



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 3

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is a pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today a teacher along with ten students from Labrador City Collegiate in Labrador City who are visiting here on an exchange programme with the Holy Heart High School here in the city. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you to the galleries today and trust that your visit here is most interesting and informative.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS): Mr. Speaker, I have a statement and I am getting it typed up now. It will be up in a few minutes and I will distribute it to the press and to the House as soon as I have it but, I propose to read it in the meantime.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador deplores recent events which led to the termination of some fifty-plus members of Local 740, a local union here in Newfoundland and Labrador, of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Pipe Fitting and Plumbing Trade from the Quebec-Cartier mining project at Mount Wright, Quebec which is just across the border from Labrador City. Reports reaching government indicate that the local company at Mount Wright, with which these Newfoundlanders were employed, was quite satisfied with their work. As far as we can ascertain at this moment, the information we have, is that the objections to their continued employment came from the Quebec branch, Local 144 of the same union in respect to the employment of nonmembers of that particular local.

The day before yesterday I wired the Canadian Director of the International Union, Canada and also forwarded a copy of the same telegram to the International President, Mr. Martin J. Ward, in Washington, D.C. I also wired the honourable Jean Cournoyer, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in the Province of Quebec, the same telegram requesting information on this recent turn of events. Further in the telegram to the union I also requested Mr. Cournoyer

to confirm or deny an indication that he had given to me last spring on a trip between Edmonton and Montreal, when I was Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, that the use of a permit for employment in the construction industry in Quebec would be discontinued sometime in September or October of last year. Thus far I have not as yet had a reply to either of the telegrams.

This matter was considered by government this morning and further to action already indicated, the Premier will be contacting the president of the Canadian Labour Congress, Prime Minister Bourassa of Quebec and the Prime Minister with our views on this subject. We are determined to do whatever necessary to ensure that such discrimination against residents of our province will not occur. Indeed it is government's feeling that employment restrictions of this nature anywhere in Canada should not be tolerated by us. Thank you.

HON. E. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, if I could say a word with reference to the statement made by the gentleman from Labrador West, the Minister of Transportation and Communications. My colleagues and I welcome the indication of government action. I think in fairness I should say that the minister, based on what he said - that is the only knowledge I have of what action the government have taken - the minister and his colleagues at this stage have done essentially what they should have done and what they could have done. This is a very serious matter, Sir, because it strikes really at the whole concept of Confederation.

I have heard people suggest, and it has come up in the past, that we should have sort of reciprocal work permits. Of course, that is a foolish idea because there are thousands of our people who find work on the mainland. In any event, it goes right to the very heart of the concept of Confederation if we are going to have what amounts to provincial immigration barriers, these work permits.

All that I want to say is that, I think, the minister owes it to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to state as quickly as he can exactly what steps the government are prepared to take, what the range of options are that are available to us, and what we are going to do. I think it is obvious that there is a concerted plan which must have, at least by negative inference, must have the consent and approval of the Government of the Province of Quebec. If there are these work permits, and the indications are that these do exist, then they must have the approval of the Government of Quebec, if only based on the facts that the Government of Quebec have not intervened within their jurisdiction to end that permit system. Well then that cannot be tolerated. That is not the responsibility of ministry to answer for what the Government of Quebec do, but they are responsible for answering as to what we do and what the government of this province do.

I think the minister has started well. His colleague the Minister of Manpower will doubtless be in the House on Monday. I hope that we will have a fuller statement then as to what exactly is going to be done because this matter is of the utmost seriousness. It is like a cancer at the heart of Confederation, and one that must be cut out as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health.

HON. A. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, in view of the press release issued by the Board of the Grand Falls Hospital, I would like to state the present position is that the government are completely reassessing the question of expansion of the Central Newfoundland Hospital.

The facts in this matter are that the Board of the Central Newfoundland Hospital sometime ago sought the approval in principle from government for construction of an extension to the hospital. At that time the estimated cost was under \$4 million, and government did approve in principle. However, since then the board have expanded upon their original request, first to the extent that the estimated cost escalated to about \$15 million, and more recently to a point where the present estimated cost is of the order of \$35 million.

In view of this tremendous and a most alarming increase the Grand Falls project is being reassessed, as this is a budgetary matter. Clarification will be given at the time of the presentation of the budget.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the minister's statement. I could make one or two preliminary points but I can assure the minister that the matter will be extensively debated at the appropriate times.

First of all, Sir, I, as was every other member, am astounded at the eightfold or nearly ninefold increase in the projected cost from \$4 million original suggestion to now apparently \$35 million. The seriousness of that, Sir, is not just in the money. The seriousness of it comes from the obvious breakdown of communications and leadership between the minister on one hand and this board on the other. I think, from what I know of it, I am subject to correction, but I think from what I know of it that the minister and his colleagues are squarely and fairly to blame. The feeling in the Grand -

HON. J. C. CROSBIE: (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I carry on?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Fisheries has risen on a point of order.

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

The House rules provide for ministerial statements to be made. Since this Thirty-Fourth General Assembly was elected on March of 1972, the House has agreed that the Leader of the Opposition or the leader of any other group can make a comment or ask for an elucidation on a ministerial statement. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not permitted, Mr. Speaker, to start a debate on the matter and to start making allegations such as he is making now in this purported response to a ministerial statement. It is clearly outside of the rules, and it is outside of what has been permitted in this House since this government took office in 1972.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order if I might, Mr. Speaker. I do not speak in this House by virtue -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I recognize the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, and I will then recognize the Hon. Minister of Health.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not speak in this House by virtue of permission of this government or anybody else. I speak by virtue of the practices and precedents of this House as Your Honour enforces them.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: People who peddle beer should stick to it.

Mr. Speaker, the second point I would make is that I am not debating it. I wish I could debate it. I am merely making a few comments on this matter. I submit that my remarks are in order and I should be allowed to continue a few comments on the quite alarming state of affairs revealed by the minister's statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health wishes to speak to that point of order.

DR. A. ROWE: On a point of privilege. It was mentioned by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about the breakdown in -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: Speak to the same point of order, go on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has recognized the Hon. Minister of Health speaking to a point of order.

DR. A. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the point of order was that the Hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned a breakdown in communications between myself, the department, and Grand Falls. I would just like to clarify the position. As recently as yesterday our relationships -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: Shut up boy! Shut up!

DR. A. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, as recently as yesterday -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: Cracky!

DR. A. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, as recently as yesterday -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Shut up down there!

DR. ROWE: Relationship -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Chair is willing to listen to the honourable Minister of Health if he could hear him above the noise of other honourable members to my left and to my right speaking.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: - the same privileges -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Go ahead.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to clarify the fact that there has been no breakdown in communications. As recently as yesterday I spoke with -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. ROWE: - the administrator and members of the board -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. ROWE: They themselves are equally surprised -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. ROWE: - and upset about the increase in costs.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! For the second time -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! For the second time I could hardly hear and get the gist of what the honourable Minister of Health was saying because of constant interruptions, mostly to my right. If honourable members are not adhering to the rule of letting a member speak and be heard in silence, then it is difficult for the Chair to make any ruling as to whether or not he is debating or speaking to the point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before you make your ruling, I would like to point to Beauchesne, page 84, section (91). Now, Mr. Speaker, when this House, when the point is not covered, as you know, in our own Standing Orders, we refer to Beauchesne, and Beauchesne is very, very

clear on the point. "When a minister makes a statement on government policy or ministerial administration, either under routine proceedings, between two orders of the day or shortly before the adjournment of the House, it is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or the Chiefs of recognized groups are entitled to ask explanations and make a few remarks, but no debate is then allowed under any Standing Order."

Now, that is the point, and I think what has happened here is an illustration of what happens when that rule is violated, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Again, to the point of order, Sir. Since the honourable House Leader has had two slices at the piece of bacon, perhaps I could. There is no question about the rule in this practice, Sir, or the rule in this case. What is in question is the application of the rule and I maintain that my remarks were not debate. My remarks were just that. They were a few remarks designed to deal briefly with the situation which the minister chose to raise in his statement.

I wish I could debate the matter. I would like nothing better than if the minister would make it possible for such debate. If he will not make it possible now, then we will have it because this is just another unkept Tory promise.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! There has been enough discussion re this matter. It is a matter that the honourable Leader of the Opposition or his representative is entitled to reply to a ministerial statement, but no debate re that matter is permitted. Certainly, I feel that the honourable Leader of the Opposition was straying somewhat from that particular point. I shall permit him to continue, but shall ask him to be very careful as to what he says with regard to this statement.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and as always I shall try to be careful and I shall try as hard as I can to live within the rules. As I was saying, it is obvious that there has been a most unfortunate and a complete breakdown of communication on this matter because the board at Grand Falls—I do not know how many phone calls there have been, there can be many phone calls and little communication—but it is obvious that a

most serious situation has arisen. This did not come up overnight. A \$4 million estimate does not escalate ninefold into a \$35 million estimate without -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, am I to be allowed to -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Am I to be permitted to carry on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to rise -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, am I being permitted to carry on?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Well then, who has the floor, Sir?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sit down.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - risen on a point of order -

MR. ROBERTS: Ah! He is just harassing us.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order, that the honourable gentleman is not permitted by the rules to commence a debate on a ministerial statement which he has again commenced to do following your last ruling. If the Leader of the Opposition is to be permitted to start a debate and make allegations that there is no communications and there is this, that and the other, none of which has any reference to the minister's statement, then this side of the House must be entitled to reply immediately and we will be into a full fledged debate.

I submit that that is out of order and I have cited Beauchesne. He is not asking for explanations. He is not making a few brief statements. He is commencing a debate. Now, if he is permitted to continue that, then obviously we will have to answer and the debate will be on.

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order, if I might, Sir. Your Honour has just made a ruling on that precise point. Your Honour, I thought, was quite clear on the precise point and I would assume that if Your Honour felt I was out of order, Your Honour would not hesitate for one second to exercise Your Honour's proper and appropriate jurisdiction and bring me to order.

The point of order taken by the gentleman from St. John's West is specious. It is another example of his bullying tactics. It just makes me regret that his assistant is not the House Leader and that the House Leader is not the assistant and then things would be proper. May I have a ruling on it, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition continued in the same vein prior to my previous ruling, and I said at my previous ruling that I felt he was straying somewhat from the relevancy of this petition, or of this statement rather. If he continues in that vein I shall certainly have to recognize another member.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may draw my, what started to be a few remarks to a close, I was about to say that the minister has given us no explanation of this. That was the whole point. If the bully boy from St. John's West had only let me finish the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Health has not given us any explanation at all.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, this House can be conducted like a beer garden or it can be conducted properly and I object to the Leader of the Opposition when I rise on a point of order using this kind of allegation and name calling, bully boy and the rest.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, I should not have to rise on this point. It is for the Speaker to stop this kind of misconduct. I should not have to rise and point out that unparliamentary language is being used and I ask for the protection of Your Honour.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I called him a bully boy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition, I think, should refer to any honourable member in his official capacity.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank you, Your Honour, and I was referring to him in his official capacity, but if I did not use the right terms I shall try better.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the Minister of Health did not give us any explanations. I submit from what I have heard publicly he has not given the board any explanations. I think the

Minister of Health should immediately, and if he wishes the gentleman from Grand Falls should feel free to make a visit to Grand Falls and talk to the board as well, should immediately seek to meet with that board to get to the bottom of this problem.

The fact remains that according to the minister's statement a proposal that everybody felt was going ahead, that had been announced was going ahead, and that everybody believed was going ahead, has escalated from \$4 million to \$35 million.

I will conclude my remarks by saying simply that the minister's facile attempt to say that this is a budgetary problem to be dealt with forthwith is inaccurate, misleading, deceptive and incorrect. It is not a budgetary problem. It may have budgetary implications but the minister, Mr. Speaker, has got to accept his responsibilities as minister and to come to grips with this problem and right away.

MR. SPEAKER: It has just been brought to my attention that we have in the galleries from the Town of Windsor, Mayor Clarence King, Deputy Mayor Walter Critchley and Councillor Aubrey Smith and I would certainly like to welcome these gentlemen to the galleries today.

