



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

First Session

Number 3

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Tuesday, 30 April 1985

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Oral Questions

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

Sir, in view of the minister's respect for and his deep and abiding belief in the collective bargaining process, and in view of this government's wage freeze which has wiped out salary negotiations for public employees in the Province, in view of these irrefutable and indisputable facts, would the minister not admit that this policy, more than any other measure by this government, has caused a tremendous deterioration to, if not a complete erosion of the collective bargaining process in this Province and, Mr. Speaker, indeed, caused irreparable damage to good labour relations in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the hon. member is asking a question or making a statement, but he is asking me to admit that the restraint programme has caused all of the damage in collective bargaining that he is referring to. Collective bargaining has not

been smooth over the last several years because of the recession we have gone through, but for me to admit that the government's restraint programme has been the cause of it would be, I think, to lie to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Certainly, the minister would admit, Mr. Speaker, that salary negotiations form an integral part of any collective bargaining process. In view, again, of the minister's respect for the collective bargaining process, I wonder would the minister undertake to use his considerable influence to convince his colleagues to scrap this offensive policy immediately and to fully restore collective bargaining in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, I am a brand new minister and I hope to be discussing with my colleagues the problems that are around in two or three disputes that have been ongoing; there is a teachers' dispute that is ongoing, there is a dispute at the university that is ongoing, there is a dispute in breweries. These come around every year, not in these same cases, but we have disputes in the labour force. I have, in fact, this very morning, discussed one of those disputes with one of my

colleagues, the minister responsible, and will be discussing others in the days to come. We are, in fact, I would like to tell the hon. member, seeking remedies to these disputes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the minister has no intention of scrapping this policy. I wonder if he can inform the House just what the time frame is for coming out of this wage freeze, this zero/zero. Now, I do not expect for the minister to know all of the units but will we be out of it by 1986? Will we be out of it by 1987? Just what is the time frame for coming out of this freeze?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, that information has been made public long ago. I am not sure exactly when, but the Premier and the President of Treasury Board have, on a number of occasions, made statements to the effect that every group that bargains with government would undergo a two-year restraint programme and they will come out of the restraint programme at the end of that two years. There has been a better announcement than that made already, that there would be 4 per cent for the CPI granted and then free collective bargaining would take place.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on those excellent questions that the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) asked. I would like to ask the minister whether he has been able to ascertain how this commitment of the Premier made just coincidentally during the election, that groups coming out of the wage freeze will be guaranteed increases to meet the increase in the cost of living, is to work? Would the minister tell us whether that commitment has to do with the increase in the cost of living for the last year of the freeze or is it the increase in the cost of living for the year following the release from the freeze?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, again that was a statement of policy by the government at the time and I do not think the fine details of that policy have been worked out. I would guess that the government will be looking at the CPI at the time, or perhaps the average of the last three months or something like that, when that particular unit finishes their collective agreement. Again I say, other than the fact that it will have to be looked at at that particular time, I do not think any further details have been worked out.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wonder if the minister, Mr. Speaker, would tell us whether or not he has read the commitment that was given by the Premier because the Premier made it quite clear that he would see that the groups would have an increase to make sure that they did not lose out for the increase that would be coming in the following year. Now I am just wondering how the minister might see an agreement would be concluded to give a definite increase but basing it upon a cost of living for the future year which will not be known at the time the agreements are negotiated?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was my minister for four months one time and he is familiar with labour practices. When somebody says that you are going to get a 4 per cent increase, at that time all groups will have been told that they would get a 4 per cent increase or an increase equal to what the CPI is at the time, and then you will go into free, collective bargaining. Free, collective bargaining meaning you will be able to exchange demands and go to the bargaining table and hammer out a new collective agreement to replace the one that just expired.

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary the hon. the

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Do I take it that the minister is indicating that possibly there might be a formula included in the collective agreements that would be negotiated with the groups coming out of the freeze, a formula that would be related to the CPI rather than having a fixed increase negotiated with groups who have just come out of the freeze? Because we will not know what the cost of living increase will be for the following year, we do not have a crystal ball.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is asking me to have, a crystal ball, because I do not know. We have to get to the table with these parties and find out what is going to be negotiated. I cannot project what any group and their employer are going to do at the table or what demands they are going to have.

MR. BARRY:

What is the Premier offering? You should know that.

MR. BLANCHARD:

I have just told you what the Premier is offering, what the government is offering.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My question follows in the same line as the last two questioners and has to do with the situation

with regard to the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and the teachers' dispute or the contract that has not been concluded. I understand from recent press reports that we are now in a position where the teachers have held off any job action for at least another three or four months, until September. My question is to the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), who I believe is responsible for the negotiations in the name of the Queen and in the name of the government. What I would like to ask is since the teachers have now, it seems to me, proffered an olive branch here and are willing to look at any alternative other than to take severe job action, and they have now said that they are doing this expressly because they want the new ministers to get a chance to be more familiar with the issues, the two part question that I have is: Has the President of Treasury Board gotten to the point now where he is quite familiar with the situation in the sense that he knows exactly where it is now, and is he planning any new initiatives in an attempt to try and avert what I think all of us in the House do not wish to see, and that is any disruption of education come this Fall?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, let me first of all remind him that negotiations have not broken off with the NTA. We do indeed have a proposal on the table which is there and available for the NTA to consider and to respond to. We would certainly hope that they would proceed with further discussions with the negotiating team. I am confident

that over the coming months we can indeed work out something that is satisfactory to both the NTA and to government.

MR. FENWICK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
I am trying to get the meaning of what you said correctly there. If I hear correctly, there is an offer on the table and that is the offer you expect to be responded to by the Teachers' Association. The next move is now on their part, is that what you are saying?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman's information that is normal procedure, that one side puts a position on the table and the other side responds, provides a counter-offer, if they so desire, or whatever. We would certainly be happy to entertain any counteroffer that comes forward from the NTA or to provide further discussions and details on the position that we have on the table at the moment, which we think is fair and reasonable. But obviously it is an negotiating position and we will be looking forward to meeting with them.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). For the first time I guess since its inception, municipalities are discriminated

against under this Joint Federal/Provincial Summer Student Employment Programme. Municipalities now have to come up with what amounts to at least 50 per cent of the cost of hiring students. The municipalities already had their budgets set and so on before they are told that they have to pay all of this extra cost for students.

Now the Minister of Municipal Affairs knows that this is a joint programme with \$2 million contributed by the Province. Why did the Minister of Municipal Affairs not end this discrimination against municipalities through this \$2 million that the Province contributes?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, that particular programme is not designed for a municipality to contribute 50 per cent. That 50 per cent is for private enterprises who may want to get into making applications under that programme. The programme is 75/25 for municipalities. Mr. Speaker, any municipality can if they so wish make application under that programme. If they can afford to come up with funds to do it, well, you know, that is entirely up to the municipalities.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The programme as described by the minister is not quite accurate.

The municipalities have to pay 25 per cent of the cost of labour, but they have to pay 100 per cent of the other costs to go along with the programme, which amounts to 50 per cent of the total cost of the Summer Student Employment Programme - actually a little more than 50 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

Now then it is not too late to change that. The grants have not been processed. The municipalities that have put in applications, and there have not been very many, not nearly as many summer jobs as before are going to be applied for through municipalities, but these people have put in their applications, they have not been processed, and it is not too late to change it. And I ask again because the Provincial Government or the people running the programme have been told that the Province can contribute the municipalities' share of this programme if they want to.

I ask, again, will the minister tell the House whether he will try to have this action taken before the applications are processed?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding of the programme that these applications are in the process right now of being processed. It is the option of the municipality, Mr. Speaker, if they wish to take advantage of that programme or not. But still I maintain it is my understanding of the programme - and it is not being administered by my department, it is being administered by the Department of

Career Development and Advanced Studies - but it is my understanding of the programme that the municipality contributes 25 per cent and 25 per cent alone. But certainly there is no area within my department that we can pick up the costs of providing this share of the money to the individual municipality which applies. It is up to the municipality if they can afford to take advantage of the programme, but there is no avenue open to me within my department to make any monies available to municipalities on that basis.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:
Obviously the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) does not really know what has been going on in this particular programme. I will ask a supplementary to the hon. the Premier, a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There is one way out of this problem, one only right now as far as I can see. If this \$2 million that the provincial government is putting in is not going to be used to help the municipalities hire as many students as they have been hiring over the last two or three years, there is one way out, and that is a request to the federal government to ask that municipalities be considered non-profit organizations for the purpose of this programme. I ask the Premier will he undertake to make that change or to request that that change be made?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, first of all the hon. member says that this programme, if it is kept in its present form, will see less students being hired by municipalities than in the past. Now I cannot see how that can be. That was inherent in the preface to the hon. member's question, and I just do not understand that. With this kind of programme now announced, I see more students being hired by municipalities, not fewer. As far as going back to the federal government on this matter, no, I do not think so, Mr. Speaker. I think that we have negotiated a programme here of youth employment for the young people of the Province. I am told by the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) in the last number of days that upwards of 6,000 young people, and it could go as high as 7,000 if I am right in what the minister told me the other day, could be employed. That programme is a good programme. Some municipalities, obviously, might be financially strapped, as is the federal government, as is the provincial government. But where there are municipalities which have valuable, worthwhile projects and can see their way clear to divert some of their funds away from some other projects to this very worthwhile project, well, go ahead and apply and let us get on with getting the young people employed. That programme has been announced by governments and it is going to proceed along the lines that have been announced.

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I want to ask the Minister of Finance a question or two regarding the Come By Chance oil refinery. Now the deadline for the submission of bids on the refinery was May 1 and that has been extended to May 21, even though we have at least one bid in there by Peninsula Refining. I want to ask the Minister of Finance who has asked for this extension, number one, why was it asked for, and by whom and for what reason was the extension given?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, some time ago Petro Canada indicated to us that there may be a situation where there would have to be an extension to the time limit for the bids for the refinery. At that time we indicated that, if they found it necessary to extend it, we would have no problem with it. In subsequent conversations with Petro Canada I learned that one of the bidders felt that they did not have enough time to put into their bid process all the information they wished to. They had to gather information from sources that they had not had time to do with the former deadline. I do not think there is anything very odd or strange about this. It is perfectly up to Petro Canada, of course, to decide when they want to close off the bids, but they felt that they were accommodating the bidder, they were accommodating their own position, and they felt that it would not in any interfere with any interests that would be brought forward by the Province in any way. They already had our assurance on that.

MR. CALLAN:
A supplementary.

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

MR. CALLAN:
Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the minister answered all the questions. I asked him as well who requested the extension and by whom was it was granted and for what reason. Anyway, let me ask the minister, then, what criteria is being used in the submission of these bids? Is Petro Canada and particularly this government still willing to accept a scrapping bid or what are the criteria being used now in the submission of these bids?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, Petro Canada has been quite straightforward about this. They took on the refinery in good faith but saying that if they felt that it could not be rehabilitated in their view and reoperated, they were not committing themselves to do that. Everyone understood that. They made a decision some little while ago that they themselves did not see that it could be operated in their hands and they therefore wanted to lay down their obligations and that is what they are now intending to do. In what form they will lay them down depends on the content of the bid. They did tell us that they will discuss in full detail with us the contents of the bids and the way they regard the bids before coming to a final decision, they will discuss that with us.

I do not know if I should do this actually but I would speculate that if they get a good bid from

someone who wants to operate the refinery that would likely be the bid they would accept. But we will not know that until they get in the bids, go through them in detail, come to some sort of decision in their own minds, then discuss it with us, and then a final decision will be made.

MR. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

A final supplementary by the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister, assuming that either the bid of Peninsula Refining or this Israeli company is accepted to reactivate the refinery, can the minister tell the House how soon after that legislation will be brought into this Legislature to amend Clause 54 of the Atlantic Accord?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all members of the House understand the hon. member's keen interest in that and we sympathize with him, but I think he really is asking the impossible at the present time. All we can say is that when we get the information it will be brought before Cabinet, Cabinet will make a decision in the best interests of the Province, and we will do whatever is necessary. Whether that is legislation or otherwise remains to be seen but we will certainly give it our very best shot and we will do the best we can not only for the hon. member's district but for the people of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) and it concerns a perennial problem that is very costly for the fishermen of Newfoundland. I am referring to the glut period, the trap fishing season. Will the minister tell the House, Mr. Speaker, if there are any new initiatives being taken this year by his department to help eliminate that problem? For example, in my own riding, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen there last year were put on a 300 pound a day quota. It is difficult enough anyway to make a living on groundfish alone, but certainly when you are operating on a quota then it is even more difficult.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, certainly we have a great deal of sympathy for the question raised by the hon. gentleman. I am sure the hon. gentleman knows that there have been several initiatives taken over the past few years. The provision, for example, or the implementation of a programme regionally throughout the Province where we had fish glut desks set up so that the fish resulting from the glut could hopefully be dispersed to plants around the Province where it could be more utilized. Also, of course, over the last two or three years we have gotten into the programme of bringing foreign vessels into various parts of the Province and, while that might not be the optimum way of utilizing the resource, it certainly has been

beneficial for the fishermen from their point of view. We are also involved in a programme of providing regional chilling facilities and freezing facilities throughout the Province and we are reviewing and having another look at that programme now. So there have been various initiatives taken by government, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that the problem will continue to be with us in some way or another when the glut season it on, when the trap season is on, but we are doing what we can to alleviate it and we will continue to do that in every way that we can.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the initiatives taken in the past have not filled the bill. The fishermen are still suffering as a result of the glut period. The Province, by the way, must issue a license to a plant that does fish processing, it must be licensed by the Province. Would the minister therefore undertake to make it a condition of that processing license to the various plants around the Island, that they be required to establish within their plant the capability to salt fish? For example, in other countries when there is a glut or when the market is glutted with fresh frozen fish, then they revert to salting, and apparently there is a big market pretty well at all times for good salted fish and that, Mr. Speaker, is obviously one of the answers in this Province. Obviously the initiatives taken have not worked. Would he give the undertaking that as a condition of the license that maybe the plants would be required to set aside a

spot, a space, and to set up the necessary machinery to enable them to salt fish, especially during the glut period?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is not that the initiatives taken have not worked, it is just that the initiatives taken have not totally solved the problem. I mean, the glut period in the fishery is very difficult to solve and all the initiatives taken, I am sure, have made an improvement for individual fishermen in individual parts of the Province, but if you put a fish plant in every community around the Baie Verte Peninsula or a salt fish plant in every community around the Baie Verte Peninsula, I suspect that at some time during the peak of the glut season you would still have a glut problem. Now, you might have reduced the problem but the problem would not, I do not think, in a lot of years, go away.

