentleman will be aware that with proper management of our resources, such as have been evidenced so plainly in the Budget that was presented by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins), that we have reason to be optimistic about the future. We prefer to be optimistic rather than pessimistic, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: It is a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, this administration seems to accept the responsibility for nothing. They have not created one new industry in this Province in the last several years and I can only base my

MR. NEARY: which one of these three alternatives the administration is considering?

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

MR. MARSHALL: To the first part of the hon. gentleman's preamble, I neither wish to contemplate the Liberals returning to power any more than I like to remember the pain that fastened on the people of this Province while they were in power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, with respect to his other question, all of these alternatives are in process of active assessment and consideration. It suffices to say though that it is pathetic really, I think that is the proper description, to note that this Province must consider such other sources in the future as oil fired generation and coal generation of electric power when we have such an abundance of resources on our own within the boundaries of our own Province, which we should be able to use for our own purposes. And we would have been able to use them, Mr. Speaker, but for the fact that the hon. gentleman and his colleagues gave them away in the 1960s.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, yes, the answer is yes. Very, very sadly as a result of the actions of the hon. gentlemen there opposite and as a result of the continued oppression by the Liberal Government in Ottawa with respect to Newfoundland to deny us our legitimate rights, we are forced to consider these other alternatives. We would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would not be forced to use oil and to use coal and to use these other mechanisms other than hydro power. And I think, Mr. Speaker, as I say, we anticipate, the hon. gentleman knows, getting justice and equity for the people in Newfoundland from the Upper Churchill in the reversion

MR. W. MARSHALL: before the offshore case, because after all we had that before their Lordships before the federal government made its unprecedented move.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is an awful lot of people beginning to realize in this Province that may - be the thing to do is to return to the good old days. If the Upper Churchill had not been developed or the ERCO plant had not been built. -

MR. BARRETT: They did not think that on April 6th.

MR. NEARY: - then the administration -

MR. HODDER: Or the Linerboard mill.

MR. NEARY: - or the Linerboard mill, this present administration would have nothing to build on, they would have nothing to renegotiate, there would be no projects because they have not started -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - they have not started a single industry, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. gentleman about three alternatives, and the hon. gentleman elected to start playing little political games again with somebody gave something away. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is aware that 100 per cent of the power generated on the Upper Churchill was not given away, it belongs Newfoundland, and we have recall rights on that power, and we can recall eight hundred megawatts immediately. And so what I am going to ask -

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman's impression of the facts as he gives them might be interesting to his colleagues.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I repeat, we are weighing the alternatives. This is a government that assesses alternatives before it makes a reputable decision of this particular nature. And, you know, I can guarantee the hon. gentleman that the lights will not go off in Newfoundland, they will probably go off in Quebec before they go off in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: But they will not be going off in Newfoundland under the stewardship of this government.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I do not know if it is the final one or not, but the hon. gentleman told us, the administration told us, when the Cat Arm development was announced that that was the last source of hydro power on the Island of Newfoundland, so it would appear to me that the hon. gentleman is running out of options. Is it correct that Cat Arm is the last source and, if so, which one of the two alternatives, to build a fourth unit at the thermo-generating station at Holyrood or to build a coal fired generating plant, which one of these alternatives is the administration looking at?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in response to that, the alternative which we select will be, if it is required to be selected, the least expensive one to the people of Newfoundland because we will regard it as only a temporary remedy until we obtain the resource of the Upper Churchill and are able to commit it to the use of the people of this Province.

MR. NEARY: You were getting your nomination fee back.

MR. MARSHALL: - my nomination fee returned, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Actually I think on behalf of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) I should extend thanks to the Liberal Party for their preponderate contribution to the coffers of the treasury from the last election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So I may not, Mr. Speaker, have gotten all of the question. As I understand the hon. member's question, he was asking why are we considering this when we have 800 megawatts of power that we can take. Because as the hon. gentleman knows the position with respect to the reclamation or recall of 800 megawatts of power is a matter that is under consideration by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland at the present time. It has been an on-going trial, it has been going on for numbers of years. It has been going on for such a long period of time because the Province of Quebec used the mechanisms of the court, by going up and down to the Supreme Court of Canada on preliminary motions, to thwart the will and the intention of the people of this Province and the agreement that they entered into which has forced us into the reversion. So it is not so simple as saying that, you know, these 800 megawatts of power we have to have. It probably would have been slightly more simpler, Mr. Speaker, if the attitude of the hon. gentleman's colleagues in Ottawa had been a little bit different and they had recognized the fact that we have, as a matter of right, the right to a transmission corridor which would put up in an equal position with Quebec for the purpose of bargaining with Quebec rather than having the federal government deal all the cards out to the Province of Quebec once again.