Are there any other statements by ministers?

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to present a petition from 885 residents in the communities of Bloomfield, Lethbridge, Musgravetown, Canning's Cove and Bunyan's Cove.

The prayer, Mr. Speaker, of the petition is that the road linking these communities with the Trans-Canada Highway be upgraded and paved. This is presently a gravel road, a rough gravel road. It is dusty in the summertime and rough, and of course it is very slippery and dangerous in the winter. The fact that the school buses are using this route extensively as well is a factor which is behind the petition asking for it to be reconstructed and paved.

With the petition are also letters of support from the Musgravetown Town Council and also from the Musgravetown Lions Club. I fully support this petition, Mr. Speaker, and I move that it be tabled in the House of Assembly and presented to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador North.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House would like to speak in support of the petition that was presented by the Member for Bonavista South. We feel too that the residents of Bloomville was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Bloomfield, Musgravetown -

MR. WOODWARD: Bloomfield, Lethbridge, Bunyan's Cove and all the other communities in the District of Bonavista South should get the attention that they are looking for and have the roads in those communities that are connecting to the Trans-Canada Highway -

MR. NEARY: Clear the snow off them first.

MR. WOODWARD: upgraded and paved, Mr. Speaker, as all other roads in the province deserve to be upgraded and paved.

In looking at the Throne Speech and the five year programme that the Minister of Transportation -

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

MR. WOODWARD: We support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, a second petition. This petition is from the residents of Canning's Cove, 158 residents, and they are asking for the reconstruction and paving of a road from their community to connect with Musgravetown.

What happened a few years ago, I think it was five years ago, the government of the day decided to go down and pave the road down to the end of Musgravetown, but for some reason or other neglected or ignored the community of Canning's Cove. I know it is not because of their political persuasion in Canning's Cove, that is for sure.

MR. ROBERTS: Are we to be allowed ...

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this petition is fully supported by me. I feel that the need for a new road to connect that community with Musgravetown is a desperate need because the road is a dangerous road. There is a very dangerous elevation there, and all the school children, elementary and high, are being transported daily from Canning's Cove to Musgravetown to the high school and elementary school there. I fully support this petition in the hope that this year there will be sufficient funds to carry out, at least, reconstruction this year, and in the future years to come that the road will be paved, and a proper transportation system to the connecting community of Musgravetown.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, also support the petition, the second petition, by the member from Bonavista South. I have stated previously that, no doubt, there is big demand for paving in the whole of the province, particularly the island portion of the province of Newfoundland. We indeed in Labrador have some very rugged terrain. We would like to have some roads to cover that terrain, Mr. Speaker. We would be glad to have any kind of road. We are not looking for upgrading and paving, we are just looking for roads. We support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the fishermen of Savage Cove in the provincial district of St. Barbe North, and the name does not refer to the residents at all, but instead to the state of the community stage in that particular community.

MR. NEARY: The savage...

MR. F. ROWE: Well the community stage is in a savage condition, Mr. Speaker.

The existing community stage in that particular community, Mr. Speaker, does not have a proper water supply system nor does it have a proper lighting system, and similar to other community stages in the district of St. Barbe North, this community stage is finding it difficult to operate as a result of the new regulations set down by the Federal Department of the Environment. Of course, these regulations are set down to protect the province and the fishermen in the sale of the fishing products coming from Newfoundland. However, it is my understanding that the community stages themselves now come under the jurisdiction of the provincial government, and the residents of this community are simply calling for a new community stage and a wharf on Cooper's Island to replace the existing community stage, which is practically falling down and surrounded by shallow water.

I have written the Regional Manager of the Small Craft Harbours' Branch of the Department of the Environment on a number of occasions to get this harbour dredged out, and just to get it dredged out around the area of the wharf itself would cost around \$100,000. This present community stage is exposed to the open sea, to the Straits of Belle Isle, and the residents of this particular community feel very strongly that a new community stage should be built on Cooper's Island where there is greater protection, and a greater depth of water, and not as much loose pebbles and sand and this sort of a thing.

Sir, I support this particular petition, and I would like to point out that the same needs exist in many other communities in St. Barbe North, and I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House, and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to arise on my feet to support this petition most heartedly and give it my endorsement and to see that it gets referred to the department to which it relates which is the Department of the Environment of the Government of Canada.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, community stages are not the responsibility of the provincial government. There are a number of them constructed by the federal government. There are a number which, because the federal government stopped constructing them, the provincial government, this provincial government, this administration, has erected. The majority of them are federal community stages.

In 1967 an agreement was proposed to be entered into between the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada under which the Government of Newfoundland would take over responsibility for community stages. That agreement was signed by the honourable Aiden Maloney, then the Minister of Fisheries, but it was not signed by the Government of Canada who for some reason did not carry forward with it. It would have been a condition of that agreement that major repairs would have been borne seventy-five per cent by the Government of Canada, and the various community stages would first be put in proper repair and then administered by the province. That was never done.

So, we have the anomalous situation now where a number of them are federal government. The federal government does not wish to spend any more money on them. A number are provincial responsibility. We have constructed and have maintained and improved community stages. We, the province, have improved federal stages because they are now neglecting them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable Minister of Fisheries I do not believe is being relevant to the prayer of this particular petition.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, just let me say this, that I will support the federal government carrying out their responsibilities in

connection with this stage, but, even better, their entering into an agreement with us so we get administration and control over it and they help us in improving them.

So, the matter is under consideration, that stage as well as others, because of the new arrangements in the herring fishery in St. Barbe North.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the Town of Badger. This petition was circulated in the community by the Badger Town Council. I would like to read the statement which headed up this petition in the matter on which the people were asked to voice their opinion. It reads as follows:

"Recently there has been a school tax levied by the Exploits Valley School Tax Authority. The tax is \$50.00 per year to be paid by anyone over the age of nineteen whose income exceeds \$2,600 per year. Several towns have already publicly stated their disagreement with the tax. Your council, that is the Badger Town Council, also disagrees with this assessment. If you also disagree, please sign your name on this petition and the indication will be sent to myself to present it to the honourable House of Assembly."

Subsequent to that petition being circulated, there was a motion of the Badger Town Council on January 29th that the petition would be forwarded to myself as M.H.A. to present it to the House of Assembly. I have on several occasions been in the community of Badger, met with the people in public meetings and so on concerning other problems related to the educational system there, the busing of students, the fact that in a community this size one time where they had several schools, today most of their students are bused outside the community. I am sure that this dissatisfaction in other areas is also shown here by the fact that they are being taxed for a service, I am sure, which they feel they are not receiving. They are not getting adequate attention for it.

So, I have no alternative, of course, but to support the wishes of the people of Badger as shown in this petition which I

do now, and I would request that the petition be tabled in the honourable House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition. I must apologize for the fact that I was out looking up the files on the fisheries for some questions for the Minister of Fisheries. As I understand it, the member for Grand Falls has presented a petition objecting to an increase of the school tax in the community of Badger.

Sir, I am sure my colleagues and I certainly agree with the prayer of that petition. It only goes to point out the confusion and the controversy that the School Tax Authorities and the different methods and rates of school taxes and school assessments are causing throughout this province. Sir, it is in total chaos, the methods and the rates that are being used to collect revenue at the local level. I pay tribute to these people who are sincerely trying to collect money for their school boards but the buck is being passed to them by this present administration. They are left no other choice.

We have a system that discriminates against different parts of the province. The method of taxation is unfair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable member for St. Barbe North is not being relevant to the prayer of this particular petition, but is getting involved in a speech with regards to school taxation in general.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will simply conclude my remarks by saying that I support wholeheartedly the prayer of the petition, and I am sure that many other people throughout the province feel exactly the same way.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of ninety-two residents of McCallum in my district. The prayer of the petition relates to the need for a ferry connection with the community of Hermitage and thereby the province's road system. Perhaps I could read the wording of the petition:

"We, the undersigned, voters of McCallum, request Premier Moores to make good his commitment of November, 1973, to provide the communities of McCallum and Gaultois with a regular ferry service, connecting with Hermitage." I do not think they are worried what boat it was at this present time. It would be better than what they got now. Continuing the petition:

"Premier Moores promised the ferry by the summer of 1974. However, we do not have it, and it does not seem to be forthcoming. The ferry would greatly improve health services, mail services, and give the people of this community a greater chance for jobs outside the community. People from here, working on the trawlers, from Gaultois, could have transportation back and forth, as would persons working in the fish plants. The ferry would mean an access to the road system, and improve social and business communications."

The petition, first of all, Mr. Speaker, is very well put in that it states very clearly the advantages that would accrue to the people of McCallum and, of course, the people of Gaultois, if this commitment of the Premier had been followed through in 1974 as promised in November, 1973, as the petition points out. The ninety-two petitioners, Mr. Speaker, who signed this petition, and who live in McCallum, not only are speaking for themselves, but I believe it can be construed that they are also speaking for the 700

residents of Gaultois on whose behalf I presented a petition in the last session concerning the same matter. These people, totalling between 900 and 1,000 altogether, really deserve a regular connection with the road system of the province for the many reasons outlined. I do hope that if the Premier and/or the Minister of Transportation rise in support of this petition, which I would certainly invite them to do, I would hope also that they would indicate in as clear terms as possible what course of action is proposed to make this promise, and much needed ferry service a reality sometime during the forthcoming summer.

I have much pleasure in supporting the petition, and placing it on the table of the House, to be referred to the appropriate department.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition so ably presented on behalf of the people in my colleague's district, in the district of Hermitage, and I do hope that the message has come through loud and clear, and that something will be done about that ferry service now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce the following private members' resolution.

MR. ROBERTS: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Unless the honourable gentleman is moving it on behalf of some other honourable member, I think there is a rule that we can only have one motion in our name at any time. The honourable gentleman from Bonavista South does have a motion standing, I believe, it is the second one, standing now.

MR. MORGAN: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is correct. Maybe the Hon. Member for Bay de Verde would introduce the same resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That is quite correct there is only one motion for a private member allowed on the Order Paper at any one time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be appropriate to ask for a ruling on the Notice of Motion given by my colleague, the Member for St. Barbe North. Has Mr. Speaker decided whether the motion -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: It is unheard of for Mr. Speaker to be questioned. The Member for Bay de Verde -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage is in fact out of order in asking that question at this particular time.

The honourable Member for Bay de Verde.

MR. B. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move the following Private Members' Resolution; to move:

WHEREAS the responsibility for the implementation of an income support programme for the fishermen is the responsibility of the federal government; and

WHEREAS the federal government have been indicating during the past three years that such a programme would be implemented; and

WHEREAS the present unemployment insurance scheme for our fishermen is inadequate and discriminatory, whereby the fishermen with eight weeks of contributions only received seven weeks of benefits, while eight weeks of contributions from other means of employment entitles the claimant up to forty-four weeks of benefits;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this legislature urge the federal government to immediately implement an income support programme for fishermen to replace the existing unemployment insurance scheme.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear! Good boy!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other Notices of Motion?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Premier would care to avail of the opportunity in this House today to tell us whether or not there have been any discussions with Bowater's concerning an announced closedown due to softening conditions in the markets?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier.

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, who is not here today, has had some discussions with them. I, as the honourable Member for Bell Island, read the release from the press that because of marketing conditions they may have to close for two weeks in April. But any definitive position other than that I do not know, but the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture may be able to help in that regard on Monday.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the Premier aware that this operation is in the Premier's own district?

MR. CROSBIE: That is not another question.

AN HON. MEMBER: A supplementary question.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the Premier indicate to the House if the government are still trying to recover \$100,000 granted to Bowater's a few years back to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: By the previous administration, Sir, to try and overcome this matter of having to close down during softening conditions in the markets of the world?

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the previous government gave away so many things in the past that that particular one with Bowater's I am afraid we have not had an opportunity to follow up with.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Would the Premier

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would the Premier indicate to the House if the government thinks that this is just a move to avoid paying taxes under the new Forestry Legislation or is this a genuine move on the part of Bowater's to try and avert a crisis that may be developing in the softening marketing conditions?