On the matter of salt fish, I would say to the hon. gentleman that the market is not as he says it is. The market for salt fish just has not been that great over the last two or three years, and projections are indicating that that market is not going to be as great over the next couple of years as it has previously been. I will certainly undertake to look at the suggestion that he has made to the House, Mr. Speaker. I cannot undertake to make a commitment that we would enforce that kind of condition but I do undertake to look at it.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I have a question for the Minister of Education. It is my understanding that he has received a letter from Lynn Barnes, the President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Human Rights Association, and that in that letter there was some concern expressed about the problem of getting children into French immersion programmes in St. John's schools. I was just wondering if the minister has information for us on any possibility that action is being taken on that problem? I understand it has now become substantial, that there are a number of children whose parents want to get them into this programme and there are not enough seats, evidently, available. Is any action being taken on that?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. Certainly, the French immersion programme in general is one that is of great concern to all of us because it has become extremely popular, to the point where the demand for students to enter the programme presently exceeds the space or teaching personnel available. It was brought to my attention a couple of days ago. I did receive a letter from Ms Barnes, which we are presently responding to, in fact, and looking at the total situation of French immersion because the problem involved is not just a matter of five or six kids being able to get into a class, it goes much further than that. We hope to come up with not just a simple

solution for now but, hopefully, a plan that will enable us to continue with the French immersion courses and, of course, to take advantage of this tremendous opportunity that kids will be provided with to become bilingual in our own Province.

As you can appreciate, it is a very complicated problem that has come on us very quickly and there are far-reaching effects here. So we are proceeding with care and assessing the situation, and hopefully, in a very short time we will be in a position to give you a definite answer as to what can be done for this coming year, which is the main concern right now of the people involved.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just one quick supplementary. The other part of it is the one I would really like to bring up now. I have been in contact with a number of teachers in my own district and elsewhere who are quite worried about the spread of French immersion programmes and I can see why, because it is, as you say, very popular. Five of my six children are in French immersion programmes and I am a strong endorser of the programme itself.

My teachers have asked me: Is it possible to put forward a task force to look at the impact of that kind of programme over the years in terms of teacher tenure and job opportunities and so on. Because I think there is a major problem there down the line. I am not sure how we can address it but

I think a study is perhaps worthwhile.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has hit the nail on the head when he said that there are far-reaching effects. He, of course, mentioned one of them, that as the courses grow in French immersion, we need more and more teachers who are bilingual to be able to handle the courses involved. This is, as you say, a concern to the teachers in our association right now. The situation has been assessed and we will be making very positive moves towards arriving at solutions, not only for the short-term but hopefully for the long-term. At this stage, of course, being just in there, I am not in any position to say we are going to this, that or the other thing tomorrow, but very, very shortly we will be making a decision on this, because it has to be made.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address this question to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett). I just received some correspondence from the Consumer Organization of Disabled People of Newfoundland and Labrador. It concerns the proposal for establishment of a Premier's Advisory Council on the Status Of Disabled Persons.

What I am wondering is if the recommendation or the plan, or

whatever, is preceding, if there are any discussions ongoing? The correspondence that I have had, that they have given me, the last one is dated December. I was wondering are there any other discussions ongoing or are there any plans for the future for the setting up of this advisory council?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to advise the hon. member that I do not have that information at my fingertips but I will get it probably tomorrow. I will take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). It concerns the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. As I understand it there was a provision made under the restructuring agreement, an agreement that the Premier at one point said was forced upon him and at the next point said it is the greatest agreement since Confederation.

But I understand that under that restructuring agreement there was provision for a Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. Well, that was some eighteen months ago and yet nothing has happened. Can I ask the minister what is the Province's position on NFDC? Indeed, does it have a position? Or is it, as some people tell us, the stumbling block to the formation of NFDC?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Well, Mr. Speaker, it is like I said to the hon. gentleman yesterday. It is not because he says nothing has happened, nothing has happened. I believe the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, would probably be delighted if nothing ever happened, particularly if nothing happened in a positive way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that negotiations are presently ongoing with the federal government on the establishment of the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. I can tell the hon. gentlemen and the House that negotiations are proceeding very, very well. As a matter of fact the officials, I think, have reached a meeting of minds at the officials level. It is my intention and the intention of the federal minister to try to arrive at some conclusions when we meet on May 22 or 23 and hopefully at that time be the position to bring something back to our respective governments. So a great deal of progress has been made, Sir.

MR. TULK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), if I were going to be happy when nothing positive happens in this House, my days would be full of happiness as far

as this government is concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, the minister is aware, I think, that the former Federal Government placed \$15 million on the table for the formation of NFDC. Now I would like to ask the minister if he is aware that the present Federal Fisheries Minister (Mr. Fraser) has seen that money taken off the table? In other words, Mr. Speaker, he has taken it away. Is the minister aware of that? And if he is aware of it, was he consulted before that money was taken off the table?

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I just finished telling the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that negotiations between officials of the two levels of government is proceeding very, very smoothly and very well on the setting up of the Northern Fisheries Development Corporation. Now that obviously has inherent in the answer that there will have to be some fiscal arrangement to carry out that initiative.

The hon. gentleman again makes an accusation that the money is taken off the table and something else is taken off the table and something else is done, and asked me if I was consulted. Well, Mr. Speaker, if in fact he is correct and it was taken off the table, it certainly has not happened in the three or four days I have been Minister of Fisheries. And if it was taken off the table before that, then I suppose there would

have been no reason for me to be consulted. On the other hand, I must say to him that what he is talking about is news to us.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Answers to Questions for which
Notice has been Given

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have the information requested by the hon. the member for Gander (Mr. Baker). What I decided to do - and the hon. the member for Gander or members of the Opposition can ask for additional information - I have tried as best I can in the twenty-four hours that I have had at my disposal since the question was asked to give as comprehensive an answer to the question as I could. In order to do that, I have asked the people in the various departments to do an overview for me to table in the House on the Eastern Provincial Airways agreements with government over the years, starting back in 1963 and giving all the relevant information. I do not have the documents here at my disposal, because it would be a raft of them, a lot of them very legal, but I think all the relevant provisions of the agreements and so on are here. It deals with the company history, then the history of government's financial involvement, in March 1963, August 1963, March 1966, December 1971, in 1976, in 1977 and up to the present time. Most of the agreements were done before I personally became Premier but were carried out then and finalized and expired since I became Premier. So I table this information for

the hon. the member for Gander and if there is additional information that he wishes a propos to the question that was asked then I would only be too pleased to provide him with the additional information.

Petitions

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of some 500 residents of several communities in Newfoundland. I will read the communities; Mr. Speaker, they are: Aspen Cove, Gander Bay South, Noggin Cove, Carmanville and a senior citizens group from Grand Falls. Mr. Speaker, the prayer of the petition reads: "We, the concerned citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador, do hereby protest against the high and increasing electricity rates in our Province." And there is a special prayer from the senior citizens from Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, that says:

"WHEREAS the cost of electricity continues to escalate, mostly by reason of the added fuel adjustment and the fact that there are two companies involved, namely Newfoundland Hydro and Newfoundland Light and Power, each making a profit before the product reaches the consumer; and

"WHEREAS many senior citizens find it difficult to cope with the

rising cost of all commodities;

"BE IT RESOLVED that government take immediate steps to have a complete investigation carried out of both companies with a view to reducing the rates of electricity."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to add anything new to this debate or in presenting this petition nor should I be able to add anything new. This debate has been going on now for the best part of a year and one has got to take its hat off to the New Lab group who is carrying the fight on behalf of the consumers of this Province. The media has done their share, Mr. Speaker, and I understand petitions are presented in the House by the Opposition so one should not expect to have to add anything new. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that people in this Province are being devastated and small businesses are being devastated. The only group that is not devastated in this Province with the high cost of electricity is Newfoundland and Light and Power, Mr. Speaker, that is if one looks at their balance sheets.

Mr. Speaker, I will give a quick warning to the New Lab group because this can develop into the old out of sight out of mind trick. In the next week or two or three or four consumption of electricity in this Province is going to drop. People do not use electric heat in the Summer and the minute the bill starts dropping people stop being concerned, government says, 'Good, we have got over it'. But next November, December and January, when the fuel escalation starts to hit again, we will find we are right back into the same mess that we are into now and, Mr. Speaker, it has happened before. I would

ask this House of Assembly and this Opposition and the government to think about this part of this problem that we presented in the next few weeks and find out the solution because if, Mr. Speaker, we allow the thing to go off the table simply because hydro bills start dropping down, the people of Newfoundland will be further devastated next Fall. There is indication in this Province already that we may be burning more fuel next Winter than we are this Winter. Water levels are at an all time low in the reservoirs. There is no run-off expected. If we do not get the kind of rain, Mr. Speaker, that most people do not want in this Province this Summer, we will be into a fuel escalation in October or November. Mr. Speaker, the consumers of electricity in this Province have got it in the neck in more ways than one. Over the past four or five years people who did not agree with the high cost of oil had the option of going to oil conversion. There was a federal government programme whereby one could convert from oil to some other source of heat and in Newfoundland it was wood. The catch was that if you burn electricity in your home you were not entitled to that. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there are people in this Province today spending more money on the fuel adjustment than if they had been heating their homes with oil in the first place. So should they not, in that line of thought, have been entitled, Mr. Speaker, to the oil conversion programme? They are paying for oil. The only problem is Holyrood is burning the oil and not the consumer.

Mr. Speaker, five minutes is not very long. I want the Minister of Energy's (Mr. Dinn) attention for

a moment because every time I have heard him address himself to this particular issue he always seems to try to give the impression that somehow or other, if we suddenly had Churchill Falls power coming into Newfoundland, our problems would be over and we would have cheap electricity. Mr. Speaker, somehow or other he tries to convey that attitude and that feeling and I would encourage the New Lab groups to take him up on that. Do some research and find out, if Churchill Falls power were delivered to Newfoundland today - it is a dream I realize that, but assuming it were - would the cost of electricity to the consumer of this Province come down? Is the minister not simply finding an easy way out by saying the problem is with the way we are producing electricity? Of course it is and the government is going to have to meet its commitment to the people because we are going to continue to produce electricity for a long time to come.

Newfoundland Hydro's annual report in 1982 put the cost of Labrador power, in the event that we had an intertie with the Province, at more per kilowatt hour delivered. If we took it right out of the Churchill Falls system, paid Quebec 2.5 mils they were selling it for now, deliver it to Newfoundland, it would be almost double what it is costing us to burn oil at Holyrood, in 1982. Now I realize the cost of oil has escalated but so has the cost of putting that intertie between Newfoundland and Labrador as well. So, Mr. Speaker, the New Lab group would be well advised - and I am certainly prepared to help them do the research and get the facts - if the minister continues to try to slough off this and try to weasel his way out

of the high cost of electricity and weasel his way out of the fact that the government is doing nothing for the consumers in this Province as far as electric rates are concerned, if he continues to weasel his way out by saying that -

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

The hon. member is going over his time.

MR. FLIGHT:
- Churchill Falls is the solution. The minister should remember that the Churchill Falls power is more expensive to deliver to this Province today than the electricity we are producing in Holyrood today.

Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition and I thank you very much for your tolerance and extra half a minute.

Orders of the Day

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labour Relations Act, 1977," carried. (Bill No. 14).

On motion, Bill No. 14 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Service (Collective Bargaining) Act, 1973," carried. (Bill No. 15)

On motion, Bill No. 15, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order 1, Address in Reply. The debate was adjourned yesterday by the hon. member for Gander (Mr. Baker) and he has approximately seven minutes left.

The hon. member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is good to continue while the press is still awake. I was in the process of talking about fed bashing and the fact that there are differences between both levels of government that have to be addressed. I would like now, Sir, to mention a couple of these areas of disagreement. There are many and many of them happen to be in fisheries. I am sure that will be dealt with a little later by some of my colleagues.