MR. MARSHALL: as a result of their poor stewardship of the affairs of the people of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will deal with the political statements made by the hon. gentleman later on this afternoon in connection with the corridor across the province of Quebec and the misleading statements that are being made about that situation. I will deal with the later on this afternoon. I want to deal now with the emergency situation of what kind of a source of electricity the administration is going to implement in order to get the power needed to take care of the load growth in this Province. I would gather from the last statement made by the hon. gentleman that the recalling of Labrador power - if I can get the hon. minister's attention for a moment - the recalling of Labrador power, power on the Upper Churchill of 800 megawatts, and the development of the Lower Churchill or Muskrat Falls is far removed from the hon. gentleman's mind and from the minds of the administration, that they are looking more at the -

MR. TOBIN: (Inaudible) speech, speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Bugs Bunny would just keep quite for a minute - is the administration looking more at building a fourth unit at Holyrood or a coal fired generator or the gas turbines, are they looking more at that proposal than they are at bringing Labrador power to the Island of Newfoundland?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The cardinal policy of this government is to reclaim for the people of Newfoundland the hydroresources that are in Labrador. I think this

MR. NEARY: if the administration has already made a decision on this new source of electricity, and what will it be? Will it be the fourth unit at Holyrood, will it be the coal fired generator, will it be gas turbines? What source of electricity does the hon. gentleman intend to develop to try to get this extra power that they need? Which one of these alternatives? Because I get the impression, Mr. Speaker, that the administration have no firm energy policy at all. They are flying by the seat of their pants and they are just merely sticking their finger into the dike.

The hon. gentleman has admitted that this will be a temporary arrangement. It is going to be pretty expensive for the people of this Province and probably drive up the cost of electricity. But which alternative is it that the administration intend to use?

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman has obviously had a very bad weekend, he is not his usual bouyant self as I see, but not only that he is repeating questions, asking the same question over and over again. And I can only give the hon. gentleman, with a great smile on my face, exactly the same answer. And that answer, Mr. Speaker, is that these alternatives are in the process of assessment by this government.

MR. NEARY: You have not made up your mind yet.

MR. MARSHALL: We do not jump in and make snap decisions just like that, Mr. Speaker, we weigh and we assess everything and that is exactly what we are in the process of doing. No wonder I see, Mr. Speaker, certain people in the galleries yawning, It is not because they are bored, Mr. Speaker -

MR. J. HODDER:

a satisfactory answer- So I now ask him publicly when will the Election Expenses Committee be struck?

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, very shortly. It is intended, of course, to have the Election Expenses Committee reconstituted and reconvened, and we will get on to that very, very shortly. Because the matter is of great concern, electoral reform is a great concern to this government and, as I say, in the very near future we will do it. I cannot give him a specified date but certainly before the end of this sitting we will have the Committee on the new Electoral Act reconvened.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the old Election Expenses Committee are all back here in this House. We were in the midst of deliberations before the last sitting of the House. But more than that, Mr. Speaker, in looking at other jurisdictions and looking at the type of legislation and the type of committees that other jurisdictions use when setting up their election expenses, many of these jurisdictions had larger committees than we had. We had just five members on the committee. Would the House Leader (Mr. W. Marshall) consider enlarging the number of people on the Election Expenses Committee? And I will ask one more question: Why are we waiting until the end of this session? Why cannot we just get on with our work because it is quite a time-consuming process? And I think the aim of this government, if they really do want to have an election reform, is to start as soon as possible so we have the best possible act.

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

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1290

MJ - 3

MR. B. TULK: in his seat I will ask the President of the Council (Mr. W. Marshall). The question relates, Mr. Speaker, to the announced decision of Abitibi-Price

MR. MARSHALL: the situation, and certainly if it were necessary for any referral to that committee it would have been done, but to my knowledge there has been no referral. Nevertheless, this does not indicate, Mr. Speaker, that we are not very much aware of the situation, very much on top of it, and have had our very competent officials monitoring it now as they will in the future.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I am amazed to hear that the government has said you can go ahead with spraying the herbicide without holding any public hearings or indeed going back to the population itself. Mr. Speaker, the Millertown area and the Red Indian Lake area is one of the most densely populated areas in terms of wildlife that you will find in this Province, especially the moose population. I am wondering if the government has done any assessment of the effect of the spraying of this herbicide 24D on the wildlife in that area?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize again that this is a very very small area involved, an extremely small area and that this -

MR. TULK: How small?

MR. MARSHALL: - well it is -

MR. TULK: 250 acres.

MR. MARSHALL: - it is extremely small. We are given the impression and the assurances that we do not anticipate, shall we say, that it is going to affect wildlife at all or otherwise there would be another result to the situation. But even though we do not anticipate it, as I say, that is part of the monitoring process. You know, we will monitor it and we will monitor it very, very carefully and closely.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: The minister has said that they have no complaints or one complaint, he is not sure how many complaints they have, and yet they are monitoring the situation. I would like to ask the minister to repeat for this House if indeed he is satisfied with the affects of that herbicide on the wildlife? Secondly, how are they monitoring the situation? And thirdly, how many complaints - it is not a hypothetical question - how many complaints? Has the government received any complaints from any people in that area?

MR. NEARY: And who are they from?

MR. TULK: And who are they from?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate the situation. I am not going to say to the hon. gentleman unequivocally right now that I have gone out and I have personally tested the affect of this herbicide on moose or on wildlife or anything. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that that proposal has been assessed by officials of the Department of the Environment and, as any action of that type, has been weighed and weighed very carefully and it will be monitored and monitored very carefully.

MR. TULK: By whom?

MR. CROSS: during the debates.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!
On motion report received and adopted.
MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Any other reports of standing and special committees?

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.
MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act."
MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.
MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act, 1975."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.
DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to question 47, from the hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), which was asked on May the 13th.

MR. CALLAN: communities in the district of Bellevue , only eleven are served by the Markland cottage hospital, only eleven of the thirty-five. But you also have a couple in the district of Placentia East and you also have seven or eight in the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, there is a larger issue here than the downgrading of a cottage hospital, but there is something just as important as that , I believe, the fact that this petition is signed by residents who live

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. HOUSE:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I understand when

a person stands to speak to a petition he supports the petition and does not take on the people across the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair's understanding of the rule is that one member from either side of the hon. House has the right to rise and speak in support of the petition, and I am assuming that hon. members will support the petition.