MR. MOORFS: Mr. Speaker, this questioning is not of an emergency nature. But what the honourable member is talking about right now, the fact is that for the first time in this province's history all the paper companies and all those people with woods rights in this province are going to pay a meaningful tax rather than be sopped along by governments as was the case for twenty-three years.

MR. ROBERTS: The Tory Government made -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Would the minister indicate to the House if his government have received any representation from the Town of Wabana for assistance to replace old, worn out, frozen up waterlines on Bell Island?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

HON. A. B. PECKFORD (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, we have had representations from the mayor and councillors of the Town of Bell Island or Wabana. We are in the process of trying to set up a meeting with them now to discuss the whole question of municipal services on the Island. Until such time as that meeting has taken place and decisions made at that meeting I cannot be any more definitive at this time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Social Services. Would the minister indicate whether the emergency meeting that he held this morning with the staff over at City Welfare will avert a rebellion amongst the staff over there at the City Welfare Office? The meeting he held this morning with his deputy, with the

staff of City Welfare.

MR. SPEAKER: If the minister wishes to answer, but the question is rather argumentative.

HON. A. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES): I would love to. The emergency meeting I held this morning was with all the members of the cabinet. We had a cabinet meeting from 10:00 to 1:00.

Now I have heard that there was something on one of the stations today, that the minister was meeting with someone today at Harvey Road. What station it was, I do not know. But I would like to say now, Mr. Speaker, that it was very, very irresponsible of that station. To my knowledge there was never a meeting held with anybody on Harvey Road. Whoever the station is, and I do not know, I would like for them to retract it at the earliest possible moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Was it, "Tell it to Steve".

AN HON. MEMBER: That is over.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for St. Barbe North.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Hon. Minister of Education. In view of the fact that it was promised in the Throne Speech of 1973 that a white paper on Education and Human Resources would be produced that year, has that white paper been completed? And is the minister now prepared to table that white paper? It is called the Harris Report, I believe.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I would not be prepared to or indeed would not be able now to table the white paper of 1973.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that in the last session of the House of Assembly that he promised to table a copy of that report within one week -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: and did not do so.

MR. SPEAKER: That is more of a statement of fact by the honourable member. That question too is out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are darn tootin it is.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 31(g) -

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that a point of order?

MR. F. ROWE: It is my privilege -

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: He has not said it is a point of order.

MR. F. ROWE: I do not have to say it is a point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes you do.

MR. F. ROWE: Read the rules.

AN HON. MEMBER: If the honourable gentleman wants to say something -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 31 (g) which states that "A member who is not satisfied with the response to an oral question or has been told by the Speaker that this question is not urgent or not in order." I give notice that I wish to debate this question on Thursday of next week.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I would just like to ask what question the honourable gentleman is referring to?

AN HON. MEMBER: Haw! Haw! Haw!

AN HON. MEMBER: He is trying to speak seriously. Check Hansard.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I just asked, what question is being tabled here?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable member has to present it in writing to the Chair by 4:30 this afternoon.

MR. ROWE: Thank you!

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation. I would rather hope that I would not have to ask this question because I thought I would get a response to the petition I presented about the same subject. Would the minister

indicate to the House what government's intentions are now with respect to the proposed and promised ferry service for Gaultois and McCallum?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think the honourable member wrote me on that matter and I replied. That is the situation. It is still under consideration by the department.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I had the letter of course, and I have it in front of me. Is the minister indicating then that there has been a change of plan on this matter, that the earlier commitment has been changed to a "perhaps"? Is that what he is saying?

MR. ROUSSEAU: No! The matter is under consideration by the department. I think that is the situation.

MR. SIMMONS: Well I would hope they decide to live up to their commitment on that one, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker. I realize that this question perhaps should be directed to the Minister of Manpower, but in his absence, I wonder if the Minister of Fisheries would indicate to us whether the talks in connection with the trawlermen's dispute have broken down, or if they are in recess, or where do they go from here? Could he report on what progress might have been made to date?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the position is that the only information we have or that we could possibly give the House is that the talks are recessed. The Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations is on his way back with Mr. Blanchard. The parties need to get several days of respite. They have been meeting with one another for some eight days now. The Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations will doubtless make a statement Monday morning or even over the weekend. There may be just a setting out of what the position is.

MR. SIMMONS: Is it the impression that talks will reconvene or have they broken off?

MR. CROSBIE: No, they will reconvene.

MR. SIMMONS: They will reconvene.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health, Sir, would care to make a statement in the honourable House regarding a public statement, Sir, that is being made that silicosis is suspected in many residents of Buchans? Does the minister care to comment on that? It is a very serious and urgent matter.

DR. ROWE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, that is an urgent matter, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. ROWE: I will take the question under advisement and I will produce an answer in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could tell us if he has had any representation from the people of O'Donnells concerning frozen water lines in that community, and if so, what action has been taken to remedy the situation?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I suppose this is urgent to the people of O'Donnells. The fact is I have not had any representation from that community to my knowledge.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the honourable the Premier aware that his private secretary, Mrs. Nugent, has had representation from the people of O'Donnells?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: And if so, what action has been taken on the matter?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! That is a statement of fact rather than a question.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. I asked the Premier, is the Premier -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Order! Order!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has made a ruling on the question

in the opinion of the honourable Member for Bell Island.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Bully boy.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has ruled that it was not a question. It was a statement of fact.

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order. The honourable the Minister of Finance just called, I think, Your Honour a bully boy or if not me. Would you ask him please to withdraw that? As he did earlier, I implore and envoke the protection of the Chair and he just distinctly said those nasty words "bully boy" and he is either aiming them at Your Honour or at me or maybe even at my poor, defenceless colleague from Bell Island.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair was in the process of making some comments to the honourable Member for Bell Island and certainly did not hear any words uttered by the honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation care to inform the House if the grievances by the correctional people who work in the boys training home and the girls training home and the two boys training homes actually have been straightened out and if the morale of the institution has gotten back to normal in the last twenty-four hours?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

HON. T. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, the grievances mentioned by the honourable member are presently the subject of discussion by representatives of that group, of my department and of the classification and pay division of Treasury Board. As far as the morale is concerned, there is no noticeable slackening off in it. These meetings, we hope, will be finished by the weekend, at which time we hope the matter will be resolved.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista North.

MR. P. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Could the minister inform this honourable House if the fishermen who were late in filing their claim for storm damage during the 1974 fishing season, if these people will be compensated?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: I have attempted to explain the position on many occasions and I will attempt again now. The position is and was, that letters were sent to every fisherman who was on the list of fishermen compiled in 1973, advising them that the closing date for applications to receive compensation for gear loss due to ice would be September 1 and that was later changed to September 10. It was constantly on every radio station in the Province, in the newspapers and in the media. That was the position.

Now, what has happened with this programme where one hundred per cent compensation is paid for gear loss due to the Arctic ice, part of which is contributed by the Provincial Government and part by the Federal under their Emergency Disaster Assistance Programme? The cost of that programme has gone from an estimated \$3.5 million to \$4 million to in excess of \$6 million. There have been many more claims made than was ever anticipated, Mr. Speaker, and sad to say, there have been many claims that we suspect are fraudulent and false that have been made, but which we are unable to root out or police because we have not got the personnel and the facilities to do that. We just have not got the hundreds and hundreds of officials you would need to investigate every claim.

The procedure is that if you swear to an affidavit and list in the affidavit what gear you had out in the water and lost due to the Arctic ice and you sign that affidavit, swear to it, then your claim is accepted. If people do that and if they make out a false affidavit, it is almost impossible for them to be apprehended or caught out. There is considerable evidence that there have been many false and fraudulent claims. We have got it by way of anonymous letters. We hear it all over the coast where that programme applied, that there are many, and it is a tremendous pity that there is a minority of unscrupulous people who will make a claim in a programme like that when they have lost no gear whatsoever. Nevertheless -
Now, as a result, not just to that -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: And I think it points out, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: - for that kind of a statement.

MR. CROSBIE: I am not apologizing. I speak the truth and it is an outrage and a disgrace, Sir, how that programme is being treated.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, to come back, to come back, -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: To come back, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: To come back, Mr. Speaker, to answer the question. It is a great pity that there was not a deductible under that programme. We would have eliminated a lot of that. Now, there has been an exception made, -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: There has been an exception made - The honourable gentleman can slither on his belly around the country if he wishes. I was asked a question and I am answering it.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

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

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: There has been an exception made, Mr. Speaker, in the case of fishermen who have made claims and who then went to Labrador, who went down fishing on the Labrador and who therefore may not have heard of the deadline, or if they heard of it were not able to get back in time to put in their application before September 1 or September 10. Their claims are being recognized. The claims, the cheques are being sent out for loss of the lobster pots, but anyone who was outside the deadline and who did not meet the deadline and who was not fishing in Labrador, or who does not otherwise have a cast-iron, reasonable excuse as to why he

did not report a loss before September 1 or the 10th, their claims are not accepted.

Now, in that category, as far as I know, there are about 200 or 225 claims in excess of \$4,500, a very small number, and that is the position on the programme. There are still claims coming in, or people writing in, who have not been contacted yet. Some have not been contacted by a fisheries officer and some are still sending in claims. They are claiming for gear loss last summer. They are outside the deadline and unless, as I say, they were in Labrador they are not recognized.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary question: Is the minister saying that some of our fishermen are actually dishonest?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am saying that a number of people who have made claims under that programme, be they fishermen, part-time fishermen, or whatever they are, have made false claims. That is what I am saying. Some are fishermen. Some may be part-time fishermen, how many we do not know, but we know there is a considerable abuse of the programme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member from Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: A supplementary on that, Mr. Speaker, before we get off the track. By way of clarification, if the honourable minister could say whether or not the extended deadline applies as well to the people, the fishermen, who are residents of the Coast of Labrador as well as those who have gone from the Island of Newfoundland down to fish on the Coast of Labrador? There seems to be a discrepancy there.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I do not recall having brought to my knowledge, any claims from fishermen in Labrador South that have not been recognized. So I cannot give the answer clearly, but I know of no claim from up there that I have heard of that has not been recognized. If there are such, then we will look at the circumstances because of their distance and remoteness.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the Minister of

Fisheries: Would the minister care to indicate to the House whether the serious charges and accusations and statements that he just made are based on substantial facts and information or on hearsay and unsigned letters that the minister has received in his department? If they are based on substantial evidence, would the minister care to table the evidence in the House?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I have answered a question that I was asked in this House and I say that this is based on the opinion of the officials who have been involved in the programme. It is based on our experience. It is based on correspondence. It is based on knowledge. I am therefore informing the House and the people of Newfoundland, and I have informed the public of Newfoundland before this on open line programmes and told them what they already know. There is a considerable minority abusing that programme and I confirm it again today.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Fisheries care to table any correspondence related to this matter in the House.

MR. CROSBIE: No.

MR. NEARY: No. You have something to hide. It is no proof.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable Member for Labrador North.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Would the minister care to inform the House if construction will commence this summer on the much needed expansion for the Paddon Memorial Hospital in Happy Valley.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the government's hospital programme will be announced at the time of the budget.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador South.

MR. MARTIN: A question for the honourable the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the crisis situation in the elementary school at Forteau where a number of school children were hospitalized the day before yesterday with what is alleged to have been carbon monoxide poisoning. I wonder if he could bring us up to date on what his department

February 28, 1975.

Tape 63

RH - 7

has done in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speculate on the cause or the nature of the illness. Actually the honourable member mentioned this to me Wednesday evening and I told him that I would indeed inform him. Yesterday I was unavoidably absent. I do believe an official of the Department of Education was in touch with him. Yesterday morning I requested the deputy minister to personally have the matter looked into, to get all of the relevant data, also to be assured that the school was closed, which it is, and furthermore to give me assurance that the school would not be reopened until the Department of Education was sure that this was suitable.