The first thing I would like to mention is there needs to be a little bit of fed bashing in and a little bit of pressure put on the federal government concerning the Search and Rescue facilities in this Province and I would like to state the positions of both governments. Obviously, the position of the federal government is to leave things as they are. The position of the provincial government is to have three extra Search and Rescue helicopters in this Province and as well put fixed-winged aircraft at Gander. As a response to that request what has happened is that they have simply taken one helicopter and transferred it to St. John's so now that helicopter is split between the two areas. Obviously, the provincial government should not be satisfied with that situation but should get on with some fed bashing of their own.

The second thing I would like to

point out, Mr. Speaker, is that while we are waiting for all this prosperity, which obviously has not come even though we are told that our buddies Up Along are not afraid to inflict all this prosperity on us. I have been expecting to see huge transport plane loads of prosperity dropping in on us every day. I have been expecting to see the airports tied up with these transports, bringing all this prosperity down and I have not seen any of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

He does not want to overheat the Newfoundland economy.

MR. BAKER:

He does not want to overheat the Newfoundland economy, but while we are waiting for all of this to happen, Mr. Speaker, other things have been happening that are not good for us and they have been done by the federal government. Somehow this particular administration has to address them.

Number one: the mobility grants. Three years ago the Premier talked in terms of - and he brought tears to our eyes, Mr. Speaker - the people in Alberta he was going to bring home, and these people wanted to come home. Well, Mr. Speaker, what has happened now is that the federal government, our senior government, has actually cut mobility grants in such a way that young people in this Province can now no longer go to some other place to look for a job. If there is a young person in this Province who can arrange with a relative or somebody in Alberta or BC or Ontario to get him a job he now cannot qualify for a mobility allowance to go to that job. He could up to a very short time ago.

MR. FLIGHT:

No more fed bashing.

MR. BAKER:

So the federal government, Mr. Speaker, instead of giving us all this prosperity has made it more difficult for people from Newfoundland who are looking for jobs somewhere else to go up there and get those jobs - people who have a little bit of gumption and get up and go. The only way they can get the mobility allowance to go there is if they are in the second portion of a UIC term or if they are on social assistance and our young people, most of them, do not qualify because there are no jobs for them to get to get on UIC in the first place and they find it very difficult to get on social assistance. So this is one area where the government should be doing a little bit of fed bashing of their own.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, because my time is winding down, I would like to deal just for a few moments with the Summer student grants that were mentioned a little earlier in this hon. House. The Summer student grants are set up in such a way that municipalities cannot take advantage of them, municipalities that have the largest employers of students in this Province for the last three or four years. They can no longer take advantage of these grants, Mr. Speaker, because after their budgets were set they were told that these programmes would cost them an awful lot of money. The hon. minister opposite is mumbling something, Mr. Speaker, but all he has to do is check with the mayors in this Province and they will tell him exactly what is going on and the number of students that they cannot hire this Summer, and the

number of students who are going to be without jobs simply because of changes that their buddies in Ottawa made. I would suggest that there has got to be a little bit of fed bashing going on on the part of this government opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am obviously touching some raw nerves on the other side of the House. Some of the gentlemen have rather thin skins and that is going to be good to work on in the next short while.

Anyway, my time is up. I wish I had another couple of hours to get into these areas of conflict. Some of them are really, really serious. For instance, in conclusion, one thing that is happening right now is on the Nose of the Grand Banks where the West Germans who have a quota of I think something like 7,000 metric tons of fish that really is our fish. They have already exceeded 17,000 metric tons and not a single bit of enforcement has been carried on. The only thing we have are federal fisheries officers boarding those ships and verifying the fact that they almost triple their quota already. You know these things are obvious areas of disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, I am a new member. My time is up and I hope that over the next while I will learn how to be a more effective individual member in this House. I hope that I will learn a great deal about government and in closing, Sir, I would say that for the sake of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians I hope the administration on the other side does a little learning as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, this is the first meeting of the First Session of the Fortieth General Assembly and it is my first opportunity that I have had to speak to this Assembly and so I would like to begin by congratulating the Premier for his signal victory. I would like to congratulate the Speaker, you Sir, on your election and I would like to congratulate the Deputy Speaker on his election. I am sure that you both will add greatly to the decorum of this House and I will try not to subtract from it too much.

I would also like to welcome the new members. There are quite a few new members here and I must say that their abilities and their stature seem much greater than the average run of the mill for new members. I think they will add a great deal to the Liberal Party so, therefore, I am ambivalent about it. Whereas I admire their abilities, I shutter to think that they may breathe new life into the Liberal Party opposite.

At the same time we have the same retreads, the old familiar faces, the tokens and a couple of new members on our side that we did not expect to get. I will have to stop talking about the wretch from LaPoile, and I will have to start saying the hon. colleague. I would not like to single any one person out, but I do think that some of the new members have very large shoes to fill and the sad

thing is they have been elected at the cost of very good members whom they have defeated. Only one person can win in one district, that is the sad fact, but nevertheless I think I see a lot of material opposite for new life for the Conservative Party. There is a well-trodden path across this floor and I am sure some of them would be very welcome over here. Of course I should point out that the Liberal Party is probably the most ancient political party there is. Do hon. members know who the first Liberal was? The Devil. So this make them probably the most ancient party there is.

I would like to welcome the hon. elevator operator for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Simmons). Hon. members may not be familiar with the fact that he distinguished himself first in this House by holding the elevator so that we would not be able to get up for a vote.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is not true.

MR. CARTER:

He is reputed to have, and he did a very good job. The actual motion was defeated at the time, I believe it was for regional government. One of the elevators out there does not work too well and I cannot help but think what irony it would be if he were to get caught in it himself.

Now, at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a motion of no confidence in the Opposition. I would like to, but I am afraid I cannot because the rules of the House do not allow it. I suppose if I were allowed to do it and the motion failed to pass, they would then become the government. I am not sure how that would work.

Anyway, this is the Address in Reply and we may mention anything at all under the Sun, by tradition, but I only have two issues that I want to discuss because my time is limited.

The first issue I want to mention is that I am totally opposed to TV and radio in this House of Assembly and I will do what I can to argue against it and to fight against it. I think it would be a great and grave mistake for two very good reasons and I will outline them now. This House is a public place but it is not a goldfish bowl. What we say is recorded, what ministers say is recorded, it gets in the newspaper, and it gets into Hansard. Nobody ever reads Hansard, of course. I mean, anyone who is caught reading Hansard obviously has something wrong with him, he obviously has a screw loose, unless he is suffering from insomnia and cannot sleep. I suppose if you got up in the middle of the night and read Hansard you would soon go to sleep. Or it might be useful if you are in a dentist's chair. Other than that, I cannot see anyone wanting to read Hansard. It is a necessary document, because this is a public place and what we say is public property and it should be recorded somewhere. Most of what we say is trash, I am afraid, but nevertheless we are saying it in public and it has to be recorded. But there is quite a difference between living like that in public and being in a goldfish bowl, where you are constantly under scrutiny. Now I saw, myself, the effects of radio in what I would call a House of Assembly. The National Convention was something like a House of Assembly except that it met for a particular purpose and only one

purpose. And that failed; it failed utterly in its purpose because it was on radio. One or two maw-mouths instead of speaking to the issues at hand spoke to the general public.

SOME HON MEMBERS:

Name them. Name them.

MR. J. CARTER:

The names are quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, no one needs to name the names.

MR. LUSH:

Name one.

MR. J. CARTER:

Smallwood was one and, of course, he dominated the proceedings. All he could talk about was the baby bonus and the old age pension, to the exclusion of the important issues of the day which were railcar ferry, an East Coast ferry, a Trans-Canada Highway, and a proper agreement for establishing armed forces here in Newfoundland. All the things that should have been debated and discussed were not, because the hon. gentleman was posturing. And, of course, if we have TV and radio in this House of Assembly that is what will happen. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) wants to put on lipstick and makeup, let him do it in the privacy of his own home.

MR. BARRY:

To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

We will all be interested in learning about the experiences of the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) in the process of

transvestism. However, I believe that we are not seeing a very good example being set at the present time for the decorum of this House and for the tone of subsequent debate. We are into day two, the third day if you count the opening day, and now we have the member for St. John's North with his references to maw-mouths and attacking individuals who are not here before the House to defend themselves. And we see the member for St. Johns North exhibiting the real reason why he would be concerned about having the proceedings televised, because he knows that he would never, Mr. Speaker, be able to raise his head in public if there were television coverage of the despicable types of debate that we see the member for St. John's North carry on with. That is the real reason, Mr. Speaker, that we have this type of low debate from the hon. member. I would ask him to raise the level of debate, let us set a new tone, a new standard for debate in this House and let us get away from this name calling that the member for St. John's North is known for.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Clearly the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) just wanted to get into the debate and did it through means of a point of order. There is a very ancient tradition in this House and that is that any subject may be debated. Any subject that has any semblance of public interest should be brought forward to this House, or should be capable of

being brought forward in this House and that is what the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is doing, and he is doing it in his own inimitable fashion.

MR. BARRY:

Inimitable is right.

DR. COLLINS:

We are glad we have these individuals here who can do things in a particular way. This House would be a great deal poorer if we did not have such individuals and if we did not have these particular issues that the hon. member feels is necessary to bring forward.

MR. SPEAKER (G. Greening):

To that point of order, in my opinion, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. J. CARTER:

I was going to add, and I may be making light of a few aspects of it but I am deadly serious, that I think radio and TV in this House would be the end of this institution. And, as I say, if the hon. gentleman wants to put on makeup, let him do it in the privacy of his own home; it is a recognized perversion, it is not one of your queer ones. Now, there would be a danger, of course, that someone might tune in to the TV station that this House was being broadcast on and might think that it was "Another World, or that it was a strange series from Dallas, but this leads directly to my next point as to why TV and radio should not be in this House. There are members in this House, or who have been in this House in the past, who have been, in my opinion, quite irresponsible and were prepared to name names of people outside this

House who do not have any way of defending themselves.

MR. SIMMONS:

As you are dealing with Smallwood.

MR. J. CARTER:

Smallwood is public property and will soon be even more public, I hope.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is attacking the former Premier of this Province in the lowest way possible. If he is any sort of a gentleman at all, he should stand in this House and retract the statement that he just made.

MR. J. CARTER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately I have to name the former, former Premier. I will refer to him by his title, if he wants, because it was an integral part of my argument that he more or less, by himself, effectively destroyed the National Convention, and I witnessed it.

Do you wish to make a judgement on that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

There is no point of order.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, the next point I want to make is that we are protected from libel in this House. It is a very important protection, we may say anything and not be held liable for it. Now, this protects us in case of a slip of the tongue. I, myself, perhaps may

make a slip of the tongue, but I do not intentionally libel anyone who is not in this House. However, I know that previous members of this House have done so, and done so quite frequently, and if this House were televised then I am quite sure that some members in the future, from either side perhaps, would take it into their heads to use their power to blackmail public individuals.

Let me sketch a possible scenario: An election is called, you are out collecting money for the election, somebody does not give you an amount that you would like to get, so you say, 'Okay, Buster, I will get you. When I get elected to the House, I will say that you were out with So-and-so, or you were doing this, or you were doing that. You cannot sue me for libel. And, okay, so I will have to retract it but in the meantime, the damage will be done.' I think that this is probably the most powerful argument against radio or T.V. in the House, because at least now if I get up and say something unintentionally and I am called upon to withdraw it, and I do withdraw it, then when the news of that does get out through the press, as it properly should, it is said that So-and-so said something but he had to withdraw it and he apologized. But if we are immediately on radio or T.V. the damage is done and there is no way of repairing it. So these two arguments, I think, are conclusive, as far as I am concerned, that the House of Assembly, while remaining public, open to the press and open to the public, should not be put on radio or T.V.

The other argument, of course, is that the present House of Commons,

which is on radio and T.V., does not, in my view, work as well as it should, because, again, the members are in a goldfish bowl and, in my view, they are reacting and not acting. I think the fact that they are on radio and T.V. seriously hampers the proceedings of the House of Commons in Ottawa.

Now, the second point I want to make is about electricity rates and I think this is quite important, too.

During the election there were a lot of Liberal faces on poles, the posters, and I suppose it was because their bare faces were hanging out that pornography became a side issue in the election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

I remember canvassing in one particular house where a lady came to the door and she said, 'There is the real pornography,' and she waved a light bill. I must say, I agree with her sentiments although I do not agree with her statement.

There is no doubt about it that a major issue, not only in the election but a major current issue, is the high electricity bills. One of the reasons, I think, is because they struck without warning. The electric bills around Christmastime were much, much higher than people expected them to be, and it was the element of surprise as much as anything else that upset people.

I knew very well the member who represented that district was not going to take an interest in it, so I took it upon myself to go down to Baie d'Espoir two weekends

ago and talk to the officials down there. As hon. members may or may not know, Bay d'Espoir is the headquarters, the nerve centre for all the power distribution on the Island of Newfoundland. They certainly do not need Christmas tree lights at Christmastime because of all the coloured lights on the control panel they have down there. Every transmission site and every electrical junction is on that panel and they can control them just at the press of a button.