MR. NEARY:

What a cowardly point of order

just made by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House), Mr. Speaker. He did not have the courage to get up and speak in support of this petition. I want to congratulate my colleague, Mr. Speaker, for the role that he has played in this matter so far of the closing of the Markland Hospital. And I want to congratulate all those people who have been holding public meetings and circulating petitions to try to save their hospital, Mr. Speaker. Not only are they trying to save the hospital for Markland, but they are probably in the process, if they can save that hospital, of saving the cottage hospital scheme throughout Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. Because if the minister succeeds in closing the Markland Hospital, then I would say the days are numbered for the hospitals at Come By Chance, at Botwood, at Placentia and various other parts of Newfoundland where they have a cottage hospital.

MR. NEARY: a person who knows the situation
in that area. He has been silenced by the administration.

MR. CALLAN: He is gagged.

MR. NEARY: He is gagged. He stands to lose
his job if he speaks out. Then we hear statements from
people in the know, people in authority in St. John's, who
say that the St. John's hospitals cannot handle the work that
will come to them as a result of the closing of the Markland
Hospital. That is frightening, Mr. Speaker.

And we all know, Mr. Speaker,
about

MR. NEARY: And instead of my hon. friend, who should know better, instead of the hon. gentleman making snide remarks across this House, it would be far better if the hon. gentleman asked his colleagues to reconsider this matter, because the hon. gentleman knows the consequences as a medical man, what will happen in this area if this hospital is closed.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

I hate to interrupt the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), but his time has expired.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, we got him up.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it was not the opposition that got me up, I had planned to address this particular petition. Mr. Speaker, I support the right of people to petition. Obviously that is a fundamental right and I support that, and I support the right of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to adequate medical services.

The petition talks about danger of health and life safety. These are not the facts of course, as given to me by the expertise that I have discussed it with. But I do say I support the right of people to have adequate medical services, but that does not necessarily mean, Mr. Speaker, that we have to continue with what we have always had.

MR. HOUSE: The other thing is we have been catering in that particular community and area to 16,000 out-patient people over the number of years and that is going to be improved with the new facility. The other thing is we had 457 people admitted to that institution last year for an average of 4.2 days, and that shows a certain pattern and we believe that the particular facility is not adequate for in-patient facilities, so we are offering certainly a good facility.

The other thing I want to mention, I am accepting the petition, Mr. Speaker, I am up to accept the petition, and I will meet with the people in the area to discuss the whole matter.

MR. YOUNG: Hear, hear! Right on there.

MR. HOUSE: What I mean by the people of the area, Mr. Speaker, is the constituted committee.

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1300

ah-1

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Unified Family Court Act". (Bill No. 43).

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

MR. MARSHALL: Order 5, Bill No. 2.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act". (Bill No. 2).

On motion clauses (I) through (20), carried.

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

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

June 15, 1982, Tape 1301, Page 2 -- apb

MR. MARSHALL: difference in the salary.

I could point out, Mr. Chairman, that the contract, as the hon. gentlemen will see, although The Order in Council

MR. NEARY: this Province, like the Premier has been saying. It was not, and let hon. gentlemen not be fooled or duped by the Premier's misleading statements. The reason the legislation granting a power corridor across any province- it did not deal exclusively with the Province of Quebec, it did not give this Province exclusive rights to have the power corridor across Quebec and all the other provinces not have a corridor across each other's province - Mr. Chairman, this legislation was of universal application and the reason it came before the Parliament of Canada had nothing to do with this administration here or the Premier of this Province,

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, also the hon.

Premier plays with words when he talks about rights and privileges, the people of Newfoundland do not have the same rights and privileges as other Canadians. Mr. Chairman, that also is a misleading and irresponsible statement. As far as pipelines are concerned, we have the same rights and privileges in this Province as any other Canadian. That is a myth. Mr. Chairman, as far as the transmission of electricity is concerned, every province of Canada has the same problems as we have in Newfoundland.

June 15, 1982

Tape 1304

PK - 2

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): A point of order, the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member was referring to a letter just a moment ago allegedly coming from Mr. Lalonde to Mr. Duhaime and he said he would table it at the time. And I ask how that he table the letter because -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I am not finished with the letters yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To that point of order?

MR. NEARY: I will table the letter. I have every intention, Mr. Chairman, of tabling it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) says he will table the letter.

MR. NEARY: As a matter of fact I am going to table the letter to the hon. gentleman too, but I am not finished with the letters yet, Mr. Chairman, and I only have one copy in front of me. So if that is in order,-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. There is no point of order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, the third thing was that Mr. Lalonde suggested and

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1305

ah-2

MR. NEARY: your feeling that some delay in implementing the sections of the Bill C108 would be helpful in encouraging a negotiated settlement between the two provinces. You mentioned a period of six months".

DR. COLLINS: It puts too much pressure on the Newfoundland government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it puts more pressure on the Quebec government because that act is going to be proclaimed in six months time.