I, also, yesterday morning, personally telephoned Dr. Gordon Thomas in St. Anthony who was familiar from the medical point of view. There was a doctor in Forteau when the illnesses occurred and Dr. Thomas was personally familiar with it and indeed some of the young people were in his hospital or had been in St. Anthony Hospital. There were, as of yesterday morning - of course there would not be any now - but as of yesterday morning, there was no child hospitalized as a result of that at that time. In other words, they had been released. Dr. Thomas also informed me that there was no serious illness. I have his concurrence to make that public.

This morning five people left for Forteau, to St. Anthony and then on to Forteau. They are a school engineer, an official from the fire marshall's office, Mr. Hatcher - his is a school under the integrated system, and he is the secretary of that committee - and two non - I would not say non-civil servants - but two other people who are specialists in heating and ventilation. I understand they arrived at St. Anthony some time around noon. They were not then able to leave for Forteau because of fog. Whether they have or not since, I do not know, but certainly five people are on their way there and I can assure the gentleman and the House that certainly the school will not be reopened until we are assured that there is no further danger, and also, we know exactly what was the cause which is a matter of some dispute or lack of knowledge right now.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question if I might. Will the minister undertake to make a public statement on the results of this investigation because I am sure that every parent with a child in a small school is concerned to know exactly - this is the first time to my knowledge we have had this sort of thing ever happen in the province. Would the minister make a public statement? Not just that everything is okay. I have no doubt what should be done will be. Will he make a public statement as to what went wrong so that we can make sure that it does not happen again?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, I certainly will. That may well take a number of days.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. Would the minister care to indicate to the House whether or not the government have registered a protest to Imperial Oil against the increases announced yesterday in gasoline and heating fuel?

HON. L.D. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): We have, Mr. Speaker. Imperial Oil was informed verbally. It will be followed up by a letter. We will also be communicating with the federal minister, Mr. MacDonald, because our government deplores the permission given by Mr. MacDonald, the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to the oil companies to increase their prices, to reflect noncrude cost increases. It is not related to any increase, Mr. Speaker, in the price of crude from Venezuela or the Middle East or anywhere else. This was a request made by the oil companies to the federal minister some time ago. I think over a year ago. Out of the blue, Mr. Speaker, with no apparent great pressure, following a period when immense profit has been made by the oil industry - this is a matter of public knowledge. Everybody in Newfoundland has seen the tremendous profits the companies have been making over the last year to two years. We now see a colleague of the honourable members opposite, party wise in any event, authorizing the wealthy oil companies to increase their prices, to recover, to force up the cost of living in this province and to make even greater profits.

Mr. Speaker, we deplore it. We are against it completely.

We hope that before this session is over we will have the legislation prepared which is now in the hands of the Department of Justice, to require companies, Mr. Speaker, to supply justification for such price increases. We have made it clear that we see no justification for the price increase that was recently announced. Mr. Speaker, we just find it astounding that the people of Canada have not risen up against this Liberal crowd in Ottawa that permitted such an outrage.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware that we have the machinery in this province set up already in the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities to deal with this matter, that all the government has to do is to pass a law in this honourable House to require the oil companies to make their application to the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities? Is the minister aware of that? If the minister is aware of it, why has the government not taken action to put this matter under the control of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities which was brought up in this House almost two years ago?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the only reason the honourable member is aware of the fact that he stated is because I, myself, stated in this honourable House that we are investigating the possibility of having the Public Utilities Board take jurisdiction over this area. At the present time it does not have jurisdiction in this area. If it is to be effective, there is going to be additional staff required. If it is going to be effective, Mr. Speaker, the procedures of the board are going to have to be worked out.

I will say that Mr. Powell and other members of the board, officials of the board, have been co-operating with my department and with the Department of Justice in developing the best procedures to be followed here. We do not want, Mr. Speaker, just to create another bureaucracy or to increase the size of an existing mechanism that will merely be an additional tax burden on the people of the province, or that will merely involve oil companies in red tape which

they will then pass on. The cost of which red tape they will pass on to the consumers. We want, Mr. Speaker, to see a machinery developed that will be effective in keeping down the cost of living as reflected in the cost of petroleum products. So, Mr. Speaker, we are working on this. We are not going to be rushed into it by the honourable member opposite just because he jumps up and says, "Oh, you have to give the Public Utilities Board jurisdiction. That is all it is to it." There is more to it than that, Mr. Speaker. We want to have an effective mechanism that can keep prices as low as possible and to keep the cost of living as low as possible in this province.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister aware that over in our sister province of Nova Scotia, where they have a great Liberal Government, that this kind of legislation has already been passed? Is the minister aware that it is only a matter of his administration copying the legislation brought in by that Liberal Government in Nova Scotia two years ago?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we have been following developments in Nova Scotia. We have also been following developments in British Columbia. We are informed, Mr. Speaker, by officials from Nova Scotia that they are having problems with their legislation, that it is not being as effective as it could be, that it is causing problems never contemplated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, our legislation is not going to follow pitter-patter the legislation of any other province, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when it is legislation that has the support of the honourable member opposite, because then we really have to look at it seriously because there must be some defect.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the honourable minister. Would the honourable minister care to indicate now whether the government has reversed its decision made earlier and pass along the benefits of the new oil tax to the people of Newfoundland in the way of subsidizing gasoline and oil in this province, the increased

February 28, 1975

Tape 64

IB-5

equalization grants of \$10 million or \$12 million that were handed over by the Government of Canada, that Liberal Government up there in Ottawa, this year in this fiscal year as a result of the federal provincial -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I guess what makes it so confusing is that what the honourable member says is half true or half factual.

MR. MURPHY: He is reading Grimms fairy tales.

MR. BARRY: Up to now, Mr. Speaker, the federal government has gotten increased equalization.

MR. NEARY: \$12 million for this province.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the funds have been applied by the federal government to keep the cost of petroleum products in eastern Canada as they have been done voluntarily by the provinces in western Canada, to keep the price of food products below the international price.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard rumblings on the horizon that the friends of the opposition, friends of the honourable members opposite in Ottawa, the Liberal Cabinet in Ottawa, are indicating that there should be an increase, a significant increase, up to the level of two dollars a barrel I think is the figure that is being thrown around, which would be more than six cents a gallon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Which would be more than six cents a gallon, Mr. Speaker. It has been indicated that this is the sort of increase that the Liberal Government in Ottawa is going to be looking at and possibly accepting when the National Energy Conference comes on in April.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, I can tell this honourable House and tell the people of this province that we will be objecting to any such increase which will see a significant rise in the cost to our people who are dependent upon petroleum products for heating their homes, running their automobiles.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal Government in Ottawa thinks that the people of this country will stand for any such disgraceful policies then I would say they have another thing coming.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The thirty minutes have elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Where does the time go?

MR. SPEAKER: A few days ago at least, honourable members, on Opening Day I guess, two honourable members made a resolution, and yesterday I think the honourable member for Bell Island made a resolution, it was a resolution which I took under advisement. The resolution as presented by the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy is in order. It will appear on the Order Paper but it has to appear as a government sponsored motion.

The two resolutions as introduced by the honourable member for St. Barbe North and the honourable Member for Bell Island I am going to suggest to both these honourable members that they make some changes in them and I refer them to page 166 of Beauchesne, section 198, near the bottom of the paragraph which says, "a motion should not be argumentative and in the style of a speech, nor should it contain unnecessary provisions or objectionable words." I find that in both of these resolutions there were some phrases perhaps which could be omitted. I am prepared to accept them if some modifications are made and have them appear on the Order Paper at the point where they were presented in this honourable House.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro-Electric Corporation."

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we have before us today what could in one sense be considered house keeping legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, in another sense I submit that since we are dealing with a corporation that will be directing the policy of this province, that will be assisting government in the formulation of policy for this province in a field of hydro electricity, in a field of meeting the electrical energy requirements of this province, that we are dealing with a very important corporation. Mr. Speaker, it is legislation that has to be considered very seriously. It is not merely a change in name of the power corporation which I believe is the impression that has been given at times either by honourable members opposite or by some members of the media.

It is in effect a completely new act.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Magna Carta.

MR. BARRY: Which while it does continue, the existing power corporation, because obviously that has to be done, Mr. Speaker, with the bond indentures that the corporation is obligated to with the borrowing and the commitments that corporation has. That corporation has to be continued, Mr. Speaker, and this legislation does do that.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have a complete review of the relationship between the power corporation, what will now be called the new Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro-Electric Corporation, and government. There are many sections, Mr. Speaker, that I will not go through in detail now but we will get to in Committee of the Whole, I am sure, that deal with this relationship between government and the Crown Corporation. In a moment I will be discussing briefly the relationship between government and Crown Corporations. You always have the problem of who is going to be calling the shots and to what extent must government continue to exercise control? In what areas is it essential that government exercise control in order to ensure that decisions are being made according to the wishes of the people?

Unless government calls the shots, Mr. Speaker, ultimately, then it is not going to be the people who are calling the shots because the people do not elect the officials of the Power Corporation. They elect members of government and therefore, Mr. Speaker, control has to be kept in the hands of government when you are talking about the disposition of the taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, to a certain extent I am unsure as to how far afield I should go, remaining relevant of course to this legislation, but really the act opens up the entire energy field to us. On the assumption that the opposition want to see a wide ranging and full debate of the energy policy of our government, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a few brief minutes to discuss our

province's energy policy generally. I will not go into as much detail as I could go into, but perhaps I will be able to answer any questions that the honourable members opposite might have when I rise to end the debate.

But, I would like to give an overview of our province's energy picture, an overview of the energy policy which our government believes is necessary. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that

while a considerable amount of work, time and effort has gone into the preparation of this legislation -

MR. NEARY: A point of information, Sir. We do not object to the wide-ranging debate on the province's energy policy, but we want the same privilege on this side when speaking in the debate, wide-ranging debate.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am sure the honourable member is aware that the Chair would have to rule on relevancy as it arises.

MR. BARRY: I think the honourable member was either absent, or asleep, Mr. Speaker, when I just made my statement that the reason I am going to take an overview of the situation, the energy situation, is with the assumption that the opposition want to have a wide-ranging debate on the energy policy, remaining relevant, of course, Mr. Speaker, to this legislation. Really, it is legislation that is fundamental to our province's energy picture and, therefore, I submit, that the debate could be fairly wide.

If I may continue, Mr. Speaker, I have lost my place here now, but maybe if I could just have a moment to get back to where I was. Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to just briefly review the history of hydro-electric developments in the province. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the annual report of the Power Corporation has a lot of good information contained in there that the honourable members opposite, I am sure, will have read, will have noted, the Power Commission, which became a corporation in 1974.

MR. NEARY: No, not until we make it law in this House here.

MR. BARRY: I think the honourable member is a little confused. It was legislation last year that went through the House to change it from a power commission to a power corporation. That is when we removed the Liberal appointees, the political appointees, and created a corporation, with a board of directors.

Mr. Speaker, the early development of the electric utility business in this province was a regional development, and you had transmission lines, and electrical generation, growing up around the centres of population, St. John's, Corner Brook, Buchans, and so on, either where the people were, or where industrial developments were. By the end of World War II, you had concentrated electrical power facilities in seven isolated pockets, from St. John's to Port-aux-Basques, and in Goose Bay, Labrador. By the late 1950's, steps had been taken to correct this situation, and I must say that one of the more enlightened policies of the previous administration was to eventually get an island-wide transmission system, to construct a strong transmission grid to inter-connect all major generating facilities and load centres on the island.

Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that this only happened back in the 1960's. As a matter of fact when I first came back from law school, one of the first things I had an opportunity to get involved in was the amalgamation of what is now Newfoundland Light and Power Corporation. When you had all these small power companies amalgamate, this in itself was another step to this unification of all these isolated systems that we had around the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: Then we had the development of the Bay D'Espoir and the 450 megawatt plant at Bay D'Espoir. Load growths from before, Bay D'Espoir, being around six per cent a year increase, immediately doubled once this large source of power became available. They doubled to an average of twelve-point-five per cent and went up to as much as a nineteen per cent increase, which we had in 1969, and an even greater increase in this past year. We had the addition of the 300 megawatt thermo generating station at Holyrood, and by the late 1960's, we saw facilities completed that would see the province through to the late 1970's.