I had a very interesting discussion with the officials down there, I even took a few photographs of the water levels. Any professional cameraman can certainly relax. The pictures came out very, very badly. Anyone who is interested in looking at them may do so. They do show the water levels to be extremely low. Although the reservoirs down in Bay d'Espoir may be very large, the useful storage is only a matter of a few feet, so that if the water levels are down as much as six or eight feet, that in itself is serious. Even though the bottom of the reservoir may be fifty feet deep, the useful storage in any reservoir, in fact in Windsor Lake, for instance, is only a few feet. I remember that very dry Summer we had in 1960-1961. They said Windsor Lake was dangerously low. You would go out there and it would look as though there were lots of water in Windsor Lake but, of course, the point was the useful storage was down.

I asked the officials just how bad the drought has been. They said that in the last thirty-five years of record-keeping, the period from October to the present has been the driest six months on record

ever, and driest by quite a degree. Not only that, but the amount of snow in the woods in the storage area is markedly less than it has been for the last few years; there has been a very low rainfall and there is not going to be much of a run-off. And although the storage area is very large, they expect that they are only going to be able to produce a fraction of the electricity that we should have. That means, of course, that Holyrood is going to be used more and more.

Now, Sir Edmund Hillary, who was the first man to climb Mount Everest, when asked about what sort of food he would take on the trip said, 'The important thing about food is that there should be some of it.' And I think the same argument could be used about power. The important thing about power is that there should be some of it.

The power capacity of Bay d'Espoir is about 570 megawatts, Holyrood, 450 megawatts, Cat Arm will be about 175 megawatts, when it comes on stream, and the smaller generating stations down the Southern Shore and along Conception Bay equal about 40 megawatts. Our total requirements on a day-to-day basis are almost 1,200 megawatts. Now, unfortunately, we are only going to be able to supply a fraction of that from hydro power, so a lot of it is going to have to be fuelled by oil and, of course, we know what the price of oil is going to do.

We all know now what should have been done years ago. Churchill Falls is an immense body of water falling over - it was quite a head there, several hundred feet; actually I think it is 1,000 feet

now that they have the storage area there. But you could perhaps compare it to Niagara Falls. Now, because Niagara Falls was such a place for honeymooners, I guess, or a tourist attraction, they could not dare take all of Niagara Falls. I think they do take about half of it now, perhaps even more than half, but, I guess, public pressure would prevent Ontario Hydro from taking all of Niagara Falls.

And, of course, the development of Niagara Falls paralleled the development of the electrical industry. In other words, they were not able to harness it all when they first started using it. So I think somebody by the name of Steinwitz designed the first hydro station near Niagara Falls and what it did was take some of the water from above the falls down through a series of flumes down below the Falls and through a generating station there. They used that and when they wanted to expand, then they drew more water from Niagara Falls.

Ideally, if the former Liberal Administration had had any sense of control they would have taken Churchill Falls bit by bit, in manageable chunks, and not try to sell it to Quebec. Perhaps they could have done a better deal with Quebec, I do not know. We will never know if a better deal could have been done with Quebec.

But in the absence of dealing with Quebec, perhaps the smart thing to have done was to have taken part of Churchill Falls. But they did not and, of course, the Churchill Falls is lost to us, the recall power is not great enough, and we cannot put in an Island intertie.

We talk about the Lower

Churchill. The Lower Churchill itself is too large for us to swallow. We cannot handle it domestically. If we are going to develop it we have to sell it. We have to sell a good part of it, otherwise we cannot develop it, and it is not feasible yet without a proper agreement with Quebec.

So what can be done? Now, before I get into that, and I do not have too much time left, one of the points that should be made about electricity today is that it is still a great bargain. In California you pay twelve cents a kilowatt hour, in Prince Edward Island you pay considerably more than you pay here. One of the side effects of electricity in Newfoundland, I suppose in Northern American generally, is one that is not appreciated by people generally, and that is that in all of the warehouses, and all the warehousing, and all the handling of goods, electric hoists are used which means that one or two people can look after an enormous warehouse, the trucks can be loaded and unloaded with relative ease and certainly very swiftly. What this must mean in potential savings on groceries and goods and services for us in the market -

MR. BARRY:

The transmission of electricity is not what it was many years ago.

MR. J. CARTER:

Okay, but now in the warehouses all across North America electric hoists are used and they are extremely efficient. I doubt if electric cars will be feasible in the near future, but these things certainly are. They are slow moving, but one man can easily move and handle an awful lot.

So what can be done? The people I talked to who have high electric bills are people who find themselves trapped in older homes and relying on electric heat. If you do not require electric heat, if you do not use electricity to heat your water or to dry your dishes, then your electric bill stays fairly low. But once you start using electric heat then it goes out of sight all together.

It is a trap that people have found themselves in, so what can be done? What should we do? There are a number of possibilities and most of them are long-term solutions. For instance, when you site your house, if you site the front of your house to the North you are going to pay the price. You really will. We should all take Ray Guy's advice to heart, 'In Newfoundland block the wind and trap the sun.' A house that faces the sun will be only half as expensive to heat. Now, I should know, I live in an old barn of a place and it costs us a fortune to heat it. Some of it is electric heating, and, of course, I appreciate what people are going through.

Now, in some parts of Europe what they have done is they have managed to get people to install devices on their hot water heaters whereby these hot water heaters can be disconnected from a central station. In other words, the load can be shed.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, I will let it go there. There are a few things that can be done.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You have another ten minutes left.

MR. J. CARTER:

I appreciate the hon. gentleman's civility. There are some decent fellows over there, I will have to say, I will have to admit. It comes hard to say, but I will admit it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Will you stop broadening yourself.

MR. J. CARTER:

Well, I find it very hard, Mr. Speaker, to have confidence in an Opposition when their House Leaders first name is Beaton.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Very good.

MR. TULK:

I would say something but the Tories would never believe it.

MR. J. CARTER:

So it could be, for instance, that some load shedding capacity and some time sharing - in other words, off-peak-period use of electricity - could effect substantial savings. And there is a possibility of an altered rate structure. I do not have time to go into it now but I am sure that Newfoundland Hydro and Newfoundland Light and Power would be more than happy to sit down and have an information seminar with the general public so that a lot of these matters could be discussed and thoroughly aired.

As I said, I think there is a lot that can be done but it is a long-term project, and, unfortunately, it is going to hurt in the short-term. But I would like people to know generally that I think that we are all concerned - I am certainly concerned about

it - and we will do what we can to hold electricity rates as low as possible, and I hope the general public will co-operate. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, Sir, I want to congratulate you on being appointed to your position. I am probably the appropriate member to congratulate you, because in the long run you may have me to thank that you got to that particular position.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say how delighted I am to be back here in the House of Assembly as the new member for Bonavista North. And I certainly want to thank these people for giving me the opportunity to get back here and be a part of the political scene of this Province.

I also want to congratulate all members who got themselves elected or re-elected. But I want to say a special congratulations to the people on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, who when the election started I am sure were not given much of a chance. Why, we were not even going to form the official opposition, other people were going to do that! And, Mr. Speaker, with all of the crossing back and forth on the floor prior to that, and people not running again, it looked like we were in a bad position. Why, Our leader was not going to win his own seat! And against these odds, Mr.

Speaker, we almost won the government. Another couple of days and there would have been people over there who would not be sitting there. So our new leader, the gentleman who has reinvigorated the Liberal Party and given it a new direction, is the man we are very proud to congratulate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

And we are a unified party, Mr. Speaker. It is the stongest time that ever we had been since I have been around, and I have been elected and in this House every election since 1975. The way I have done it makes it a little hard on the pension, but I have been here every election since 1975. And I have come back now, Mr. Speaker, reinvigorated and plan to stay here, I am going to make a career out of it. I am going to be here for a long time. I am sure that the people of Bonavista North are going to ensure that. They are going to see that I am back.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was a lot of hard work. We did not have any gas for motorcades, Mr. Speaker. We did not have any monies to announce for paved roads and for water and sewer. But despite that, Mr. Speaker, fifteen of us on this side got elected. So, Mr. Speaker, that was a great accomplishment. It was great work. We did not get in on any tide, there was no tide with us, but we made it. It is a great accomplishment and the Leader of our Party (Mr. Barry) is to be congratulated for doing the best job that has been done on this party since I have been around. A marvelous job, Mr. Speaker!

Now I do not know what to say to the remarks made by the previous speaker. In view of what he said today, there is little wonder that he does not want radio or television here, Mr. Speaker. Because, in view of the unmitigated twaddle that came out of the man, he would not even get elected in St. John's North if the people heard the nonsense that comes out him. His suggestion today, again, about reducing electrical costs were every bit as simple as back about three years ago when he advised all the poor people of this Province to buy microwave ovens to cut down on the cost of electricity. That was his suggestion then, to buy microwave ovens, Mr. Speaker. The people in Wesleyville never heard about that. I am sure that they would have all invested in a microwave oven to cut down on the cost of electricity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have studied the Throne Speeches going back to 1979 to see what theme had been going through them. You know, it was a surprising thing that when you look at the 1979 Throne Speech and study all the ones up to now that there was a tremendous change in tone and in attitude in the ones that were previously given, excepting two, though. In 1980, I believe it was, there was a Throne Speech given where we were going to enter a new era of prosperity. Now this is the second time that we are to meet a new era, it is in this one as well. So in 1979 we were to come in to a new era and we are supposed to come in again at this particular time. Now this is the fourth time that we were supposed to be led into a new era by Tory governments, the fourth time - twice by the former Premier and twice by this one. Now the former Premier never brought us

there, he never brought us to that new era. This is the second time now that this Premier is going to bring us there. But the new era in 1980 was not long lived. Let me just quote: "This offshore agreement," we were talking about that then, you see, "This offshore agreement signals the beginning of a new era for this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador." Then the next year the Throne Speech again says: "Since my last speech to the House of Assembly we have witnessed the unfolding of events which tell us that we have not only entered a new decade but a new era in the history of both the Province and the whole world." This was the year of Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark was then the Prime Minister and things were moving pretty well. At that time the Newfoundland people had a great dream, and it says: "Again, my Government believes that our people are determined to march forward in a dynamic and confident manner and that they sense, perhaps for the first time, that they can truly gain control of their social and economic destiny. Moreover, the general framework of Confederation is being appropriately modified to give us as a Province the rights and powers by which this great historic dream can be realized." It goes on to say, "This coming year, indeed the whole decade, will be a momentous one for this Province and its people. The year 1980 will see momentous events in the history of Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker, I followed the next one, 1981, a year later, after all of that optimism, "Our country faces an uncertain future."

SOME HON. MEMBER:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

"The traditions and customs which are the bulwarks of our heritage our being unilaterally threatened." Mr. Speaker, we were into the great constitutional debate and we were going to be ruined. But anyway, a thread from thereon in said that this government is going to fight for three things. There were three things they were going to fight for despite that government that was going to take away all of our rights, there were three things they were going to fight for. They were under the following headings. One, the economy; and under the economy were three of our natural resources, Mr. Speaker, our fisheries, the hydro power and the offshore resources. These were the three things that we were going to fight for to control and manage, and then there were other things related to the Constitution, the constitutional rights of 1949, and then the future role of federal and provincial governments. But, Mr. Speaker, this thread went all the way through every Throne Speech since then - the fisheries, the hydro and the offshore.

The fisheries, Mr. Speaker, they wanted to manage. They were going to have concurrent management on the fisheries. They wanted to manage the fisheries jointly with the federal government. And they were keeping after the Prime Minister to settle the Churchill Falls deal, they were after the Prime Minister day in and day out. They passed Private Member's Resolution after Private Member's Resolution to get the Prime Minister of Canada to act, to get the federal government to act. Now in this Throne Speech the Premier is delighted! Delighted over what? Because he heard the

Prime Minister say in a press release that he is going to try and do something to resolve the Churchill Falls power contract. He is satisfied now with just hearing the Prime Minister of Canada say that he is going to do something when in former years it was to pass Private Member's Resolution after resolution, Mr. Speaker, it was on the public airways all the time asking the Prime Minister and other federal ministers to act. There was nothing substantially said in the fisheries. I have been out for a little while. Maybe this government got control of the fisheries, I do not know.

There is another line that I should remind hon. members about, too, during the Constitution. I think it is a nice line. You know, the Premier got a tremendous affection for Tennyson and during this constitutional debate the Premier said in that Throne Speech at that time, "And like the poet we must realize that, 'Though much is taken, much abides.'" Mr. Speaker, much abides today too, I am sure. The Premier ends up his Throne Speech again with Tennyson again. He quotes Tennyson again. The strange thing about it is that it is not a very appropriate selection because this particular poem is a dramatic monologue and this is an undramatic Throne Speech. A dramatic monologue is the poem that he quotes from. I think the Premier read too many principals' messages, you know, in the Year Book.

They have gone out now, they do not quote that line any more, they quote modern poets from today.

But, Mr. Speaker, watching this thread go through of the emphasis on management and control of the

fisheries and no mention of it in this particular Throne Speech, I am wondering whether they now have legislative control. I never heard that it was passed but I can only assume that they now have the legislative control that they have been fighting for all through those years because there was nothing said about it. Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to find out.

The Premier talked about the hydro, again, how he wanted to get that moving, how he wanted to get power back and wanted to get the power transmitted through Quebec in the same way that we can put oil and gas through other provinces of Canada. No mention of that in this Throne Speech, was there? I did not see that. That was mentioned in every Throne Speech, the right to transmit hydroelectric power through the provinces. Now no mention of that at all when that, Mr. Speaker, was their theme song all the way through. It was their swan song.