DR. COLLINS: And you are against the delay, are you?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, further in the seventh paragraph, and this, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion is the key paragraph, it says, "The Government of Canada is of the view that we should give another chance to the negotiations processed. A settlement between the two governments would be substantially beneficial for both,

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) because
Newfoundlanders are reasonable people.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the first thing that
would happen is that we would be tied up, we would be tied
up in litigation for the next 100 years. There would be
problems about the environment, we would be in the court. We would
be in the courts for the next 100 years. And hon. gentlemen,
Mr. Chairman, they can dig in and they can tell the world, 'If
you do not do it our way you do not do it at all.' In that case
the water from the Lower Churchill will flow into the Atlantic
forever, there will be a dead end on the reopening of the
Upper Churchill contract- it will never be reopened-and there
will be no other rivers in Labrador developed. That is the
consequences of the policy that the hon. gentleman is following.

DR. COLLINS: That is a good summary of the
Quebec case.

DR. COLLINS: The federal government will not communicate with the government of Newfoundland.

MR. MARSHALL: That is a fact, Mr. Chairman, as the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has indicated, that obviously the federal government again, just as they did when they came down on the offshore case, communicated with the provincial opposition Liberal caucus, they are also giving them correspondence which we have not had the benefit of seeing, but we will see it because the hon. gentleman is going to table it.

MR. NEARY: I have no hesitation.

MR. HOUSE: That is one of the reasons they got wiped out in the last election.

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman always gets up and speaks with great authority, but nobody really challenges him to any great degree because he is an aggressive speaker and because he puts his sentences together the way he does that sometimes they take it that he understands what he is talking about. But if you listen, Mr. Speaker, to the substance of what the hon. gentleman says, you will realize that this is entirely to the contrary.

He talks about we not having the same rights as other provinces of Canada, and the

MR. MARSHALL: Now let me make it plain: There is no government that has ever negotiated as much as this government has. On the offshore, we have wanted to negotiate on the offshore. We have put a proposal before the federal government on the offshore; they have not responded to it. The subject before consideration now is with respect to the transmission lines. For seven years we have negotiated, for eight years we have negotiated, and we have negotiated hard with the Province of Quebec. And they have not put anything substantial to any degree whatsoever on the table. The last meeting with the Province of Quebec occurred in September of last year between myself and Mr. Duhaime, about ten days before the beginning of the reversion case before the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. The meeting was at his request because he wanted us to postpone the reversion case, to which we

MR. MARSHALL: the Canadian Confederation do not depend upon our negotiations with the Province of Quebec or with anyone else. We have these rights and what the federal government is doing by this particular action is dealing out a deck of cards with all of the cards being dealt to the Province of Quebec. There were negotiations before, Mr. Chairman, on that basis and we know what the results were. Indeed, if there had been a recognition, if the federal government of the day had been prepared to implement the right which Newfoundlanders have to this power corridor in 1960, the government of the day would have been in a much better position with respect to their bargaining and they would not be at a disadvantage or an unequal position. And I think with the personnel of that government we would have still had the same mistakes anyway because they were so consummately stupid in their handling of the affairs of this Province, but at least they would have felt in a more equal position and possibly something better would come. I say to the hon. gentlemen there opposite when you have people put in unequal positions what is going to happen is you are going to have inequalities that are going to result.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: And that is what the federal government was doing in this particular case. I will get back to it later on, if the hon. gentleman wishes.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I have every intention of tabling these two letters. I have a copy of the letter that was also sent

MR. NEARY: opinion, is a reasonable proposal, reasonable and fair -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - reasonable and fair in every respect. And the whole trouble is, Mr. Chairman, that is anybody was being discourteous, it was not me or members of this side of the House, it was the hon. gentleman and the Premier, the Siamese twins who were being discourteous, and not only being discourteous but being

MR. NEARY: being difficult to get along with and being unreasonable. I will read the letter and then I will table it after. "Dear Sir," it says to the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall). To, "Hon. William Marshall, Minister of Energy, St. John's, Newfoundland. Dear Sir: During the last few months I have had the privilege of discussing with you and your predecessor, Mr. Barry, the dispute between the Newfoundland and Quebec Governments over the transmission of electricity. As you know, the Government of Canada tabled in Parliament last June a draft bill and in February of this year a bill entitled, "The Energy Security Act". This bill contains legislative amendments to the National Energy Board Act which will permit the designation of certain interprovincial power lines as falling under the regulatory power of that board, and which will grant the board authority to permit expropriation for these designated interprovincial and international electricity transmission lines. Our government has already indicated very clearly its willingness to exercise its constitutional authority to regulate certain aspects of interprovincial and international electricity transmission.

"As you know, the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party have voted against those provisions in Parliament." Mr. Chairman, I hope hon. gentlemen got that. "As you know, the Conservative Party of Canada and the New Democratic Party have voted against those provisions in Parliament. You will also remember that in my previous correspondence with you and your predecessor, as well as in numerous public statements, I have repeatedly stated that the federal government

MR. NEARY: "It is clear from these proposals" -

DR. COLLINS: Very impressive.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman
has such a buttoned-down, narrow mind. Look, in
Newfoundland and in this House you have Tories and you
have Progressive Conservatives,

MR. NEARY: activity, which both provinces are sorely needing at the present time. The alternative" - Mr. Chairman, just listen to this - "the alternative will be more years of endless and possibly fruitless litigation between the two provinces," That is the alternative.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is another key sentence."In spite of the opposition of the Conservative and the New Democratic parties, the government of Canada has decided to ask parliament to pass bill C-108, including the provisions concerning electrical power transmission. However, in order to encourage both provincial governments to return in good faith