Mr. Speaker, we are now at the stage where we have to start planning, not for next year's energy needs, and not for the year after, but for the needs of our province in the 1980's. We have to look ahead, ten, fifteen, twenty years, and take action, develop a policy that will see the energy needs of our province in the 1980's being met.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this past year, you have seen our government take steps that will ensure that the energy needs of our province will be met, not just in the 1970's, I submit, not even just in the 1980's, but well into the 1990's. Mr. Speaker, you have seen fantastic steps being taken; you have seen fantastic developments made; you have seen a significant energy policy developed. The opposition tend to say that this is a do-nothing government, that this government have not had any new ideas, that this government have not developed any new policies. Mr. Speaker, I submit, that the greatest decision ever made by any government in this province in terms of the effect on the future of the people of our province, will be recognized as the decision of the Moores' Government, the decision of this government, to bring the island of Newfoundland onto a transmission grid with Labrador so that we can see the development of the hydro-electric potential of Labrador for the benefit of all our people, for the benefit of all our people, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Dunphy): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Here we have, Mr. Speaker, an example of the obfuscation, an example of the deception, an example of the hypocrisy, the scandalous attempts by the opposition, by others for their own political ends, to obscure the fact that this government said that there will be no development of the Gull Island site, unless it benefits the people of Labrador as well as the people of the island of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, even in the last week, we have seen statements in a certain newspaper, which I will not mention, a certain nameless newspaper, that unfortunately we still have no clear statement from this government as to whether any power will be available to Labrador. Mr. Speaker, that is pure garbage, nonsense. That is complete deceit, complete deceit.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we have set out from day one, even when we were negotiating with BRINCO, that we would not agree to any proposal of BRINCO that did not include a transmission line from the Gull Island site to the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area. Mr. Speaker, following the purchase of Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation, and that in itself was not a minor decision to take, not totally unrelated, Mr. Speaker, to meeting the future energy needs of our province -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: - Mr. Speaker, that decision to take back control of our hydro potential, and to take control of the Upper Churchill so that we could develop the Lower Churchill is going to be recognized, and I submit is recognized today by the majority of the people of our province, as being one of the great enlightened decisions of this century in our province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have reasserted clearly, without any doubt, over the last year, since the feasibility of bringing power from Labrador was confirmed, we have reasserted that there will be a transmission line hooking the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area into the Gull Island site, and in turn hooking this into the Upper Churchill, and in turn hooking all this into the island grid, and in turn hooking all that into an eastern Canadian grid, through Quebec, since we already have the transmission lines from the Upper Churchill to Quebec, thereby, Mr. Speaker, in one fell swoop ending the isolation of the province, ending the isolation of the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area, from an electrical energy

point of view, and tying us into a grid, Mr. Speaker, which will permit the exchange of energy, which will permit, when one area of the grid is peaking and the other is not, to have an exchange of energy, which will by doing that, Mr. Speaker, mean that less capital investment is needed in order to meet the needs of everybody.

Mr. Speaker, really, I am just giving you the details of what is the major policy direction of this government in terms of meeting the future energy needs of our province well into the 1990's, as I have said. And that policy decision, Mr. Speaker, was that, if feasible, we would tie in the hydro-electric potential of Labrador into an island grid and into an eastern Canadian grid.

Mr. Speaker, I think so much has happened in the last year, I do not think people really realize just how fantastically fortunate our province was that the Teshmont, Zinder Study of which this is the summary in just one volume - there are another four volumes about this thick - how tremendously fortunate our province has been that this study confirmed the feasibility of bringing hydro-electric energy from Labrador to the Island of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, we would have a dim future indeed if this imaginative vision of this government had not been confirmed.

What would we be looking at, Mr. Speaker, today if this feasibility study had turned out to be negative, if the indication was that it was not feasible to bring the power across? What would we be looking at? We would be looking at putting in more thermal plants, Mr. Speaker, putting in thermal plants, relying on petroleum products supplied by people in the Middle East or in Venezuela, the price of which we had no control over, absolutely none. Our province would be completely at the mercy of the sheiks of Araby or the Venezuelans or anybody else that we were buying our petroleum from.

Mr. Speaker, our government said, "We do not want to see that dependence." Our government said, "We do not want to see our developments stultified, our province become stagnant because we have to put in energy sources of fantastic cost leading to great increases in the cost of energy, leading to increases in the cost of living of our people." No, Mr. Speaker, we said that we must, if there is any possible way, develop the great hydro-electric potential of Labrador for the benefit of all the people of our province. Mr. Speaker, that is our energy policy. I submit, Mr. Speaker, perhaps a simple policy but a very important policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, is that all we have done? Just state the policy and do nothing else?

MR. NEARY: Just carried on with the policy of the former administration.

MR. BARRY: Let us talk a bit about the policy of the former administration. Mr. Speaker, as I said, I do not think many people

in the province realize just how tremendously fortunate we were to have the feasibility of this project confirmed. Mr. Speaker, there is something else I do not think people realize. I do not think that the people of our province realize just how significant, how fantastically significant this decision by the federal government was a little over a week ago when they decided that they would supply \$343 million towards the cost of bringing the transmission line from Labrador underneath the Strait of Belle Isle to the province.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Great Liberal Government.

MR. BARRY: A loan, Mr. Speaker, a loan, not a handout, a loan. Hard, cold cash that this province is going to have to pay back but on fairly favourable terms, Mr. Speaker, on terms that make it less costly to the province than having to go to the private money lenders. The Ottawa money lenders are a little bit more conscious of the need to keep their rates down and so on. It is a loan, Mr. Speaker. The people will have to pay it back, but our people are prepared to accept this. If that is all that they will give us, if we will only get a loan from them, well, we will have to try and make do. It is going to be difficult.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that I do not think people remember just how long this idea of an Upper Churchill was battered around and how many times the idea came up and was kicked down as being unfeasible, never happen, never happen. Mr. Speaker, it took years and years and years. Honourable members opposite can probably tell me. What? Five years? Six years? Ten years? Fifteen?

MR. NEARY: It took ten years. The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Justice -

MR. BARRY: Probably fifteen years.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries, all involved.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, what did you see in the cast of the Lower Churchill? You saw this government start from scratch with an idea, with a concept and say, "We must prove the feasibility of this." In 1973, Mr. Speaker, the feasibility study was commissioned,

and now at the beginning of 1975, less than two years later, Mr. Speaker, not only do we have this project confirmed as feasible, we also, Mr. Speaker, have the federal government prepared to lash out \$343 million loan on the basis of the project plus the interest which will bring the federal loan up to in excess of \$400 million, \$424 million, is it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could inform the House if the development of the Lower Churchill would be possible if the Upper Churchill had not been developed?

MR. DOODY: It is all the one river.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, it is not. That is where you are wrong.

MR. BARRY: If the Upper Churchill had not been developed, Mr. Speaker, this government would have seen that it was developed in two years and then we would have had power for this province at a rate of three or four mils for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, not for Quebec which is the province getting the benefit right now.

MR. NEARY: That was a little bit different.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is getting at a good point, that it is necessary to control the Upper Churchill in order to be able to develop the Lower Churchill. Mr. Speaker, that happened to be the next point on my list here because this is the reason why this government took the step that it did in purchasing control of Churchill Falls, Labrador Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the Lower Churchill development could not get underway until our province controlled the Upper Churchill and until our province controlled the water rights of Labrador. Mr. Speaker, this was all brought out during the debate on the BRINCO legislation. So, I will not go through it all again. I will just point out that both the Churchill Falls Plant and the Gull Island Installation are on a single river system that will require an integrated operation for maximum utilization of the available water. Only by unified ownership, Mr. Speaker, could we ensure that this integration took place efficiently.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the scheduling of the facilities at Gull Island must be co-ordinated with the developments on the upper part of the river. We must have intimate knowledge of the system at the Upper Churchill so that we can develop the Lower Churchill. So, Mr. Speaker, once we decided that we had to develop the hydro-electric potential of Labrador, and once we found that we were being blocked in this policy, in this imaginative, creative policy by the fact that a previous administration had given away control to a private company, Mr. Speaker, this government had no hesitation, It saw its duty. It saw what the next step had to be and it said that we must gain control of Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation and it did, Mr. Speaker.

Now, that took a considerable amount of work and time, Mr. Speaker, because it is all very well to say that we would take control of the company, but there is no point in having a company on paper. It is the people with the company that make the operation tick. You have got to have the records. You have got to have the computer records and so on, Mr. Speaker. An unbelievable amount of time has been spent in the past several years ensuring that we maintain that we keep as many of the excellent employees of Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation as possible to attract as many of the employees that BRINCO had as possible.

We have been fantastically successful in that respect, Mr. Speaker. I mention only one. There are many others that I might mention, but Mr. Jack Beaver, former Operations Manager on site at Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation and now President of CFLCo, a fantastically capable individual, Mr. Speaker, and this province has been fantastically lucky in keeping his services.

But it was more than luck, Mr. Speaker, and here I have to mention the great efforts of the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Development in developing the necessary personal relationships with these gentlemen, Mr. Speaker. To ensure that we maintain their services as much as possible.

MR. NEARY: I thought the Minister of Fisheries took credit for all this.

MR. BARRY: The then Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker, did yeoman work, yeoman work, Mr. Speaker in ensuring that this programme was carried to fruition and it was a sweet day indeed, Mr. Speaker, when the news broke to the people of this province that we had control of CFLCo and the hydro rights of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone around the province a lot since then and you know, I think there is only the voice of one individual which has been recorded as being in opposition to this policy and I suspect that that was a bit on the spur of the moment, Mr. Speaker, and on reflection I am sure that even that gentleman would recognize the value of taking the steps we did, a mistake of the heart.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of this is relevant to the existing legislation because what we are doing here, Mr. Speaker, with the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act, is to set up a corporation which will co-ordinate the efforts, not just of the existing Power Corporation, the old Power Commission on the island, and not just Churchill Falls, Labrador Corporation, although that in itself would have meant a reorganization would be necessary. The fact that this year we have control of CFLCo, whereas last year we did not,

means that we have to co-ordinate; we cannot have two corporations that are essential to meeting our energy needs. We cannot have those two going off without one paying attention to the other. We cannot have them unco-ordinated. We have to tie them in, Mr. Speaker, to make sure there is no conflict of policy.

So the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro-Electric Corporation, Mr. Speaker, will have responsibility both for the Power Corporation on the island, it will in effect become the new Power Corporation. It will also, Mr. Speaker, have responsibility for Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation. CFLCo will in all probability, it is not worked out yet, but will in all probability be a subsidiary of the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro-Electric Corporation. Mr. Speaker, there will also be a corporation, the Gull Island Power Corporation, to develop the Lower Churchill, the Gull Island site. This also, Mr. Speaker, this corporation also must be co-ordinated with the other energy related corporations on the island.

MR. NEARY: Is that a corporation of BRINCO or a combination of BRINCO and Shaheen?

MR. BARRY: This, Mr. Speaker, will be a Crown Corporation, a provincially owned Crown Corporation to develop the Lower Churchill River.

MR. NEARY: Who bargained for power?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, could I have some control on the honourable member opposite there? Could we bring out a muzzle or some such?

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: I drink a lot of water. It will be necessary, Mr. Speaker, prior to the time when the Gull Island site is developed, it will be necessary for us to bring on an energy source in the interim to meet our needs until 1980-81 when we expect the energy from the Gull Island site to be flowing to the island.

Mr. Speaker, quite recently an announcement was made that we would be expanding the Bay D'Espoir Plant to help us first of all meet the peaking requirements that will be needed prior to the Gull Island site coming on stream, and this will supply 154 megawatts, Mr. Speaker, additional to the island system but it will not supply any additional energy, Mr. Speaker. Merely putting another unit at Bay D'Espoir does not increase the amount of water that is available to flow through the units. It does not increase the amount of energy that is stored up in the reservoir.