There was also a mention, Mr. Speaker, of revitalizing the Newfoundland Railway. No mention of that in this particular Throne Speech. I do not know whether they had forgotten about that. No mention of it, Mr. Speaker. But let me say, though the Throne Speech represents a change in tone and attitude and even philosophy, the members on this side of the House have not changed one iota, we have not changed one iota, Mr. Speaker. We have supported this government on every piece of major legislation affecting the offshore development of this Province. We have supported them on every piece of major legislation with respect to the fisheries. And, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to fight in that direction, no change. We supported them. When we had a

party of the same political stripe in Ottawa, we supported members opposite on the offshore and on every piece of major legislation that ever went through this House. Hon. gentlemen would like to say that we did not support them, but we supported them. We supported every piece of major legislation respecting the fishery and, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to do that. You see, Mr. Speaker, our policy, our philosophy, our nationalism, our Canadianism is not contingent upon the political stripe of the federal government in Ottawa. We are as great Canadians today as we were two years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

I am as great a Canadian today with Mr. Mulroney as the Prime Minister as I was with Mr. Trudeau as the Prime Minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, we will continue to fight for those issues that we fought for over the years and we will see that this provincial government fights for legislative control of the fisheries in this Province. We will see that they fight for the revitalization of the railway. We will see now, Mr. Speaker, that they were only giving lip service to those things that they were talking about. We will see now that they were only giving lip service to wanting to control the fisheries, that they were only giving lip service to wanting to revitalize the Newfoundland railway. Mr. Speaker, we will call upon them, now that they have a government in

Ottawa of the same political stripe, to fight for those things. We did it when the Liberals were there. We fought, Mr. Speaker, for legislative control of the fisheries, we supported hon. members opposite for every piece of major legislation affecting these areas that I am now talking about. We supported the offshore, we supported the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, we supported all of these measures. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite tried to back us in a corner, they did not want us to support them. They do not want our support right now, but, Mr. Speaker, we are going to support these issues because we believe in them.

MR. TOBIN:

You ran away from the issue when it got hot. You ran back to the classroom!

MR. LUSH:

Aha! Ran back to the classroom! Yes, I ran away, Mr. Speaker. I came back at a time when the tide was in for the Liberals! I ran away all right, Mr. Speaker! I might run to another district the next time. I do whatever my leader tells me. If my leader tells me that he wants me to run in St. John's East, I am going to run there. He is a great leader and wherever he tells me to run, I am going to run.

MR. BARRY:

We might send you to Ferryland next time. Who knows?

MR. POWER:

The same type of allegiance you had for Trudeau got you into trouble and it will do it again.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about

allegiance. We know where the allegiance is. Our allegiance to Canada, Mr. Speaker, is not contingent upon the philosophy of the party that is there. Our allegiance to Canada is not contingent upon the political stripe of the party that is in Ottawa. Whether it is an NDP government, whether it is a P.C. government, Mr. Speaker, we on this side are still loyal Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, looking through the Throne Speech, it is no wonder that people talk about this one-dimensional government, a government that has only one policy, a government that has only one programme by which it is going to develop this Province, the offshore. It is no wonder that people have labelled them the one-dimensional party. Looking through Throne Speeches since 1979, Mr. Speaker, how many times do hon. members think the development of agriculture is mentioned? What emphasis is put on the development of agriculture by this government? From 1979 until now it is mentioned in one Throne Speech, something to the effect that 'we are going to promote and encourage the development of agriculture so that we do not have to import food products, so that we can grow our own.' Well, Mr. Speaker, so much for a lot of words, nothing else ever mentioned about it. Tourism was mentioned twice. Now, Mr. Speaker, you talk about lip service to the development of the resources of this Province! Two major industries, Mr. Speaker, two industries in which we can create thousands of jobs for our people, agriculture is mentioned once in Throne Speeches from 1979 until now, six years, and tourism is mentioned twice. Now, Mr.

Speaker, that is so much for the policies of a government that want to develop all of the resources of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, although this government has changed in tone and attitude and in philosophy, we on this side have not changed. We are going to continue to maintain the positions that we have taken over the years on the fisheries, on the offshore and on hydro-development in this Province. We are going to maintain those positions as we have always done. And, I expect over the next little while, Mr. Speaker, that we will be bringing in private members' resolutions stating our positions on these very matters, on these three major issues that the government of this Province over the last seven or eight years, the last six years certainly, harped on so much. Of course, the offshore now is taken care of with the Atlantic Accord, so, fine, that is now over. There are a lot of questions that we have to ask about it when we get into the appropriate debate, but we still want to ask this government what is their position now on the fisheries when for the last six years they have been saying they wanted to have legislative control of the fisheries. I do not know where they stand on that. We want to know where they stand with respect to having joint control of the fisheries, having legislative control of the fisheries. We want to know if they still stand firm in that respect. We want to know how they stand now with respect to the transmission of power through Quebec, when they antagonized and aggravated the last federal government with that. Are they still going to carry on? Because we will, we have not changed our

position, Mr. Speaker, in that particular direction. We want to know what their position is with the Newfoundland railway when that was such a strong point with them, the revitalization of the Newfoundland railway. Are they going to cave in on that? We want to know whether that is not now the popular thing to do since they have their friends in Ottawa and they do not want to be seen to be fighting for the Newfoundland railway.

MR. POWER:

Did you support the railway?

MR. LUSH:

Yes, we supported the railway.

MR. FLIGHT:

Did you, Charlie?

MR. LUSH:

What policy? I did not know you had a policy. All I knew was that you were calling on the federal government to revitalize it.

MR. TULK:

Calling and urging.

MR. LUSH:

They were urging and calling, both, calling and urging the federal government. That was the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The only policy they had in the last six years was to call upon the federal government to do something. To call and to urge, Mr. Speaker, that was their policy.

Well, we are going to be looking, Mr. Speaker, to see what will be happening.

I am not going to use up much more time, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to let you know, Sir, that I have not changed, that I am still a

great Canadian even though we have a Tory Government in Ottawa. I am just as much a Canadian today as I was two years ago. I have not changed in terms of the issues that I am going to be fighting for for Bonavista North. I am going to be looking for the same things that I have been looking for and getting them, I expect, the way I did in Terra Nova, looking for some roads down there. The people down there need some roads paved and I hope that I am going to get them. We need some water and sewer.

MR. TULK:

The Premier promised them.

MR. LUSH:

Well, the Premier promised a lot so I do not need any water and sewer for the next three or four years. He promised enough in the election and we are going to get all of that, I hope.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is just one little item that I wanted to talk about. Talking about roads, I have a much better situation now in Bonavista North than I did in Terra Nova, thank God for that! We do not have a lot of roads to be paved. We just have a couple of by-roads there, the road to that great historic town of Cape Freels, about four or five kilometers, and the road to Greenspond, another six or seven kilometers there. And, of course, over the next few months I will certainly be talking to the minister about that and asking that we get these roads paved. And I believe that just about every community there has water and sewer, or has it started anyways, again excepting Cape Freels and Greenspond.

MR. TULK:

I hear they found a Tory down in Cape Freels this time?

MR. LUSH:
They found two.

MR. TULK:
Two?

MR. LUSH:
So I will be working on these issues. But, Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering: As I recall the last time I was here and we sat in those estimate committees, I at that time enquired what my constitutional rights were, whether indeed I did not have the right to hold up the passing of the estimates until I was assured where the money was going. Now maybe Your Honour can undertake to look into that for me to find out. I never did get an answer because I do not believe any member should agree to passing money bills when that person does not know where that money is going to be spent. And that was always a source of aggravation with me, that I would sit down, particularly in the Department of Transportation estimates, and we would agree for X number of dollars, we would agree to \$25 million or \$30 million to be spent on roads. And, of course, being a very trustworthy person, I would wait for the monies to see what would be allocated to Terra Nova. And, Mr. Speaker, I would wait and I would wait and I would wait and there would be no money going to Terra Nova. So I wondered what my rights were to say that I as a member would sit down and let those estimates go through and my not knowing where the money is going to be spent. Well, I am going to look into it this time, Mr. Speaker, and I may even consult the United Nations on it. Because there is definitely

something wrong with that kind of a system whereby a member of this House cannot be told when he is on a committee where the money is going to be spent, whether it is going to be water and sewer in Traytown or in Musgravetown or in Cape Freels or in Fogo, wherever. An hon. member has that right.

MR. TULK:
Do you know what your problem is?

MR. LUSH:
What is that?

MR. TULK:
You are not a friend of the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

MR. LUSH:
Well, I will get into that later. I do not want to deal with that too, too much now, Mr. Speaker. I will get into that at a later date. I want to be kind today. I do not want to be ungracious while speaking to this gracious Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I think in conclusion the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) when he was speaking said in reference to some remark, I believe made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), that he could not understand -

MR. TULK:
It was not the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. LUSH:
I am sorry, the Minister of Manpower or the Minister of -

MR. TULK:
Career Development.

MR. LUSH:
Oh, Career Development. That is

it.

MR. TULK:
Old CD.

MR. BARRY:
With hidden Manpower
responsibility.

MR. LUSH:
That is right. He could not see
how the Leader of the Opposition
could not see jobs there. I read
it through and I must say the only
thing that impressed me was the
rhetoric, again, of the Throne
Speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I am giving this
great speech -

MR. BARRY:
And your own members are
interrupting you.

MR. LUSH:
- and my own members are not even
listening to me now and I think I
am down to about two minutes. So
I thought that when the hon.
member was saying that there were
jobs there, knowing that he was a
teacher I said that he must have
taught ballads because this Throne
Speech is like a ballad. You
know, a ballad is more significant
for what it does not say than what
it says. So I figured that the
hon. member must have been a
student of ballads and that he was
reading between the lines and
thought that in there somewhere
this government was going to
create jobs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that
this new era will be more
productive than the other three
eras that we were told we were

going to get into. The other
three eras, Mr. Speaker, that we
were told that we were going to
get into resulted in nothing only
hardship and deprivation for the
people of this Province. These
other three new eras of prosperity
that we were supposed to get into
resulted in a tripling and a
quadrupling of the unemployed in
this Province. It resulted in a
tripling and a quadrupling of
jobless people, these were the new
eras, Mr. Speaker.

Well, I will not be that
pessimistic, Mr. Speaker. I would
hope that this new era, this
fourth era, will indeed be an era
of prosperity and that the people
of this Province will get the jobs
that they gave the Premier the
mandate to create and we hope that
the people of this Province do not
have to wait too long to get these
jobs. We certainly hope that they
do not have to wait for the result
of the royal commission on
unemployment. And the young
people, Mr. Speaker, these people
who are devastated, the people
with no future, we hope that this
government will realize their
responsibilities in this matter
and that they indeed have been
given a mandate to create jobs. I
do not know what the other
mandates were for that they were
given but they specifically asked
for this one to give jobs. And if
they do not get jobs, I can assure
you the people of Newfoundland
will not be ready to give them
another mandate but they will give
a mandate where it belongs, to the
people on this side of the House.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. member for Carbonear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, as for the member from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) I am sure that everybody is thankful that he sat down. I did notice however that since he has been absent from the House he has changed his image.

MR. RIDEOUT:

I was disappointed he did not tell the story about being the first Lush in the House of Assembly.

MR. PEACH:

I am sure the members here who have returned since April 2 and remember the member who was then from Terra Nova would always do up his coat and undo it, to put it the way he usually has said it. His buttons were always flying. But I notice today he did not even try it once. So since he moved to Bonavista North his image has changed, probably -

MR. BARRY:

He has not done it since Bill Doody asked him whether he got suitcase for his -

MR. PEACH:

But however, Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to congratulate you, yourself, for being elevated to the position that you now hold. I am sure all members here have already said you are well deserving of it and I am sure this last couple of days you have carried out your job well. As well, I congratulate my colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Greening) for being elevated to the position of Deputy Speaker. As well, I congratulate all of the members who were re-elected, particularly

my colleagues on this side, and my colleagues who have been selected and chosen to hold various Cabinet positions. I notice one person who has not been referred to at all. I think it is a bit of an historic occasion in that we do have in our Province the first woman Attorney General of our Province. I think herself holding the portfolio of Minister of Justice as well is a first for the Province.

MR. TOBIN:

First for Canada.

MR. PEACH:

Probably. Well I am not sure if it is the first for Canada. Well, that is another first for this government, a first for Newfoundland and what a better place to start than here in this Province. So I am sure that we all agree that the position is one that will be filled well by our first lady - I am not sure if I am allowed to use that word now however - female person, I guess. I am sure we all consider her to be a lady as well. I congratulate her in her new role and look forward to serving with her.

It is good to see some of our old faces back at the same time, to quote our MHA representing the district of St. John's North (Mr. Carter) who called some of them 'retreads' or warmed over faces. I guess we could say in the form of an MP and some other MHAs. As the days and the weeks go on we will see them perform in their usual style as we just saw by the warmed over member from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush).