MR. MARSHALL: _____ dispute between Quebec and Newfoundland concerning the transmission and electricity." Now how nice and cosy, cosy, Mr. Chairman, Almost as cosy, cosy, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and the Minister of Energy Mines and Resources for Canada. How nice and cosy, cosy and how, Mr. Chairman, we should atleast weigh the fact that the hon. gentleman is indicating in his telex of consultations with the Province of Quebec when they never had the courtesy to record us the same type of consultation. Now that is the first point, Mr. Chairman, and that has to be a very real point, And his statements in that telex the meat really and meaning to the statements, the intemperate remarks, that were made by the Premier of Quebec in the National Assembly of Quebec some ten days before that, you will recall

MR. MARSHALL: confidence can we have
when we know there are seventy-four members of the
Quebec caucus in the Federal Liberal Party? What
confidence can we have when we hear their ,

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1316

RA - 2

MR. MARSHALL: I would say that the hon. gentleman has probably been drawn into line by Mr. Lalonde, and Mr. Lalonde's colleagues, and being told by the Leader outside the House to toe the line and to adopt whatever the federal government want, which is what the Leader outside the House did to his sorrow during the last Provincial election. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that we have no confidence in the way this thing has been handled. I mean, here the federal government obviously has imparted its decision

MR. MARSHALL: on an equal basis with Quebec is if we have the same rights as they have, as any other province of Canada. How can you sit down with somebody and even negotiate - this is why the Upper Churchill occurred, this is why we made no progress over seven or eight years, because you sit down with the Province of Quebec and they know that Ottawa is behind them and Ottawa is going to block the transmission of power. And this is what Ottawa is doing in this particular case, believe you me, it is taking steps to block the transmission of power.

They have made no meaningful proposals with respect to the Upper Churchill. And I say also, Mr. Chairman, that one of the purposes of this move,

I believe, is to counteract the effect of the Reversion Case. Because this government had the courage to bring in the Act which it did, and has brought it to the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, it has been ruled to be valid in the Supreme Court of Newfoundland, it only awaits an adjudication of the Supreme Court of Canada, the people of Quebec and the Government of Quebec all of a sudden now are getting concerned. So they say to their friends in Ottawa, "Well, we have got to have something to counteract that, so what can we do?"

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Duhaime, which is really one that the cynicism could be wrung out of, if you consider all the factors in it, the very fact that the hon. gentleman consulted with Mr. Levesque - this is what he did, he consulted with Rene Levesque, He did not consult with the people of this Province, he consults with the Leader of the Opposition and gives him the information. They refuse, themselves, to negotiate themselves on the offshore. All of these factors are harmful to the people of this Province, and how he ever expects the people of Newfoundland to accept this, I do not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: And it sounds so reasonable people will say, "Oh, why do you not negotiate"? Because-

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - negotiate sounds fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order.

MR. MARSHALL: What we have been is trapped into it, Mr. Chairman, with the connivance collusion of Ottawa with Quebec, and the hon. weaklings on the other side will go along with it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is a classic example of the kind of bile and poison that we have been hearing now in this Province for ten years. The actual fact of the matter

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1319

IB-2

MR. NEARY: with some kind of a little vicious mind that the hon. gentleman has, a vicious buttoned-down mind and bigotry on the part of the hon. gentleman.

The hon. the Premier (Mr. Peckford), by the way, Mr. Chairman, cannot refer to residents of Quebec as Canadians. The hon. the Premier has repeatedly referred

MR. NEARY: And what a bluff it has been, Mr. Chairman. They are afraid they are going to be exposed for perpetrating a gigantic fraud on the people of this Province, that is what they are afraid of. Mr. Chairman, here are the two letters. Any fair-minded Canadian, any fair-minded resident of Quebec or Newfoundland reading these two letters would say, 'There you go, that is a reasonable and fair proposition. Now why do the parties not go back to the bargaining table and negotiate in good faith and after six months, if they do not resolve their problems, then the act will be proclaimed.'

DR. COLLINS: Oh, who said that?

MR. NEARY: Who said it? Mr. Lalonde said it right in his letters.

MR. TOBIN: The newspapers would not publish them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this is a very realistic and reasonable proposal. And what it is asking is both parties - it is not only asking this government, it is also treating the government of Quebec in exactly the same manner as it is treating this

MR. NEARY: Quebec.

MR. STAGG: Sit down now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, what are negotiations?
Do I have to go through that again? What are negotiations?
Are negotiations the way that the Premier and the Minister
of Energy (Mr. Marshall) want it done? You do it our
way or you do not do it at all, is that negotiations?

MR. TOBIN: It is our right. It is our right.

MR. NEARY: What is our right?

MR. TOBIN: You know what is our right.

MR. NEARY: What is it? I challenge the hon.
gentleman to get up and tell us what is our right. What
is our right? What is our right?

MR. TOBIN: To transport power through Quebec.

MR. NEARY: Oh, it is our right, I see. The
Province of Quebec does not have any rights.

MR. TOBIN: What about the rights of Alberta?

MR. NEARY: Yes, what about it?

MR. TOBIN: The right to go through the rest of the provinces.

MR. NEARY: On what? On what?

MR. TOBIN: To transmit power.

MR. NEARY: On a pipeline.

MR. TOBIN: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the Province of
Alberta can run a pipeline, a gas pipeline or an oil pipeline
through a province only if the province agrees to it.

MR. TOBIN: What is Confederation all about?