Mr. Speaker, we have announced that we are taking another step as well, and that is the Lloyds River Diversion Project where we will be diverting water from the Lloyds River to run it down through the Bay D'Espoir reservoir, thereby increasing the amount of energy as well available to the island.

Mr. Speaker, this we expect to have completed in time to meet the requirements of 1977-78 when, based on existing projections of load growth and so on, it looks as if we will need additional facilities. Already, Mr. Speaker, we have had to bring in gas turbines to meet the peaking requirements at particular times and there will be additional gas turbines as well as the Bay D'Espoir project extension needed before 1980.

The total cost in 1974 dollars of these various projects which will be needed to meet our energy needs until Gull Island power is flowing to the island, will be \$72 million, in excess of \$74 million, Mr. Speaker, of which the Bay D'Espoir unit seven is close to \$40 million, the Lloyds River Diversion another \$7 million, that is \$47 million. So another \$20 million to \$25 million, Mr. Speaker, will have to be spent on gas turbines.

Now these, of course, will not be obsolete once the Gull Island power comes on, they will still be available for emergency backup on the island to meet peaking and so on. But, Mr. Speaker, you can see there is significant activity required by our power corporation, by our new hydro corporation, to meet our energy needs.

In addition to building the Lower Churchill River there are significant projects which must be carried out in the interim.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: I am developing a little laryngitis I think.

AN HON. MEMBER: You should.

MR. BARRY: Do not be nasty now.

Mr. Speaker, if I just could give you a few of the reasons why this Lower Churchill development is such a beautiful concept, and why everything has clicked, Mr. Speaker, since our government had the imagination to put this on the rails. I think this explains really, Mr. Speaker, why we have had such a fast response from the federal government, the fact that we went about it in a businesslike manner. We were organized, Mr. Speaker, and we set out and we showed, Mr. Speaker, not only that this project was viable but also, Mr. Speaker, that it complimented, it complimented the policies of the federal government with respect to 1) lessening dependence upon foreign supplies and energy products, and 2) Mr. Speaker, it complimented the federal policy of allievating regional disparity.

Mr. Speaker, I will give you some indications of the reasons why the Gull Island development will help meet the needs of the Province. First of all, it will be the power of lowest costs, Mr. Speaker. It is our cheapest alternative in terms of obtaining power for the future. Secondly, it will provide security of supply, as compared with having to depend upon fossil fuel, Mr. Speaker, supplied from foreign countries. Third, it will minimize the effect of escalation on the Province's economy and on the individual consumer, Mr. Speaker, because once this power is hooked into a transmission system, the price of the water is not going to increase as would the price of a fossil fuel. Fourth, Mr. Speaker, it permits conservation of a nonrenewable resource from its conservation of petroleum products instead of using them up more and more to burn when, as the Shah of Iran likes to point out, it is really a waste of good oil to burn it when you can make plastics and textiles and fantastic numbers of products from these nonrenewable resources.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this Gull Island project will provide an extension to the interprovincial transmission system. It is a major national project and not just a provincial project, in that it will tie in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador to an Eastern Canadian grid, Mr. Speaker. That will mean advantages for our neighbours in Eastern Canada as well as for us.

These are some of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we knew we were on to a good thing. These were some of the reasons that we stressed with the Federal Government, Mr. Speaker, and why we have seen progress being made in this area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of questions, I suppose, that will be raised. I will not try and anticipate all of them. There will be, I am sure, questions about the escalation in cost of the Gull Island project, and the accuracy of the estimates and so on. I have a lot of information on this which I will be only too happy to supply to honourable members opposite or anybody for that matter. It is a very complicated and involved

thing, Mr. Speaker, and I hope I am not giving the impression that it is a simple thing. I hope the opposition recognizes this in the questions that they ask and the replies they expect to get. When you talk about cost, for example, Mr. Speaker, the initial cost as set out in the initial feasibility study was \$1.2 billion. Mr. Speaker, that included interest during construction and that included factors for escalation, assumptions about escalation, There are certain rates every year, Mr. Speaker. In effect, the actual cost of building the project itself - if it could be built in one year, say, in the 1974 dollars - the actual cost of the Gull Island project at the time the report was completed was something less than \$1 billion, about \$900 million, if you leave out interest during construction and escalation and so on.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that if you add up the cost of supplying the same amount of energy or the energy that we will need, if you add up the cost of supplying it either by coal fired plants and nuclear plants, a combination of them which was the next best alternative, or the cost of building fossil fuel thermal plants relying upon crude, bunker C, you will find, Mr. Speaker, that the total cost of the coal fired and nuclear plant is almost \$900 million, almost as much as the capital cost of Gull Island. You will also find, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of building the required thermal plant is not much less than that.

The only advantage you have, if it is an advantage, and it is not, would be that you could stage in your capital investment. You could build one thermal plant in a couple of years time, and another thermal plant in another three or four years, and so on and you would be building a number of plants, whereas here you cannot build a half of a dam, Mr. Speaker, you cannot build half a transmission line. You build the whole thing at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, just consider with the capital cost over the ten years or fifteen years, whatever the period we are looking at in terms of meeting our energy needs, if you consider that once the Gull Island plant is there, then there is going to be no escalation in the cost of the water, but the

fact that you built a coal fired plant or a nuclear plant or a plant relying upon bunker C, that does not mean that you are not into then considerable expense and cost for purchasing your fuel. It most certainly does. Here is what you have to weigh off, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand you have the greater initial capital investment of Gull Island, or any hydro development. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, you have the fact that operating costs and maintenance are almost negligible once the thing is constructed. That is the problem. It is a matter of getting the proper balance and working out the benefits from each.

Mr. Speaker, I think anybody who goes through this feasibility study will be assured that the step we are taking in developing the Gull Island power site is the step to take at this time in our Province's history. Mr. Speaker, I submit, really there is very little choice that we have because our other choice would be to say that we are going to suppress the amount of power that we are going to use; we are going to increase costs in order to ration the quantities of energy used by our people; we are going to slow down the rate of development, whether it be commercial or industrial development, within our Province in order to regulate the number of these thermal plants or coal fired plants, or whatever, that we have to build.

Mr. Speaker, with the development of Gull Island we will have a large source of energy. We will have a source of energy, Mr. Speaker, to meet the energy needs of our Province into the 1990's. Mr. Speaker, there are one or two things that I would like to get into with respect to Gull Island where we have had a lot of questions raised. One is with respect to the tunnel crossing itself. We have had a lot of controversy, a lot of questions as to - well, why not build a transportation tunnel? - let us build a transportation tunnel - let us not just have a power tunnel.

Well, first of all, Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize that we should not confuse transportation priorities and energy priorities. Now, I have satisfied myself, my department is satisfied, the power corporation, its advisers have satisfied themselves that in terms of our

Province's energy priorities, Gull Island is the answer and a power tunnel underneath the Strait of Bell Isle is the answer. But is the \$120 million or \$150 million additional that would be required for a transportation tunnel and the rolling stock and so on that would have to go into it, is that the priority for that money in the transportation area? Well, I am overlapping into my colleague, the Minister of Transportation and Communications field right there, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it does not necessarily follow, that because a power tunnel is our immediate priority in terms of meeting our energy needs, that accordingly a transportation tunnel is also the priority in terms of our transportation needs.

For example, should this \$150 million be spent on a power tunnel instead of on a Trans Labrador Highway? Or on paving the Great Northern Peninsula Highway? Or on other transportation priorities and needs in the Province? Now, Mr. Speaker, in

my personal opinion, a transportation tunnel is going to come. You know, it is an idea whose time has come. The power tunnel shows that it is feasible. It is purely going to be a question of when do you put your capital investment in there, invest that amount of money? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that maybe the immediate amount of traffic that you could foresee in such a tunnel might not justify, and I am just saying 'might'. I am speculating. It is not my area of expertise but I am saying, 'might' not justify the construction of that transportation tunnel at this time. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, when there does not appear to be any economic advantage or gain from building the two at the same time. In one sense the power tunnel could be taken as a pilot tunnel for the transportation tunnel. You will probably save costs. I know you will save costs. In the eventual construction of a transportation tunnel from what you learn and construct in the power tunnel. In many cases in this type of project they actually construct a pilot tunnel before they get involved into a transportation tunnel.

There are a lot of developments in this tunnelling field, Mr. Speaker, a lot of expertise, a lot of detail I could go into and I will not at this time unless the honourable members opposite have questions. But representatives from the Power Corporation have visited sites, for example, in Japan where they have constructed tunnels the same length as this one, the same size approximately, with

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: No. The actual tunnel itself will be approximately just under twelve miles, eleven-something miles, but that is including certain access from either side. The actual sea crossing is not that - what is it? Nine or ten miles?

AN HON. MEMBER: Nine miles.

MR. F. ROWE: Nine miles, the Strait of Belle Isle. It is not exactly at the narrowest point -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: From Yankee Point to Pointe Amour.

MR. MURPHY: Yankee-doodle.

MR. BARRY: But, Mr. Speaker, this is just what I would call a red herring that has grown into, or become involved into the discussion of this particular topic. What we are talking about, what we are trying to analyze here is the best way of meeting our province's energy needs. What should be our priority in the energy field?

Now I submit that to confuse our transportation priorities with our energy priorities-- it can lead to confusion, it can lead possibly to a delay in getting the project underway, I do not know. I know it will lead to a confusion. It will lead to the public not being as informed as they should be about this very important project. Our policy purely and simply is, full disclosure.

We have released the feasibility report. It has been made available to the opposition, I guess for over one year now. So they must really have had plenty of time to study it. I am sure they will have a lot of interesting comments to make on it.

But our policy, Mr. Speaker, is one of full disclosure. I mentioned the questions raised about the tunnel merely to try and avoid what I see as a possible area of confusion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just briefly discuss crown corporations generally, since this is what we are dealing with here. We are talking about legislation to set up a crown corporation to be responsible for advising government on electrical energy policy, Mr. Speaker. (If I can just find my notes here, if I could have a moment). I have, Mr. Speaker, some comments that are very pertinent to this. Comments that come from the Task Force Report that was carried out in Ontario, Task Force Hydro. It is called hydro in Ontario, a future role and place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this report they go into the concept of the crown corporation. (If I can find it here, I will only be too happy to share their views). Yes, Mr. Speaker, (they quote) "Why do we have crown corporations? What is the purpose of a crown corporation?" Well in a crown corporation, Mr. Speaker, to quote from this report

"We cease to combine the principle of public accountability of a consciousness on the part of the undertaking that it is working for the nation, for the people and not for sectional interests with the liveliness, initiative and a considerable degree of the freedom of a quick moving and a progressive business enterprise." In other words, the idea is that to have an actual department of government within a department of government with the civil service requirements and the requirements of treasury board and so on, that that in some way will impede its ability to act as a profit making effective, efficient business.

On the other hand, and the honourable member opposite stressed this point, it is a good point, on the other hand, when the taxpayers dollar is going in to such a corporation then it must be accountable to the public. This means it must be accountable to government, that is in turn accountable to the people.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most difficult things that I have found since being in the Department of Mines and Energy as minister, to get clear (even in my own mind) to get consensus as to what the relationship should be between, not just the power corporation, the hydro corporation, but between any crown corporation and the department of government. Because it is all very well on the one hand to say, well the corporation must report to the minister. But unless the minister, unless the department has the ability to analyze what is coming out of the crown corporation, to analyze the decisions, unless it has the ability, and that means the information, to assess what is coming out of the corporation and re the accountability as the accountability in name only or controlled by the minister is, I submit, very tenuous, because -

MR. NEARY: In Ontario they have one minister -

MR. BARRY: My heavens, Mr. Speaker, I have surveyed across Canada and around the world and the ways that they try and do this, everybody has tried something different. I do not think anybody is satisfied. The Ontario government and the public in Ontario are criticizing government because they say, Ontario Hydro is a government in itself. It is virtually running the province because of the difficulty again

in having the proper control by government. So they have decided that they have to make a new start. Over the last year I understand there has been changing relationships there. They have some good ideas, Mr. Speaker. I might mention one that is not contained in this legislation but will be, we hope, brought in before too long. And again I know the honourable member in a week's time is going to be up asking a question as to why we have not done this. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not mind. We have good ideas. We believe in making the public aware of them.