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to thank the people in the Carbonear district for electing me again. I must say

that I also have set a bit of a history record in that it is the second time in recorded history that a PC MHA has been returned for two turns in the Carbonear district. With that in mind, I am sure that the myth that the Carbonear district is a Liberal district is now over, gone, forgotten and buried because I look forward to being returned many terms down the road to serve the people of the Carbonear district. As a matter of fact, this is my second election and second time of taking my seat in the House, in the 39th and 40th Assemblies, in less than three years because I think it was later on in May, 1982 that the House opened. I do not actually have three years under my belt yet. So I consider myself to be a junior member, yet, and look forward to representing the good, now Progressive Conservative, district of Carbonear in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, just to look briefly at some of the points of the gracious Throne Speech that have already been mentioned by some of my colleagues on this side and some members opposite. I should also congratulate the mover and seconder of the speech who were two of our new members in the House. I am sure we all realize what a tremendous job they did. I am sure that as they replace the former MHAs in the districts of LaPoile and Humber Valley, if their performance to date signifies what we can expect from them, I am sure that their constituents will be well represented by their presence here in the House. I notice already that they have had some discussions with various ministers about their districts.

Mr. Speaker, as I guess we all

anticipated the Throne Speech made reference in its beginning to the Atlantic Accord. That document is one that all Newfoundlanders are very proud of. It is a document that Newfoundlanders spoke out on on April 2, 1985, when they returned the Peckford government to office again, despite the mathematics that some members opposite have attempted to use with regard to the popular vote and so on. I would have to say that for myself I was returned here with just thirty-six votes short of what I got in 1982. That is probably one of the lower numbers of votes lost during this election as well.

Mr. Speaker, the things that are pointed out in the Throne Speech are those that we as a government have fought for and finally got signed by both our governments coming to a mutual agreement. With regard to its reference to the equality of both governments in the management of the offshore, I am sure that is one of the key issues and all of the people in this Province realize that it was one of the parts that we as a government held out long and strong for. It will give us equality with the other Provinces of Canada. In effect, it gives us the ability over time, as it said in the Throne Speech, to become an equal partner in Confederation. In the past three years that I have been a member representing the Carbonear district in the House we have heard those things brought forward many times. The joint management board, Mr. Speaker, that is referred to again in our Throne Speech, will manage the offshore development but it is something that our members opposite were not in favour of during the process of negotiations. I am sure when the

now Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was in the position of Minister of Energy on this side of the House, before he crossed over, it was something that he could not get both governments to agree to, despite the fact that quite often now we hear him say they could have got a better deal with the then Trudeau administration. That, Mr. Speaker, is not true and far from the truth. The agreement that we have, Mr. Speaker, in the Atlantic Accord, giving us the right to collect and establish the royalties from the offshore as if they were on land and then make us equal to the other Provinces in Canada, I am sure brings to us the fact that we will now - as our theme was, 'Some day the sun will shine and have not will be no more', - we will, as a Province of Confederation and as an equal partner in Canada, be able to catch up socially and economically to the rest of Canada.

The agreement with regard to the mode of development - which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) tried to make into an election issue, I remember just before the House adjourned that it was an issue that was brought up daily in Question Period - I am sure that the number of jobs that will be created by the mode of development will be unveiled in the next numbers of weeks and months ahead will probably be disappointing to the members opposite because they do not want us to create 10,000, 12,000, 14,000, or 15,000 jobs. They want their prediction to be correct and a very small number of jobs will be created. However, Mr. Speaker, we do and will look forward to an agreement on that with the oil companies that will provide jobs for the people in our Province, our youth in particular. Mr.

Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has made and has issued statements on the number of jobs that will be created so I guess we should hold him to task on that and see how accurate he will be when the details are finally released.

The development fund, Mr. Speaker, of \$3 million that is to be set up, which I am sure will lead to, as the Minister responsible for Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power) said in his remarks, many changes in our educational system, in our trades schools, in our university, in our Fisheries College and so on and that fund can be put to good use to ensure that the students coming out of our educational system will be given the opportunity to be trained with the skills that they are in need of to fit into the work force, as they go out into the world of work. I am sure we all, Mr. Speaker, look forward to the agreement being sanctioned by the Parliament of Canada and by this hon. House. The people on April 2 did make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that they chose this party and that they felt very strongly that this was the party that could put this agreement in place. As the Throne Speech indicated we now must take up the difficult task of using our new found power wisely and compassionately so to ensure that the citizens of our Province prosper and take advantage of this development. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this government, under the leadership of our Premier, will see that that takes place.

However, Mr. Speaker, one of the other issues that was addressed, despite what the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) just

said, is the fishery. The fishery is, as we all realize in rural Newfoundland, one of our key employers. The fishing industry is our principal employer in the Province. The district I represent is not greatly affected by the deep-sea fishery but it is greatly affected by the inshore fishery. I have had, and I am proud to say, very few disruptions in the fishing industry in the past three years owing to the fact that the plant that operates directly within my district have been able to remain viable. So the fishing industry, Mr. Speaker, is one that we have to place a great deal of emphasis on.

One of the things this government has committed itself to, and it is indicated clearly in the Throne Speech, is with regard to the resource short plant programme. That is one area that does affect my district because the plant that operates in the Carbonear district depends on the inshore fishery to get fish from the resource short plant programme. I feel that those small to medium sized fish plants around our Province, if they are to be viable operations down the road, are going to have to operate for nine to ten months a year. That is not going to happen, Mr. Speaker, unless they can have a supply of fish. One of the avenues open is through the resource short plant programme. As a matter of fact, it was only yesterday that a plant in my district, owned by Earle Brothers Fisheries Limited, took advantage of this programme and eighty or ninety people are working there today. I am looking forward over the next number of weeks to more fish being made available through that programme.

It is one that I support strongly

and I am sure that the small and medium sized fish plant operates in this Province realize that it is the only way they can survive. They cannot survive by having their plants operate three or four months a year. Many of them have older plants and with the maintenance on them, they have to actually continue operating without producing. So this concept, I am sure, in consultation with the Federal Minister of Fisheries, is one that will be pursued.

The government's decision to allow existing plants to expand their operations without increasing the number of fish plants in our province is another very worthwhile concept, Mr. Speaker. I feel strongly that we do have many plants in our Province now that cannot be viable. We just do not have the raw material to go into them. But there are many presently operating that probably could take over and operate some of the smaller plants around, some of which are owned by fishermen's committees and so on.

I have one such plant in the lower part of the district that I represent, in Lower Island Cove. That plant, although very small, was operated by a company at Old Perlican for a number of years and has been closed for the past couple of years. But I understand, Mr. Speaker, having talked to and tried to encourage some operators to come in to take over that plant over this past several years that in the next several weeks an interested operator has been found. An operator operating from another plant will go in and purchase fish, fillet it there and ship it off to another larger plant. But it will mean that the fishermen in

Lower Island Cove in the next month or so will be able to will be able to get rid of their fish without having to store it at any great length of time. We realize that quality is the name of the game these days. They will be able to get rid of their fish and at the same time create fifteen to twenty new jobs, particularly during the inshore glut season. So for the ten, twelve, or fifteen week period I am sure that the people in Lower Island Cove will be very happy and pleased another operator has been found to go in operating from another plant to keep their little operation there open.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other issues that has already been addressed on several occasions, this afternoon, is that of electricity rates. I notice that the Opposition have developed a formula for at least one member a day bringing in a petition on electricity rates. I guess that will go on, Mr. Speaker, until they have probably exhausted all of their supporters in the Province, which should not take too long. And I notice, Mr. Speaker, that during the election, I was approached by some concerned people, and I am a concerned person myself with regard to electricity rates, in my district. I offered, as a matter of fact, to bring their petition to the House when the House opened after the election. But I was not given that opportunity because they have aligned themselves with the party opposite. There is nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. However, I represent the district of Carbonear and represent it well, as was shown on April 2 when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) had one of the mayors of our larger towns in

Conception Bay set up on this pedestal to run and knock me off. As a matter of fact, CBC had their camera crew ready for three days to come out to the district of Carbonear because it was one that the Liberal Party had zeroed in on as a target district, thinking they were going to knock me off.

However, the political ambition of that particular mayor of one of our large towns was short-lived. In fact, he did not live out the nomination process. The Leader of the Opposition then, of course, not being able to find another candidate to run against me had to go outside the Province to get a candidate to run against me. He had to bring somebody in from one of the Praire Provinces. Again, Mr. Speaker, that was short-lived because the people in the Carbonear district knew well who they want to represent them in the House of Assembly for the next three, four, ten, twelve, probably even twenty years. So, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that was a great disappointment to the party opposite.

But getting back, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PEACH:

- if I could be heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order!

MR. PEACH:

Mr. Speaker, the problem with regard to the matter of electricity rates. I am sure that there is none of us here in this Province who are not concerned about the rate of electricity. I am sure we all realize that many of the propositions and the

comments that have been made by the members opposite, particularly during the election, cannot be implemented. The solution to high electricity rates, Mr. Speaker, is not simple. I do support the fact that we in Newfoundland today are paying electricity rates that are far too high. However, in the absence of any additional power, I am not sure of the immediate or long-term solution. If we are going to satisfy the electrical needs in this Province we need access to a much larger block of inexpensive electric power and that would obviously come from the Upper Churchill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PEACH:

I trust that the members opposite would support that. That is not something that can happen overnight. It will not mean that our electricity rates will decrease between now and, as somebody mentioned, next Christmas.

But it is very worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, that this government have already broken the ice with regard to reopening and discussing the long-term viability and operation of Churchill Falls with the Quebec Government, and as a matter of fact, as is clearly spelled out on page 7 of the Speech from the Throne in that the federal government with the Prime Minister are now willing to become involved in helping us resolve our long-standing problem with Quebec. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that that particular part is one that will address the problem with regard to our electricity rates. And over the next number of days and weeks I am sure that members on both sides of the House will be given petitions from the people

around the Province to present in this House and I am sure that none will present them without supporting them. Mr. Speaker, the other aspect which was mentioned in the Throne Speech which I feel is very important is that with regard to our social welfare system. The employment opportunities programme, Mr. Speaker, that has been so well received, so well implemented in the past three or four years has done a lot to help create jobs and alleviate the unemployment and to get people who have, in many cases through no fault of their own have had to resort to receiving social assistance. That programme, Mr. Speaker, the Employment Opportunities Programme has provided them with an opportunity to go out and do some meaningful tasks in our community and in many cases have jobs performed that normally municipalities and groups could not get done. I know that the statistics in the Department of Social Services, Mr. Speaker, indicate that that programme has been successful and in many cases those people have not had to go back to receiving social assistance but have gone on and found some meaningful employment the following year. With regard to that I am looking forward to some additional funding going into that programme this year with regard to housing and with regard to the other community development projects that take place around our Province. I as one MHA have taken advantage of those to get many needed things done in my district and look forward to pretty well the entire district being served by that programme or where the need dictates because of people receiving social assistance.

As well, Mr. Speaker, the particular part with regard to job

creation in addition to our Employment Opportunities Programme and with regard to youth. I was very pleased to hear a week or so ago that our minister responsible for Culture, Recreation and Youth at the time indicated that his department was encouraging groups to apply for the youth programme jobs, Challenge 85 and the C Programme particularly with regard to provincial parks because as we all know there are many improvements that could be made to our parks. I am again fortunate to have a provincial park in my district at Northern Bay and I understand that a concerned group in the Northern Bay area have made application to create jobs and to get some work done in that particular park this Summer. I am looking forward to working closely with our federal MP in Ottawa under this joint federal/provincial agreement to see that those programmes, as many as possible, can be approved this coming Summer to give our youth a chance to challenge themselves and to find some meaningful employment. We all realize that it is short-term however most of those people who are going to take advantage of it will be returning to some educational institution in the Fall and therefore it is a great help to them, and to their parents, I am sure, to give them some additional funds to use to further their education.

The matter with regard to school construction, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that this government has been very generous with funding that they have put into school construction. And I will feel very proud in September, Mr. Speaker, to, I am pretty sure, to be asked by the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn) to accompany him to the Carbonear district to

officially open a new \$3.5 million high school that is presently under construction and will be opened in August of this year and probably during the month of October will be officially opened. That is an issue that has been long outstanding but now has finally come to a successful conclusion and the students there will be entering a new school in the Carbonear district come September.

There are other things, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to go on with but I am sure that there are other members opposite itching to get up and make some comments. I notice that they all came in and sat down very attentively listening to what I had to say but there are other matters that I could address. I am glad to see and pleased that we will be looking forward to some changes with regard to The Labour Relations Act, with regard to collective bargaining, and I am sure that many of the labour unrest that we have out there presently in the Province in the next coming weeks, as a matter of fact, with our new Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) and with the other ministers concerned in the various departments, many of those things will be laid to rest, Mr. Speaker.

And probably to clue up, from my own district, the main concern relate to the fishery and I think I have addressed that. With regard to the plant that operates directly in my district, also the Ocean Harvesters Plant in Old Perlican and Harbour Grace, directly affecting my district, is back in operation. Roads, Mr. Speaker, are a main concern and I must say I have had a close working relationship with the

Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). There have been many million dollars worth of road construction in my district since I became elected on 6 April 1982. Our Minister of Transportation saw to it that our district was treated fairly.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please! The hon. members time has elapsed.

MR. PEACH:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave.

MR. PEACH:
If members want me to sit I will or by leave I will be glad to go on.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Leave has not been granted.