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. gentleman trying to
tell me that if Newfoundland did not want a pipeline, if
Newfoundland -

MR. F. STAGG: Now, Mr. Chairman, what I would like for the Opposition to deal with in this debate since it has turned into an energy debate, and I understand that we are on the Premier's Office, on the estimates concerning the Premier's Office- is that not correct?- but, as usual, debate is far-ranging and relevance is stretched to the extremes, so the order of the day has been to attack the energy policy of the Province. Can you imagine the Opposition Liberals in this House attacking the energy policy of this government? The people of this Province in no uncertain terms told everyone- they spoke, and they said, ' We support the valiant courageous efforts of this government and this group-

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: - of individuals in their fight for there resources of this Province.' They said it in no uncertain terms. This is the ultimate gallop poll, Mr. Chairman, the ultimate gallop poll, when the government puts itself on the line and goes out and says, ' Do you support us or do you not?' And the people have said in no uncertain terms that they do. Now, Mr. Chiarman, the Opposition Liberals have,

MR. STAGG: the word of a man who is not even supported, really, by his political colleagues here in this Province? We are said to be undermining Canada. We are called bigots on this side, warmongers and so on. What I say to hon. members of this House is that I have heard the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) today make the same kind of speech that his predecessor, the former Leader of the Opposition made as his campaign slogan when he was running for the leadership of the Liberal Party, as it then was in 1980, in November of 1980.

MR. PEACH: The out-house leader?

MR. STAGG: That is the former leader.

That is the outside-of-the-House Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PEACH: Out-house leader. In-house and out-house.

MR. STAGG: Some of my hon. colleagues have shortened the name to the in-house leader and the other fellow who is not in the House, that leader.

MR. STAGG: rabbit ears up around it, because it was a Sterling speech with a capital S. It was not a sterling speech as far as content is concerned, it has been proved to be one of the most specious, the most specious arguments and the most specious speeches that Newfoundlanders have ever been subjected to.

So that is the sort of thing that we are being subjected to here. We are being given nothing constructive from the members of the Opposition. They get little papers, they get the letters from abroad, letters from other jurisdictions that they try to spring on the government to try to embarrass the government. They have no sense of history, they have no sense of dedication to the Province, their only desire, Mr. Chairman, is to get into power, to get into power so that they can have the perks of power. They are not interested in the exercise of power, except as it pertains to the comforts that allegedly accrue with power, they are interested in the posturing of government.

And, Mr. Chairman, it is my submission that as long as this position is perpetuated by the present in-House Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) as he is giving the Stirling speech that we have heard for many years, that the people have flatly rejected. And even more importantly, Mr. Chairman, the people in his own district of Bonavista North flatly rejected the Leader of the Opposition, they thought his Stirling speech lacked luster, that it needed shining up. And of course, we have the present member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), who, to some extent, was the benefactor of that poor, illtimed strategy on the part of the then in-House Leader of the Opposition.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just suggest to any other members opposite who might be frantically putting pen to paper to get together a few notes with which to reply,

MR. F. STAGG: be a little more constructive, that they could give a speech that is not the regurgitation of an old discredited and defeated position-

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right.

MR. STAGG: - what the Opposition needs now, they need to out-Peckford 'Peckford'. I will give the Opposition a little bit of strategy. Rather than saying that the government here is intransigent and will not debate and so on, their position should be that this government is about to give away the shop, that we here are being less than good stewards of the economy. Unfortunately these words of wisdom, and I have given them to hon. members opposite many times, they do not appear to fall on very receptive ears. The last time I gave them there were eighteen members opposite-

MR. CHAIRMAN (Aylward): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. STAGG: We had eighteen members opposite and now there are only eight.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: And I must say that if hon. members do not buck up-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: - they are going to have some difficulty in remaining in the House of Assembly. So, Mr. Chairman, I will probably have another go at it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know if I should demean myself by replying to the member's remarks, but, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite would rather fight than eat. And when the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) talks about old records, both him and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) are much the same, very much the same, the same type of mentality, the chip on the shoulder, separatist, rather fight than eat mentality. Now, Mr. Chairman, when we have to sit

MR. J. HODDER: suddenly and so quickly it is mind boggling, the people of this Province have realized that this government does not have any intention of negotiating on the offshore, or negotiating with Quebec or anyone else.

MR. STAGG: We will never surrender.

MR. NEARY: That is what the Argentinians said.

MR. PATTERSON: We are not in Argentina.

MR. NEARY: That is what they said in Argentina.

MR. HODDER: People have suddenly realized that this government has used this issue in order to perpetuate their political skins and are now using it to try and attack - they are looking forward to the next federal election.

MR. TULK: The Argentinians said, 'We will never surrender' and then they waved their flags.

MR. STAGG: Give the hon. member a white flag -

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman says that on the one hand we support the Province and on the other hand we are subversives. Well, Mr. Chairman, I take great exception to that. What the hon. member is trying to say is that we must go along, if the government says that this is our policy, we must go along with the policy. What we are asking, Mr. Chairmsn, is what is the government's policy?

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: Because we have not seen a government policy yet.