In Ontario one of the things they have done, Mr. Speaker, to increase the degree of public accountability is, in a question, say of rate increases or in the question of cost controls by the hydro corporation, they require the corporation to justify, Mr. Speaker, rate increases and costs and so on to an energy board. They have an energy board set up which is not a government department, it is almost a consumer type board. Before there is a rate increase, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: There is consumer representation, and also there is provision for public hearings, Mr. Speaker.

Now our government have decided that this will be a good thing and that we should go this route. But, Mr. Speaker, you might ask, okay why do we not have it in the legislation that is before the House today? Just because, Mr. Speaker, we do not anticipate that the corporation will be in a position to do this, to prepare for this sort of public dialogue in debate and so on, for six months, maybe a year

until it gets its reorganization completed, until it gets these major projects underway and with proper controls, such as Gull Island, such as getting the finalization of the status of CFLCo completed. We have to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that we have limited resources within the province and limited resources within the hydro corporation, and that we think it is only fair - we have given them notice that we will be going this route - but we have decided that it is only fair that we hold off taking this step until they have had an opportunity to get organized, to get their board of directors appointed and in operation, to get Gull Island going and so on.

Mr. Speaker, we go on record as saying that we believe there is an necessity - just as in the case of a private utility, we submit that the public should have the opportunity of questioning the public utility. Mr. Speaker, whereas up to now there has not been that opportunity, this is a policy which we intend to see implemented, as I say, probably within six months to a year. The reasons I have given for not including it in this legislation, I believe, are reasonable, but of course, honourable members opposite may disagree.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we went into great detail in speaking with our neighbors in other provinces as to the form the corporation should have, as to whether there should be a board of directors; as to whether there should be a chairman of the board separate from the president of the corporation; whether there should be representation from government, either from the public service or elected representatives on the board. Many of these questions, Mr. Speaker, we do not say that we have satisfied ourselves completely beyond a shadow of a doubt, that we are making the right decisions on.

As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of work and effort and time put into this legislation, but, Mr. Speaker, we are not saying that we have a closed mind and that in every sense we

will fight for it, and we will take as a vote of nonconfidence in, Mr. Speaker. What we are saying is that this is good legislation, but let us have ideas from the opposition or from any honourable members and, Mr. Speaker, we will consider them. They will be considered. I am not saying they will all be necessarily accepted, Mr. Speaker. I am sure they will not. We will keep an open mind on any aspect of this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Two areas of particular significance in dealing with the relationship between a crown corporation and government is one with respect to budgeting and financing. As I say, as long as there are public funds going into the corporation, then the government has to be accountable to the people for these funds. That in turn means the corporation must be accountable. Mr. Speaker, in this legislation the way we have done it is that we require the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council for the annual budget of the corporation, and we require annual reporting by the corporation.

Another area, Mr. Speaker, where quite frankly there will be problems - there have been in the past and there will continue to be - is in the area of personnel policy. There is a danger, Mr. Speaker, that you can have your crown corporations ending up with pension plan, salaries, whatever. You can have government being bled white of its best public servants because the salaries or the opportunities offered by a crown corporation are set at a level higher than the opportunities within government, paid for out of government funds.

This will continue to be a problem, Mr. Speaker, even with the new hydro corporation because the corporation in turn has to try and set salary levels and so on that will prevent its employees being bled away from it to either the public utilities in the province or other utilities outside the province. An electrical engineer has a lot of mobility. If he can get better salaries somewhere else, there will be an attraction for him to go.

We are not saying that we have all the answers, Mr. Speaker, It is a matter of keeping the proper balance. The way we see this being controlled as much as it can be, or the way we see the best relationship developing between government and the corporation here, is to have certain policy directives issued from government to the board of the corporation. The board of the corporation is given the ability, given the power, to hire and fire, to determine standards of employment and so on.

MR. NEARY: Answerable only to the government.

MR. BARRY: Answer to the government who is in turn answerable to this House.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: No, Mr. Speaker, the minister reports to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

Mr. Speaker, we see the way that this is being carried out by way of policy directives that would go from government to the board of the corporation and, in effect, power of government then is that if the board does not comply with the policy directives of government, then the board will be flung out, dismissed, fired.

MR. DOODY: Ostracized.

MR. BARRY: Ostracized.

AN HON. MEMBER: Expelled.

MR. NEARY: Political, political.

MR. BARRY: In that way, Mr. Speaker, we hope to see proper control by government.

MR. NEARY: It should be like the Workmen's Compensation Board, the minister reports to the House. The minister should report for the Power Corporation to the House and not to the government.

MR. BARRY: Oh, the honourable member is out to lunch again.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not out to lunch.

MR. BARRY: The Workmen's Compensation Board, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: It is responsible to this House.

MR. BARRY: - is an area where there are no government funds going

in, Mr. Speaker. What is going in there are payments by employees and employers, Mr. Speaker. It is not your normal crown corporation, Mr. Speaker, It is an entity onto itself. It is like he is talking about apples and oranges, Mr. Speaker, two different things.

MR. NEARY: It is open to abuse.

MR. BARRY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is open to abuse and yes, there is a danger of political patronage. Mr. Speaker, I put this government's record on the line in comparison with the government that the honourable member opposite belonged to.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: I will put this government's record on the line with respect to appointing political hacks to the board of crown corporations, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: I will compare, Mr. Speaker, the record of this government with the record of any government -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - that the honourable member opposite was in.

MR. NEARY: We have not had a Roberts' Administration yet.

MR. MURPHY: You are not likely to, either.

MR. EVANS: You never will.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, can a leopard change its spots?

MR. NEARY: If we had a Crosbie Administration in this province -

MR. CROSBIE: If we did, it would be a far different province.

MR. BARRY: So, Mr. Speaker, you will see somewhat more independence in hiring and firing and in budgeting given to this new corporation.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: But, Mr. Speaker, we hope at the same time to have the proper degree of control by government over this corporation. Another

thing that you might notice, Mr. Speaker, in going through this legislation is that obviously since it will be controlling CFLCo, and being involved in the Gull Island project, that this new corporation will have jurisdiction province wide. Unlike the old power corporation where jurisdiction was limited to the island of Newfoundland, this body will have jurisdiction province wide.
Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, another area that I should draw to the attention of the honourable member's opposite is with respect to the Auditor General, and the function of the Auditor General, the relationship of the Auditor General. There have been problems, Mr. Speaker, in the past, where the Auditor General had the responsibility for the auditing and the -

MR. ROBERTS: He never had the Power Commission - Peat, Marwick.

MR. BARRY: No, he had to be in there as well. Peat, Marwick, are the corporations accountants, as required under the trust indenture where they require auditors, I think the wording is, of international reput or whatever.

Mr. Speaker, what we provided for, there was discussion, well, should the Auditor General be involved at all?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. BARRY:

Well, this was my impression. There were other opinions. The same debate has gone on in other provinces with respect to auditor generals and crown corporations generally. Mr. Speaker, the solution we set upon was giving the corporation the power to appoint its auditors which it has to do under its trust indentures anyhow, but also requiring that the Auditor General be supplied with working papers and so on as needed and that the Auditor General has at any time the power to go in there and carry out any investigations or audits that he thinks necessary.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this, we think, reaches the proper balance, at least we hope it does, between giving the corporation a businesslike ability to proceed efficiently with protecting the public interest and requiring the corporation to account to the Province, account to the people, account to this honourable House for its spending, for its dealing with public funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could just have a moment here to see what I have omitted or what I have not covered. I think I have touched on most of the major...

MR. WOODWARD: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: I am sorry. What is that, Mel? What did I miss?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Oh! The bill, we will talk about the bill in committee, Mr. Speaker. I do not think there is any need unless the opposition opposite would like to see me get involved in it, nor do I want to belabour this honourable House with the rest of the magnificent tidings in the energy field that I have to hand out. I will, however, go into detail in any areas that the honourable members opposite would like to see elaboration on. For now, though, maybe somebody else would like to have a few words. My throat is gone. Thank you.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, no, I want to spare the Christian charity.

I will not say what I was going to say about the minister's throat.

Let me, first of all, Mr. Speaker, thank the minister for what he

did say, the information he gave.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Frightened the Premier out of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Anybody can frighten the Premier out of the House. The House Leader can, the opposition can, his constituents can, CBC will on tonight's news. I urge Your Honour to be sure to see the national news at six thirty tonight for another example of glaring government patronage. Where is Fabian O'Dea now that we need him? That is the catch word.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House is allegedly a bill to set up a crown corporation. I suppose allegedly is not the most accurate word there. It is a bill to set up a crown corporation to carry out certain purposes, and those purposes, broadly speaking, are to develop hydro-electric power in every part of this Province and then to distribute hydro-electric power in every part of this Province, although it is envisaged that they may not have an exclusive role in the distribution of power.

The debate, however, Sir, and I think Your Honour has done the wise thing in allowing the debate to be a little broader than strictly speaking the very narrow principle of the bill. The debate, hopefully, and the minister began on this note and I would hope that we could carry on. I do not think we are being irrelevant, Sir. We are not being irrelevant to the issue under discussion. It may be difficult to relate some of the comments which honourable members on either side will make to the precise clauses of the bill, but after all this is a debate. It is the first chance that we have had in the House to discuss the old question of the Lower Churchill and the Upper Churchill and the government's policy with respect to hydro-electric power.

Let me, first of all, Sir, make a few preliminary remarks with respect to the bill itself, the proposed act. I will come back to these in detail and perhaps I could begin by saying that my colleagues and I have no real quarrel with the thought of a crown corporation being set up to develop hydro power and even to distribute it.

I do not think that is a very unusual statement for us to make. After all, it was the Liberal Administration with Mr. Smallwood as Premier which first set up crown corporations for this purpose back in the early sixties. I realize the minister went through the chronology. He may or may not have stressed some of the highlights. He may have tried a little political gymnastics. If so, he doubtless did not succeed or he never has, but the fact remained, that in the early sixties in this province there was established and accepted the principle that the government of the province through a public agency, and the crown corporation form was chosen, the government of the province would take the responsibility for the development of further hydro-electric power on the island. The government also became involved in the distribution of power through the rural electrification authorities.

I said they were crown corporations. I am not sure in law whether they actually have the status of a corporation. I do not know if there was a corporate form with shares being issued and so forth. In any event, the point is a very minor one. The distinction is largely irrelevant. They were public bodies appointed by cabinet, by the government, answerable to the cabinet and thus to the House. They were financed by public funds and they accounted to the public for what they did or did not do.

Of course, what they did was develop power. There has been no new power generation of any kind developed on the island since the early sixties other than by the public body. There have been some thermal plants built or provided on the Burin Peninsula by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, but that is with the permission of the government authority and it is in the area the franchise to which has been given to the private utility.

I think that is a wise policy. I think the first thing we should look at is whether or not we should extend that policy and whether the time has not come that we should not take over in Newfoundland. I will deal with Labrador in a minute, but let us look

at the Island of Newfoundland, whether we should not take over all power generation and all power distribution facilities. We have in this province three utilities. Again I am speaking about the island part of this province. We have three utilities involved in the distribution of power. We have the Bowater Power Corporation, centered at Deer Lake, which generates power and also distributes it, at a settled rate, at wholesale and at retail. We have the Newfoundland Light and Power Company, which has the franchises to the more populace areas of the province. Then we have the government which by and large has chosen to only be in the wholesale business, although through the rural electrification authority they generate and distribute power in many of the smaller communities on the island, all of the communities in my district, for argument's sake or most of White Bay South, St. Barbe North, large parts of Fogo, I think, are provided by the power by the power corporation, the South Coast.