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker, it is finally my time on stage, I guess, for the first time and I guess traditionally I have learned and been told that we direct our jives and jokes initially in our initial statements and so on in the speech to the other side of the House but I had to say something. Even though my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) has slipped out for a minute in watching his performance today which was entertaining, very entertaining for someone like me who appreciates eloquence when I see it and hear it. I now know the reason that the members of this House have access to disability insurance because for a while

there I was in fear of being judo chopped to death on my side. However I survived that. I am sure he heard that on the outside. His arms are not quite as long as mine and perhaps when I gain his expertise and that sort of thing with the longer arms I may be able to reach him and reciprocate the dangerous atmosphere I felt myself in for a little while.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my congratulations and best wishes to you, Sir, on your election to the important post of Speaker to the House, to the Deputy Speaker. As a novice, of course, I have paid close attention to what transpires in this House and I believe from what I have seen that I can anticipate that the access to debate and questions will be dispensed in a manner that has been exemplified by all your predecessors in that particular position. I have confidence that all who wish to will be heard, officially and otherwise, and that the rules and traditions of this House will be adhered to and we will be given adequate chance to have our say as members of our respective districts.

I would also like to extend best wishes and congratulations to new members like myself on both sides of the House. Some of us have been in the municipal arena before, as volunteers basically, I realize we do receive salaries in this position but still, nevertheless, you have to consider yourselves, to some degree, volunteers, in that you are giving up a lot of your private time to get into the House and serve your districts. I do congratulate new members on both sides and look forward to dealing with you - a good choice of words - and

discussing matters with you from time to time.

With regard to representing districts, and the comments by some of the members who left in our minds no doubts, for example, the hon. the member for Carbonear - who said there is no doubt now what his district is - I can say there is no doubt, and there never has been any doubt what the Naskaupi district is and will be for the next number of years. I think that was adequately demonstrated on April 2nd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

It is just that I was not available prior to that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

I would like to also take an opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation, of course, to the people of the Naskaupi district, who gave me their support. As a person who was in public life for about ten years and wished to get out and stay out for quite a while, in fact, they gave me their encouragement and persuasion to come in and be their representative. And again, I say, it was demonstrated that that was their wish on April 2nd and I am more than happy to have been successful. I take it as a signal honour. I take it not lightly and I expect that it was not given lightly either, Mr. Speaker.

I am very pleased that the district is something unique. I have to say the Naskaupi district

is probably the greatest ethnic mix you would find anywhere outside the larger cities in Canada, in that we have the Innu people, frequently called the Indian people, we have the Inuit, sometimes called the Eskimo people, and we have those of European ancestry. We have first, second and third generation Newfoundlanders, who now frequently, by the way, prefer to call themselves Labradorians. We have a transient population, in that we have the federal public service, who are usually two-year term people. We have included in that, of course, National Defence, quite a large contingent now and one that will be building, I understand. We now, in recent times, have the NATO appearance there, and that is also on the increase. So we do have a complex melting pot in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Naskaupi district and it is a difficult one to represent adequately, in that you must address all these various cultures and concerns. I am going to do my best in the next few years to try to do that.

Like our leader said earlier - something that I support - I do not believe in opposition for the purpose of obstructing, nor would I intend to obstruct under the guise of opposition. I have worked with many of the gentlemen across the House many times when I was in another capacity and I see no reason why that cannot continue, provided it is of some benefit to my district and to the people of our Province. I would be more than happy to co-operate along those lines and I support our leader in that particular philosophy.

I am glad that the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is present now

in the House because I thought I could use aspects of his department and his responsibility as an example of some of the complexities we are faced with in Naskaupi district.

I point out, for example, our major facility now for the delivery of health care, which is the Melville hospital, originally built for the American Armed Forces on the former base, is now in a very dilapidated condition in an apparent sense, and perhaps structurally as well, Mr. Speaker. It is probably long past its expected life span. Now, to say that alone is one thing. I am sure the minister, as time goes on in his post, will have an opportunity to look at that facility. But, added to that is the fact that in order to keep it and to put it in what might be considered to be good shape, Mr. Speaker, would require hundreds of thousands of dollars, I guess, over the next few years. Add to that the fact that there has been a lot of talk about making Happy Valley - Goose Bay a NATO base. That looks like it is at least quite possible in the coming years. We currently have a population in Happy Valley - Goose Bay of a little over 7,000, Sheshatshit and North West River together perhaps another 1,000 and we serve some coastal requirements as well. Now, if you add to that the effects a NATO base would have - well, I understand the total permanent military establishment would total something like 1,500 people and another 1,500 during the Summer months when the low-flying activity is at its greatest level - we are talking about 3,000 military personnel at certain times in our community, which is a great increase over what we have at the moment.

The question here, then, as it relates to Melville hospital is is that facility now adequate? I do not believe it is. It is in poor condition, as I have already mentioned. It is beyond its life span, and I would think that with the increasing military commitment and so on, we would have to look at the possibility of providing some sort of a centralized medical health care unit, perhaps of major proportions in relation to our population in the Naskaupi district.

We also are plagued with transient medical staff. I would like to mention that point, in that we were talking about staff provided from Europe, in a lot of cases, as student medical staff who are in our area sometimes for just a few weeks, sometimes just a couple of weeks. The fact is that that sort of, I think, destroys any confidence that some patients might feel towards the medical person who is attending them, that on the first visit you have a young student doctor who prescribes and diagnoses and whatever, you are asked to come back in a given period of time and when you go back again there is a new person there. - That sometimes happens, I have been given to understand. In my mind, if I were the patient involved, I would think that would have a tendency to destroy any confidence I may have in the medical system. That is just a small point, of course.

There is also - and this was a reasonably major issue in the past year or so - the closing of the North West River hospital, which probably cost my predecessor dearly in the election and in his credibility in the riding. We are told, I think, because of the fact that there is a major hospital,

the Melville hospital we spoke about, the dilapidated building we now have, is just a few short road miles, about twenty-five road miles from North West River and Sheshatshit, that we did not need the hospital in North West River. That is probably so in a lot of ways, but in Labrador, when you say an 'all-weather, all-season road', as many former residents of the area - I can see at least one on the other side of the House - can attest, that is not necessarily the case and not certainly on a 365 day a year basis. So consequently, the total picture of medical health services is going to have to be looked at with a view to doing something about it. And beyond the communities I have already mentioned we have, of course, Churchill Falls. On a recent visit to Churchill Falls, where they have a clinic now staffed by one doctor, Mr. Speaker, previously two, I believe, and a staff of nurses and so on, even a normal child birth in a community such as Churchill Falls requires that the patient is brought somewhere to the outside. We seem to lack a quantity and perhaps even quality of specialization right in the Melville Hospital in that almost anything beyond a minor hangnail has to be taken out to St. Anthony or the Health Science Complex here in St. John's. A lot of people feel with the air evacuation situation, the difficulties with weather, the conditions of the patient and so on, except in extreme emergency cases, is something that is less than desirable. The thought has often been expressed in Naskaupi district that the Grenfell Regional Health Services Board, an agent of the government, appointed by the government and so on, for some reason unknown to many of us

in Naskaupi district, has the idea that the base of power for the delivery of health services should be in St. Anthony and not let us have more say in centrally located Naskaupi district, where most people in Labrador say it should be. And I know over the years, Mr. Speaker, I will have the opportunity in the next coming months and years to speak on these subjects with the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) and I am sure he will be only too willing to have discussions on the subject as it relates to the good of many people, not just those inside of Naskaupi district.

Another thing that is addressed, and quite strongly, has been the question of the offshore. In Labrador they basically do not know what the government is talking about in that the offshore, in most contexts that we have heard, relates to the Island of Newfoundland and not necessarily to Labrador, even though there has been some drilling off Labrador. We know that. But they feel left out of that particular mainstream.

I read a recent letter to the editor in a local paper which says, "What is the Atlantic Accord? What is the offshore agreement? What is the offshore as it relates to Labrador today?" What they are really looking for is some means of getting into the work force that is employed in the offshore, if that is at all possible. But, in that regard, they feel that they are left out.

For example, I was surprised to find in checking with the various government agencies available in Happy Valley-Goose Bay in particular, in Naskaupi district, very little information is

available on the two training programmes that are prerequisites to having a job on an oil rig in the offshore. Those are the marine emergency duties training, and I believe the other one is the basic offshore safety training course. These are two and three week courses, I believe, run pretty regularly in St. John's, Halifax and perhaps Prince Edward Island and I found out only just recently that only one or two Labradorians, I believe, have ever had the opportunity to go on that. I wonder if perhaps the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) would like to discuss how we can access more young Labradorians into those training programmes with a view to having them employed in the offshore.

Although I profess to be no expert at all on the Atlantic Accord, a thought occurred to me, and I expressed this to a number of people. They talked about the Atlantic Accord, the refinery in Come By Chance, and the East Coast refineries and the complexities of that, and a thought occurred to me some time ago, Mr. Speaker: could not there have been something in the Atlantic Accords which could be used as a bargaining tool to help reopen the negotiations on the contract on the Upper Churchill? Could we not have said to our sister province - in a conciliatory manner and negotiating in the true sense of the word - something along the lines that, "We will be able to supply you oil for your East Coast refineries and in return, in a bargaining sense, could we not reopen?" In other words, I am asking, could not some clause have been included in the Atlantic Accord which would allow for that? And speaking about Labrador and the mainstream of offshore oil

development, why not have included something in that whereby they would guarantee drilling one hole off the Labrador Coast a year, or something along these lines? I understand all drilling off the Labrador Coast has ceased or will cease and may not take place again for another ten years. I gather, to extend that out, that does not mean there is no oil off the Labrador Coast but rather they are not ready to drill for the oil that may be off the Labrador Coast. I am curious about that. Could there not have been something in there to guarantee that the largest geographic portion of our Province is not being neglected. It feels left out in many of these things.

As in the offshore and other things, there is a feeling in Labrador totally, not just Naskaupi district but totally, that we have some kind of second class citizen status up there. We are not the same as, nor are we treated the same as our fellow citizens on the Island and I wonder about that. Is that really true? Many, many, many times I am sure the present administration has heard the expression that Labradorians feel themselves to be second class citizens. Now that is not generated by members of the Opposition obviously. They are in no position to even generate that kind of a thought so the generation of that kind of feeling and that kind of thought must be coming from the government side of the House. That seems to me to be a logical statement and is there something we can do by addressing the problems in Naskaupi district and Labrador generally to alleviate that feeling of second class citizenship which appears to be the case now?

To look at some of the communities in our district, Mr. Speaker, we could go to the extreme Western end. They have an unusual circumstance in that Churchill Falls suffers, we can say, under the company town syndrome. What does that mean? When I was into Churchill Falls people told me that government does not care about us because they think the company looks after everything up here, that we have no concerns. Now obviously that is a sort of statement that cannot be held up to any kind of examination. For example, there are about 1,000 or 1,100 people in Churchill Falls and when there are human beings there there would be concerns, no matter what the number. Certainly, if the thing was completely automated, requiring only one person to throw the switch to start it all up each day or each year or each decade, he would obviously have concerns. So there are many concerns.

For example, poor air transportation. The regional carrier goes into Churchill Falls twice a week, currently Tuesdays and Fridays. I think that is about to change to Monday and Thursday. So on Tuesday Eastern Provincial Airways goes in on the way West, and goes in again on Friday on the way East. And that is not very good service in this day and age. I would like to think that perhaps some of the communities, smaller and less developed and perhaps less sophisticated than Churchill Falls on the Coast, for argument's sake, in our colleague from Eagle River's district (Mr. Hiscock), must have better mail service and air service than they have in Churchill Falls and that is almost unbelievable.

Also on the question of transportation in a general sense, there are many Newfoundlanders in Churchill Falls. The population of Churchill Falls is made up of a lot of Newfoundlanders who prefer to be able to connect to the other part of their Province on vacations and what have you by travelling over the road - the so-called Freedom Road, but called many other things frequently to the Lake Melville area, Happy Valley-Goose Bay the other end of Naskaupi district - and get aboard the Sir Robert Bond and go out that way rather than to wait for the Trans-Labrador Highway, which would take them out to a number of provinces and quite a long trip when you are limited to a two or three week vacation. They really want to see that road. But that part of the road between Churchill Falls and Happy Valley-Goose Bay got to be one of the worst roads I have ever seen in my life, and I have travelled it many times. I have driven over it in my own private vehicle, all kinds of vehicles, and it is something that is of major concern to the people of Churchill Falls and certainly the people of Happy-Valley-Goose Bay and the other parts of Naskaupi district. They also would like to travel Westward. But, you know, you are risking \$12,000 or \$14,000 or \$15,000 or \$20,000 vehicle. The price, I guess, depends on which side of the House you are on. You know, you are risking whatever vehicle you have to get across thereon. That is something that we do not have to put up with in this day and age, and perhaps the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), whom I have known over the years to frequently mumble, would some day come in with me and look over that situation. I would be more than happy to show him.

MR. DAWE:

I have already been in there.

MR. KELLAND:

I am sure that is quite possible, Mr. Minister. You have very little else to do, I have been told from time to time. Anyway that be as it may.