MR. HODDER: will be making sure that this government, or trying to point out the flaws, and, Mr. Chairman, there are so many flaws emanating from the other side of this House recently, we do not have time to bring them all up. We may have to keep the House open until October or November.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that the tabling of those letters in the House of Assembly has pointed out today is that it is not that it is unusual that letters should come from the Opposition. What is unusual, Mr. Chairman, is that there is such a breakdown in negotiations, and a breakdown in federal/provincial relations, and a breakdown in relations between the Province of Newfoundland and the Province of Quebec that no one is speaking to anyone else anymore, and that this government is no longer trusted

MR. HODDER: President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the Minister of Energy, earlier today when he was speaking, spoke about the last negotiations we had with Quebec and mentioned a four or five line letter which he had received from the Minister of Energy in Quebec which had said, 'Well, let us sit down and talk about it'. But that particular letter was written before this particular legislation was passed in the House of Commons in Ottawa. And I feel, Mr. Chairman, that it is reasonable and incumbent on this government to open negotiations with Quebec.

MR. STAGG: He does not believe a word he is saying.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member thinks that we are going to be able to push a hydro line across Quebec without some sort of an agreement and understanding from Quebec, and the good will of Quebec, then the hon. gentleman should sit down and think about

MR. NEARY:

I beg your pardon?

MR. SIMMS:

about the Falkland Islands war was coming to him. I mean, he was outside.

MR. NEARY:

No. What I said was, in case the hon. gentleman is not aware of what I said when the hon. gentleman was out, if we want to have a third world war, the thing to do is to appoint the hon. gentleman to the United Nations. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this is a very realistic, sensible and fair approach to a long standing problem. And we have not heard one statement made by spokesmen for the administration today to indicate otherwise. They viciously attacked members of the opposition. They have made all kinds of irresponsible statements.

MR. SIMMS:

That is what he just said, he called your attacks vicious.

MR. NEARY:

No, the attacks came from that side first.

MR. TULK:

They always do. Always do.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, all we have to do in this House is ask ourselves a question. Who is the ultimate in nastiness in this House? Who is the ultimate in nastiness in this Province? When you get the answer to that, then you have the answer to the problem, you have 90 per cent of the answer to the real problem in this Province. The fact of the matter is that the administration, Mr. Chairman, the administration is paranoid. They are paranoid. They think that somehow or

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, if they are not capable, if the job is too big for them, if the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) or the Premier cannot negotiate, if the job is too big for them, well, then, what I fear, Mr. Chairman, is this -

MR. DINN: We will let you do it.

MR. NEARY: - that nothing will ever be done.

MR. HODDER: Yes, we will do it.

MR. DINN: Let you do like you did in the Department of Social Services.

MR. NEARY: They have a five year mandate, Mr. Chairman, they do not intend to negotiate. Now, Mr. Chairman, how are problems in the world resolved?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, if they think that Mr. Clark if he becomes Prime Minister is going to resolve the problem, all they have to do is look at this piece of legislation. Mr. Clark and the Tory Party were against putting a corridor across Quebec. So if through some fluke he became Prime Minister, is he going to change his mind then and force a corridor across Quebec? Is he?

MR. SIMMS: You wait and see. He was not just against that, and you know it.

MR. NEARY: He was against it, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, he and his party specifically were against that cause. Is the hon. gentleman aware of that? There was a special committee established on that bill, C 108, a special committee of Parliament. Okay? And in that special committee of Parliament the spokesman for the Tory Party, Mr. Roch Lasalle -

MR. SIMMS: Is he the energy spokesman?

MR. NEARY: He was the spokesman for the Tory Party on this Committee. And do you know what he said? I have it here. I can read it for the hon. - I think I have it here. Would the hon. gentleman care to hear what his party's position was on this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Lasalle - this is a transcript of May 27th - Mr. Lasalle, and here is what he is saying -

DR. COLLINS: What does he represent?

MR. NEARY: He represents the Tory caucus on this committee.

DR. COLLINS: No, no. What else does he represent?

MR. NEARY: What else does he represent?

MR. NEARY: "I say to you, Mr. Minister, that if you accept to suspend implementation of this bill for six months, I have every reason to believe that very special efforts are going to be made, and that an agreement can be reached between the two provinces which will be of benefit to both of them. Technically, yesterday, and I am not the first one to be telling you this, the Chairman of Hydro Quebec taught us a lot. As for politics, that is a horse of another colour. The president of Hydro did not want to get into that. It was quite his right to refuse that kind of discussion. And he did very well in avoiding that." Now listen to this, he said, "I can say quite categorically and without hesitation, that if you are ready to put back the implementation of this bill for six months, my party would not hesitate of voting in favour of that amendment." That is the spokesman, the chief spokesman for the Tory Party on that committee.

MR. COLLINS: And where is he from?

MR. NEARY: Now, if hon. gentlemen think that if Mr. Clark, through some freak of nature -

MR. HODDER: Clark has said that himself.

MR. NEARY: And Clark said that himself - became Prime Minister of Canada, that they are going to force Quebec to give this Province a corridor across Quebec without negotiation, without goodwill, without bargaining in good faith, then they had better think again. There is the answer there, Mr. Chairman, for the hon. member for Stephenville, when he hinted that maybe that is what they are waiting for.

DR. COLLINS: And where is that MP from?
Is he from Newfoundland?

MR. NEARY: - down the tubes and gamble
on Mr. Clark becoming the next Prime Minister of
Canada. That is a pretty risky game they are playing, Mr.
Chairman. It is pretty risky.

MR. TOBIN: Do you trust Lalonde?

MR. HODDER: Do you trust Clark?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would
trust Mr. Lalonde further that I could throw the member
for Burin Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

MR. TOBIN: That is not very far.

MR. HODDER: that they have done this and when you look at the other side, it was not Mr. Clark alone who made the decision, Mr. Chairman. It was not Mr. Clark alone, it was the PC caucus in Ottawa which made this decision. And, Mr. Chairman, what we may have here and what we may look back at in ten years to come, we may have another Churchill Falls in the making.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HODDER: Because, Mr. Chairman -

MR. BAIRD: You do not have to worry, you will not be around then.

MR. HODDER: - because this government is hoping and waiting, and -

MR. NEARY: Listen to the croaking bullfrog down there.

MR. HODDER: - as we hear from some of the lesser lights on the government side of the House, they are waiting until such time as, they hope, the Federal Liberals are out and the Tories are in. And they are going to do their part, they are using there negotiatings, their stance - their whole stance is aimed at trying to change the Government of Canada. But, Mr. Chairman, this particular stance could back fire in the faces of the government. I mean, we already have an example of Mr. Clark, who is trying too garner support in Quebec. He is trying to get the Quebec vote. He knows if he is going to be Prime Minister of Canada again, he has to give concessions to Quebec. And he is willing to sacrifice this Province in order to get concessions and be able to win seats in Quebec in the next federal election. He still wants to stay on, Mr. Chairman, as Leader of the Tory Party of Canada. But what is more frightening, Mr. Chairman, is that

MR. HODDER: exacerbate the problems which we presently have.'

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, two or three of the members of the Opposition have spoken and I have got to respond to them. First of all, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and he indicating about the MPs abstaining from voting, and they have made a great deal about that. But I am going to repeat again, the hon. gentleman is obviously not familiar with the act.

 Now, here are two members of Parliament both of whom have fought long and hard

MR. MARSHALL: against this Province of the five quiet quislings who sit in the Liberal caucus, who do not open their mouths at any stage about Newfoundland. You remember they were promising us this power corridor? Now they are not being held and called to account with respect to it at all. They just weakly and meekly follow the line of Mr. Lalonde of the Federal Cabinet, of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) with his new-found faith in Mr. Lalonde. They just meekly follow along, Mr. Chairman, to the detriment of the people of this Province. Because the fact of the matter is, and the fact of the matter, it has to be said again, we have a right under the Constitution of Canada to the transmission of hydro power in the same way as other provinces have the right, and the legitimate right, for the transmission of oil and gas. Indeed, we have the same right for the transmission of hydro power, to sell our resources, as the breadbasket of Southern Ontario has to sell the commodities which it makes in its extensive industries without having to sell them from one province to the other. We have that right. Now, how do you acquire that right? That right was given us under the British North America Act,

June 15, 1982

Tape No. 1336

IB-2

MR. MARSHALL: But the operative provisions of
that act with respect to the power corridor are not law.
And it is not so,

MR. MARSHALL: costs that are accelerating not just yearly or monthly but daily, there will come a time when the economics of this line, of putting this line through are going to be questionable. And this is one of the aims. If it is not the aim to delay it and to delay it forever and a day, it is the aim to keep it to such an extent that the line then becomes uneconomic, and that we are not being able to get the practical realization of the rights which we have and which we are entitled to as Canadian Citizens. This whole story of the relationships of federal government not just with this Province but with the all of the Provinces, is a sorry, sorry sight, and it is a sorry plight it has got Canada in. And nowhere do we see anymore manifestation of it than the actions which were taken. The telex which was sent by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Duhaime), as I say, just drips with sarcasm, just drips with cynicism and it is an action, really, against this Province. The hon. gentleman there opposite compares

MR. CHAIRMAN (AYLWARD): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: What a gigantic bluff, Mr.

Chairman! The hon. gentleman has shown us once again, Mr. Chairman, why there are no negotiations. The hon. gentleman just could not resist the temptation to give Mr. Trudeau and the Liberal Government of Canada a broadsides. The hon. gentleman hates everything that is Libeal. He keeps referring - what is it he says about this side of the House? -

MR. TULK: He should settle for a new phrase.

MR. NEARY: Yes, he should get a new phrase.

MR. TULK: The hon. gentlemen there opposite.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentlemen there opposite.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that we are getting the upper hand of the hon. gentleman in this debate. And, Mr. Chairman, let me say this to the hon. gentleman, that that debate on Friday, we could have saved it for today. What was the urgency of that debate on Friday?

MR. DINN: You did not want to debate it anyway.

MR. NEARY: I see, we did not want to debate it. We wanted to debate it, Mr. Chairman, but we wanted to debate it under the rules of this House. The hon. gentleman had

MR. NEARY: Now, Mr. Chairman, that matter of whether or not it was a proper ruling, that matter has been resolved to our satisfaction, I am happy to say, and we will not have to do what we said we were going to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: What is so funny?

MR. BAIRD: You are!

MR. NEARY: Is that so?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, that matter has been resolved to our satisfaction, but let us hope that the Premier will not again try to bend the rules of this House just because he could not get his own way, just because he sulked.

The hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) knows what I am talking about. There are precedents piled upon precedents, rulings given by Speakers, three Speakers of this House, rulings given by - no, two Speakers.

MR. SIMMS: You have that resolved now.

MR. NEARY: We have that resolved and I am prepared to drop it. That is right. It is a very delicate matter, as the hon. gentleman knows, and I have no intention of pursuing it. I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, the adjournment of the debate, and I would like to move that the Committee rise and report no progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Chairman of Committees.