Also in Churchill Falls let us look at the inequities of taxation. Now I know that they are going to be a lot of questions, a lot of debate on taxation, a lot of rhetoric and a lot of other things said about taxation. But look at the inequities of taxation in Labrador alone created by the present administration. I know that the public information was that they would reduce certain of the provincial sales tax in Menihek district, perhaps to get their member elected privately, but nevertheless the public reason was that they would make it fair and provide a means by which the local business in the Menihek district could compete with the people across the border in Quebec. That also applies to Eagle River district, I believe, where they border also on Quebec down there.

Now what they have done, of course, if you were to buy, for example, an article of clothing or an amount of clothing worth \$100 retail, in Menihek it would cost you the straight \$100, Mr. Speaker, and the rest of Labrador and Newfoundland has to pay \$112 for it. I know the reason, as I have said, the public reason was to cut out the competition from our sister Province of Quebec and the businesses over there who were suppose to be taking business away from Labrador City and Wabush. But I was told by a former resident, who now lives in

Churchill Falls, a former resident of Labrador West, that if someone was to check the membership roles of the Co-op in Labrador West they would find that there are quite a few members from Fermont, on the Quebec side of the border, which sort of knocks a little small hole, at least, in the argument that the only reason why they gave the break was because of unfair competition or pressing competition from the other side of the border.

Now I do not want to take anything away from Menihek district or anything like that, or anything from Eagle River, but we should address the fact that where they have a pretty good deal in that regard, we do not have nearly as good a deal. Would it not be better totally in the Province if we could arrive at some provincial taxation figure which would we would consider treating everybody equally and fairly.

Another thing that bothers the people in Churchill Falls in the long Winter months is they really have no access to the outside or no access to roads other than those maintained by CFLCo itself. They pay the same price, let us say, for their vehicle stickers and their licence plates as you might do in other districts where you can drive all year along and be connected into ferry services and so on, travel basically anywhere in the North American Continent. Now they are not alone in that, but Churchill Falls has that as a concern. And I am mentioning these various concerns of Churchill Falls simply because they believe that they are the subject of an attitude by the present administration that says they are a company town and we do not have to do anything for them.

But I will guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, and the House that they certainly do have a lot of concerns, all of which will be addressed in the next few years.

Let us look at another community on the other end, unique in its own way, the community of Sheshashit which is the Indian village or Innu village across the river from North West River. At one time they were municipality, the same community, but now they have changed. They are struggling to try to keep an identity in a changing world, a world that is really changing on them quickly. I believe, and I cannot totally blame any present administration on this, but there seems to be a monster created here that the government does not know how to handle. I do not mean that the people of Sheshashit do not deserve everything that everybody else in this Province deserves, but they have a monster of a situation that the government does not seem to be able to handle and deal with.

So, for example, we can talk about the present situation. We will be discussing this with the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. B. Aylward) and others. The situation which currently exists with the two Band Councils, where we have two distinct separately elected Band Councils, one appears to be supported by the government. The other, strangely enough, appears to be supported by 94 per cent of the residents of Sheshashit. I thought that, in the sense of equality, governments formed by the people would certainly include the Innu people of our district and they would be entitled to any rights anybody else is entitled to.

Sheshashit is unusual. Now a permanent community made up of Nomadic people earlier who have settled now on the river there and they make that their permanent home. They were equally affected by the closing of the North West River Hospital, and the problems we have in the year round transportation even over that short distance. But they have a question also of land claims, along with the Inuit people of Labrador, which must be addressed in a very serious manner.

Now we do not in our district support the idea of development at any cost. What we do support though is development in a manner that would be the greatest benefit to all the people in Naskaupi district, the Inuit and those of European ethnic origins as well. So we have to consider that and those things will also be addressed in the upcoming sessions, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I did not realize, to be quite honest, that I could speak for half an hour and not get quarter ways through what I had to say.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well I have known you for sometime and even I knew that.

MR. KELLAND:

It sort of takes one to know one, Mr. Minister, I guess.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude, I am very close to my time, as I realize. You know, it was not until last Thursday - and I have followed the House to some degree, to the limit of the time I had available - it was not until last Thursday that I knew how to spell the word 'Throne', and we are addressing the Throne Speech

and debating the Throne Speech. But it seems to me that after last Thursday the meaning and the spelling is crystal clear to me, because the Throne Speech totally appears to be something that was absolutely thrown together in haste, without thought and consideration for the people of this Province, and we should address that and debate it to its fullest extent.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate that I follow the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) because I think between us we probably spent more time in Labrador than perhaps any other members sitting in the House today, although I do not know about the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). In any event, I can relate to and address very briefly some of the matters the hon. member raised. Before doing that I would like to commence my few comments on the Throne Speech in the traditional manner, by expressing my congratulations to Your Honour on your elevation to the most prestigious post of Speaker of the House, and to my good friend and colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Greening), the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, a position which was held by other illustrious members of the House, I might add, I believe the now

Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and others. I would also like to congratulate all members who were elected for the first time and, of course, to the other members of the House who have been re-elected and are looking forward to a good Session.

I want to commence my remarks by just addressing a few questions that were put to me today about the weather. I just want to say that as the new Minister of the Environment I want to tell you that at the present time the weather is under the jurisdiction of the federal government but I have commenced negotiations with my federal counterpart, Madame Suzanne Blais-Grenier, and we will get it under provincial jurisdiction pretty soon and I am sure that things will clear up considerably.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate two new members on our side of the House, the hon. the member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) in moving that an Address in Reply be drafted to the the gracious Speech from the Throne, and his seat mate and colleague, the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell), who seconded that motion.

I want to start off by just addressing a couple of points that were raised by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in his address to the Throne Speech the other day. In his comments he mentioned about problems in local communities with hiring practises. Well, I just want to say that I think all members of the House are faced with that problem in that we have a public tendering system now in this Province, thanks to the PC

administration. Private individuals and companies bid on government work and when they go into communities to do work and they hire whom they see fit, really. I know we all lobby with them and so on, but it is not only a problem for Opposition members, it is a problem for all members of the House. That was one point that was raised.

On the matter of national defence spending, which was raised by the new member for Gander (Mr. Baker), he is quite right when he says that there is not enough national defence spending in this Province. As one who grew up on an air force base in Labrador, and who spent some time in Nova Scotia, I am more aware than most people of the defence dollars that are spent in the Province of Nova Scotia when very little comes to Newfoundland. But now that we have a PC government in Ottawa, I am quite sure that that will be turned around within the next couple of years.

When the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) was making his remarks he referred to Goose Bay as the possible place for a NATO base. Well, I certainly hope that that comes through for the many good friends that I have in Labrador. I hope that that fact will be realized very soon, as that will stimulate the economy there.

MR. PEACH:

You should have run there.

MR. BUTT:

Well, I guess if I had run there, obviously the hon. member would not be here right now. I think he would agree with that, because then we would have been running for the same nomination, the PC

nomination, because the hon. gentleman until recently, of course, was a good Tory like myself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in following the traditional approach I would like to, in my few comments in the Address and Reply, express my gratitude and thanks to the people of Conception Bay South, a much reduced population, I might add. In the electoral boundaries redistribution my district was pretty well cut in half and I lost a lot of good people to my good friend and colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the member for the new district of Harbour Main (Mr. Doyle), and, of course, some 4,000 souls to the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry).

AN HON. MEMBER:

They are really upset.

MR. BUTT:

Yes, they are really upset. You are quite right about that.

The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) raised a point about MED courses, and he directed it to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), but perhaps I could just make a brief comment on that because there are a lot of people wanting to take that course so they can seek gainful employment in the offshore and offshore related industries, supply boats and so on. Well, a couple of years ago we embarked on an adventuresome programme of building a new MED center in what was then the district of Conception Bay South, it is on the West side of the Foxtrap Access Road. That new facility will soon be completed and we will be able to put a lot more people through

that new school out there. The school that John built is now in Norm's seat. That new facility, that new MED center, will be able to handle a lot more people who are interested in obtaining this new marine emergency duty training course they require in order to work on the rigs.

I did not like one comment that the hon. gentleman made and that was that Labradorians consider themselves to be second-class citizens. Although I enjoyed the hon. member's speech considerably, I just want to say to him that I have three children who were born in Labrador and consider themselves Labradorians. They consider themselves Labradorians, but they certainly do not consider themselves second-class citizens.

MR. KELLAND:

I did not say they were second class-citizens, I said they felt they were being treated as such.

MR. BUTT:

I see. All right.

In any event, I would like to get into the issues that were raised in the Throne Speech and what it is all about, and seeing that we are nearing six o'clock, with just a couple of minutes to go, with hon. members' permission I will adjourn the debate and we will get back at it when the House resumes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

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, May 1, 1985 at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

April 30, 1985

EASTERN PROVINCIAL AIRWAYS

Tabled by Hon.
Premier, 30 Apr.
1985

COMPANY HISTORY

Eastern Provincial Airways (1963) Limited ("E.P.A., 1963") was incorporated in 1963 to acquire the assets and undertaking of (i) Maritime Central Airways Limited ("M.C.A."), a 21 year old airline which, at the time of such acquisition, owned and operated 6 aircraft and provided scheduled airline service from Moncton, New Brunswick to Summerside and Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, and to Seven Islands, Quebec and Goose Bay, Labrador, and (ii) Eastern Provincial Airways Limited ("E.P.A."), a company established in 1949 with a single aircraft to provide airline service in Newfoundland and Labrador and which, at the time of such acquisition, owned and operated 25 aircraft. The companies were structured so that E.P.A., as the parent company, controlled the operations of Maritime Central Airways and E.P.A. 1963 Limited.

HISTORY OF GOVERNMENT FINANCIAL INVOLVEMENT

1. In March, 1963, Government guaranteed a \$2.5 million bank loan on behalf of E.P.A. to enable it to purchase two Handley Page Herald 200 Series aircraft.
2. In August, 1963, Government guaranteed a bank loan up to \$6.0 million on behalf of E.P.A. (1963) Limited to finance the purchase of the assets of Eastern Provincial Airways and Maritime Central Airways (referred to above) and to discharge all secured indebtedness of the respective companies, including the guaranteed loan mentioned in (1) above.
3. In March, 1966, the Province guaranteed a \$6.0 million debenture issue of E.P.A. (1963). The debentures bear interest at the rate of 6 1/2% per annum and mature on March 15, 1991. From the proceeds of this issue the company repaid the Government guaranteed bank loan mentioned in (2) above, of which \$5.0 million had been drawn down.

With respect to the above debenture issue, E.P.A. (1963) Limited has established a sinking fund which is adequate to service this debt and retire the debentures when they mature. At March 31, 1985 the debt outstanding under this issue was \$1,987,000, while the sinking fund value was \$2,105,600. Because of the sinking fund provisions the Province has no liability with respect to its guarantee, however, reference to the guarantee is shown on the Public Accounts of the Province. This is the only obligation with respect to E.P.A. (1963) Limited in which the Province is still involved.

4. In December, 1971, the Province, and the Crown Corporation Newfoundland Industrial Development Corporation ("N.I.D.C."), entered in arrangements with Canadian Acceptance Corporation ("CAC") and E.P.A. (1963) whereby the airline acquired three Boeing 737 aircraft. N.I.D.C. borrowed \$10.5 million through a bond issue supported by a guarantee from the Province. This amount was then loaned to CAC and was used to purchase three Boeing aircraft. The three aircraft were in turn leased to E.P.A. (1963) for a period of thirteen years with a provision that at the end of the lease the company has the option to acquire the aircraft. On May 25, 1984 CAC provided \$1.2 million which allowed N.I.D.C. to redeem its debenture debt and consequently release its security. N.I.D.C.'s involvement with E.P.A. was therefore concluded.

5. In 1976, the Province provided E.P.A. (1963) with financial assistance in the amount of \$3.0 million to enable it to expand its maintenance facility at Gander. This financial assistance was provided by way of an Industrial Assistance Grant in the amount of \$1.5 million and a loan of \$1.5 million from N.I.D.C.

6. In October, 1977, the Province again guaranteed a bank loan of \$6.0 million on behalf of E.P.A. (1963), of which \$1.5 million was used to repay the loan from N.I.D.C. referred to in (5), and the balance of \$4.5 million was for working capital purposes. This guarantee was subsequently released by the bank in 1980.

SUBSIDIES

In addition to the financial assistance provided by loans and guarantees, the Province has paid subsidies for passengers travelling via E.P.A.. During the period 1966-70, Government paid a subsidy of 25% of the air fare for travel via E.P.A. between the Island and Labrador. Although this is now discontinued, Government still, through the Department of Recreation and Culture, makes grants to amateur sport and youth organizations to subsidize cost of travelling. Undoubtedly, E.P.A. receives much of the benefit of this program.

SUMMARY

The financial assistance provided by the Province and N.I.D.C. as detailed in (3), (4) and (6) above was secured by mortgages on the assets of Eastern Provincial Airways, Maritime Central Airways, and E.P.A. (1963), and also a chattel mortgage on the three aircraft owned by CAC and leased to the airline. Under the terms of the various mortgage agreements both the Province and N.I.D.C. were required to release their respective mortgages on the assets of these companies once the sinking fund for the 1966 debentures was sufficient to cover future interest payments and redemption in 1991. These conditions were met in October 1980, and the mortgages were released. The chattel mortgage on the aircraft was maintained until 1984 as security for the balance of CAC's indebtedness to N.I.D.C.

APRIL 30, 1985