In Labrador, of course, we have two utilities in the retail distribution of power, the public body on the coastal areas and in Eastern Labrador in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. In Western Labrador the power which originally came from Twin Falls is now coming from the Churchill project.

I think the first thing I would say to the minister - I would ask him if he would deal with it at the appropriate time when he closes this second reading debate - is why not, why cannot we as a province take over by purchase for fair price all of the power distribution facilities of this province and including the power generation facilities? It is not a very radical proposal. Most provinces have done it. Nova Scotia did it recently, a year or two ago, not by nationalization as I recall it - they did not use the power of the legislature or the power of an expropriation act to nationalize the assets of a company or the shares if it was a Nova Scotia company - but instead they went into the market, as I recall it and they - I thank the minister, if he listens he will learn. They went into the market, as I recall it, and purchased

the shares of the Nova Scotia Light and Power Company and ended up eventually with a majority of the shares, made a tender offer to the shareholders, and, as far as I know, either have all the issued shares now of that company held by the public or if not, they certainly have the great part of them and have effective and complete control.

We could go either route. I do not pretend to know, at this point, what route we should take. It is a matter where one would have to get financial advice. One would have to measure the pros and cons of the various routes but that is a rather technical detail. The important one,

I think, is that we should take over all of the power generation and distribution of facilities in this province, take them over, run them in the public interest. As I said, we will have to pay for them. It is going to cost a lot of money. I am going to talk a little, either later today or whenever we come back to this bill again, about the debt and about the costs that are being laid upon the people of this province. But all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that at least with respect to the proposals to take over the generation and distribution systems, essentially purchase the Newfoundland Light and Power Company and purchase the Bowater Power Corporation. We are paying for them anyway, Mr. Speaker. We are paying for them because the customers in their monthly bill is included an amount sufficient to pay off the capital cost of those projects and of the plant and the installations that these companies have.

In the case of the Bowater Power Corporation, a large part of their power is sold to their own parent company at Corner Brook, the paper mill, but they would still have to purchase their power. ~~Mr~~, and they would still have to pay for it at an economic rate. So again the debt would be self servicing. So it would not cost us anything. Once the thing is paid for it would give us all of the profits. It would give us the profits right from the start and either those profits can be used against the general costs of providing power to the province now being borne by the government, or they could be used to lower the electric rates, the rates which are charged to our people.

I do not see any reason why we should not take over distribution and generation, but distribution is the crucial thing. We are very large in the generation field now. The most recent report of the Power Commission, is that we the people through the commission generated a little under sixty per cent of the power consumed in Newfoundland, and that was during the calendar year 1973. I have no reason to think the figures for the calendar year 1974 were any significantly different.

So the first point I would make to the minister and to the government is let us take over, by purchase, amicably, all the distribution facilities. Then whatever return the shareholders are now getting, Sir, we the people will get. Either we will get them in the form of dividends to the government on the shares, or we will get them in the form of lowered hydro electric rates. As I said, it is not a very radical proposal. I do not know what is the position all across Canada. I think Prince Edward Island still has private utilities. I am not sure about New Brunswick. Quebec has none left. Ontario has not had any for seventy years. Most of the utilities there, Sir, are municipal utilities and we might look at that here. The distribution systems are mainly owned by the municipalities. I do not know about Manitoba or Alberta. Saskatchewan I am sure has no private utilities left, and in British Columbia Mr. Bennett acquired the shares and thereby gave generations of lawyers a great deal of work in litigation, the various suits arising out of the British Columbia Electric case.

Mr. Speaker, that would be a significant step forward. That would be a step forward that had some benefits for the people of this province. This bill is not such a step forward. This bill at best is a sheep masquerading in wolf's clothing. It appears to be a very great creation indeed, and to hear the Premier and other members of his ministry speak, one would have thought that it was next only to the second coming in importance for the people of this province. Indeed, before Christmas we were standing by hourly to meet to discuss this great reform allegedly, and I use allegedly in its correct sense. Then when we left before Christmas, having sat until one or two o'clock in the morning, those of us who were allowed to sit, at that stage I was on the sidelines in the penalty box, we were asked to stand by almost on a minute by minute basis that at any minute the call might go forth, Your Honour would have word from the Premier and Your Honour

would send out word to all the members to come immediately so we can pass this great bill.

Well here we are now, the twenty-eighth day of February, The bill is, you know, as far as it goes, it is a fairly interesting and useful piece of legislation. But it is a sham and it is anything but a great step forward. At best it is a piece of housekeeping legislation.

It does, however, have some very offensive features. I would suggest to the minister and to the ministry that either this bill should be withdrawn, and rethought, and then we submitted, or they should amend it in committee to remove the offensive features, or they should defeat it. I can point out four major flaws in this bill that are not flaws of policy. I can name a number of flaws of policy, but those are matters of debate and argument. The fact that this bill still allows private generation and private distribution is a matter of policy, a matter for debate, back and forth, where we can differ. There are four matters that I say, Sir, that make this bill completely unacceptable to the people of this province.

First of all, and the most minor one of all, is that there is a section that allows the government to appoint M.H.A.'s, members of this House, to the board of the corporation and to pay them. As a matter of fact in section 4, subsection 8; section 6 subsection 4; section 6, subsection 8, read together, it is quite obvious that it is the intention of this government to appoint members to this commission and to pay them. I say that this is obviously a way to buy off a few backbench members of the government who will not accept anything else. I find that offensive. It again makes a mockery of the Legislative Disabilities Act. We have a cabinet of sixteen, seventeen, or eighteen members, much too large.

The old power commission had a similar proposal in it, a similar thing in it. I would not say that that was the best thing ever. Mr. Thom Burgess served on the commission while he was a member of the House, and that was not a happy experience for him, or for the administration which appointed him. I think Mr. Pat Canning, when he was the member for Placentia West the first time around, as he will be possibly again, if he wins the nomination, served on the commission. I think it is wrong in principle, and I regret very much that the minister -

MR. DOODY: It is very useful.

MR. ROBERTS: - who used to be - yes, the Junior Member for Harbour Main

says that it is very useful and, of course, that is the whole point of it.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Canning was very useful while he was there.

MR. ROBERTS: I certainly think he was. Mr. Canning, I can say, Sir, has done infinitely more for the people of this province than has the Junior Member for Harbour Main. In fact the only service that the Junior Member for Harbour Main has yet performed for the people of this province is to leave public life. We will take care of that, Sir, when the next general election comes.

As I was saying, I regret very much that the minister and his colleagues have not dropped this principle. It was in the old legislation, and they criticized it there. Here it is again now. Obviously, it is designed to allow the cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and that is not His Honour, it may be His Honour-in-Council, but that is the cabinet, the men who meet on the eighth floor, to allow them to appoint M.H.A.'s, and in fact they can appoint as many as ten M.H.A.'s. There is no restriction even on the number. There can be ten directors, and all of them can be M.H.A.'s. This government used to talk of principles; they used to talk of public tenders; they used to talk of freedom of the press. Now here they are asking this House to approve a bill which would give them power to appoint ten M.H.A.'s, who hold office during pleasure, and who can be paid out of public funds.

I would suggest to the minister that members of the House of Assembly should be barred from serving on the commission, and if he is not prepared to do that, then I would suggest that they be barred from accepting any remuneration, and I would suggest further that if he is not prepared to bar them period, there should be a provision that only one or two members can sit on it. If we are concerned about public supervision of this, we do not feel that the cabinet can adequately supervise this, then let us have a standing committee. We used to hear a great deal about committees in this House, about how they were going to be working and active. The Premier used

to be very eloquent reading Mr. McLean's speeches. He used to be very eloquent about it. It is very relevant to this bill, because the bill deals with section 6, I did not put it in. If I had been Premier, it would not have been in in that form. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no argument, no convincing weight at all given to the suggestion that, oh well, we will put M.H.A.'s on it so the House can be assured that the public interests are being protected. I agree we cannot rely upon this cabinet to protect our interests, but the way to do it

is not to allow as many as ten members of the House of Assembly to be given another \$15,000 or \$20,000 or \$30,000 a year. It could be done.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I agree it should not be allowed, but it is in the bill. The Premier, Mr. Speaker, under this bill can appoint ten M.H.A.'s, and he can give them out of public funds \$50,000 or \$100,000 a year. There is nothing in this to prevent it, and they hold office, Sir, during pleasure only. The gentleman from St. John's West used to go on at some length, as did his assistant the Minister of Justice, he used to go on at some length about how it was necessary to have firm tenure of office during good behavior for a stated period. Not so here. They hold office at pleasure. What a tremendous weapon that would give the Premier of this province.

Now, he may need all the help he can get to hold down the rebellion in his party, Sir, but this should not be done. This is the wrong way to do it. It is a very offensive provision. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a wide ranging bill. I am speaking of section six of this bill. That is point one.

Point two, Sir, this bill, in itself section six should be dropped or amended in the ways I have suggested. We will put the government to the test. Have they any honour? We saw what they did on the Public Tenders Act. Shamed into it by a cabinet revolt. We all saw the Minister of Social Services on the television the other night writing a new chapter in the doctrine of cabinet solidarity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: This is not relevant to this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the point raised by the honourable Minister of Fisheries is well taken. Although there has been a great deal of latitude allowed in the debate, I think that the honourable Leader of the Opposition was straying somewhat from the -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is relevant to say that this ministry made commitments on policy and that this bill does not represent those commitments. I suggest that is as relevant as debate can be. This bill represents a policy. It is not the policy which this administration used to advocate hypocritically. They fooled the people of Newfoundland. They tricked them and deceived them. Every man over there is part of it and party to it except the gentleman from St. John's East who had the courage, the moral fortitude to stand and say, "Cry halt", the only man over there. The rest of them sniveled.

Now, Sir, that is one point. A second point is section twenty-four which embodies a principle which I would suggest every member of this House should find offensive. The section, Your Honour may not have read. I shall read it for Your Honour because it is an important part of the principle of this bill. In its entirety, Sir, the section reads, "No action or proceeding by way of injunction, mandamus, prohibition or other restraining process or proceeding of any nature which has or may have the effect of terminating, suspending, curtailing, limiting or hindering the supply of power to any person shall be brought or may be maintained against the corporation in any court."

That, Mr. Speaker, represents a deliberate decision by the ministry to establish any native claims there may be to lands in Labrador. It may represent more than that, but it represents that clearly, unequivocally and decisively.

MR. BARRY: Not so.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister will have opportunity in his turn. I say to him that that section is designed to prevent the native people of Labrador or anybody, anybody else for that matter, from doing exactly what the section says, "Bringing any injunction, mandamus, prohibition -".

Now, let us look at a little history in our neighboring province of Quebec. The government there launched into another gigantic power project, the James Bay Development Project. The

Indian peoples, the native peoples - we are all natives.

MR. CROSBIE: Indians under your bed, my son.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from St. John's West is a native.

He is a indigenous to Newfoundland, Sir. He may spend his time in Costa Rica on vacation, but he is indigenous to Newfoundland.

He is an aboriginal, as are we all including Your Honour, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I use the term native people in the colloquial use, the Indian and Eskimo, or if you wish the Indian and Innuit peoples who live in Labrador. The minister can display his arrogance and his contempt for those people just as he showed the contempt for the fishermen of this province. Now, Mr. Speaker,

I cannot tell whether his tan, Mr. Speaker, is a reflection of his shirt or the reflection of the expensive Costa Rican sun.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Quebec; the government of Quebec launched on a gigantic project to develop power, and I hope the gentleman from Labrador West listens carefully because he has several times failed to stand up for the interest of the people of Labrador that I hope he will not here. The native peoples living in the James Bay area, the area to be affected, began an immense series of legal actions. I believe they were financed by the Government of Canada through the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Mr. Chretien was then the minister. I think the Government of Canada financed them, put up several hundred thousand dollars for lawyers fees because we all know that justice can be a bit of a farce. Any man has access to the courts provided he has enough money to retain the lawyers to do it. Well, the Government of Canada provided the money and the Indians took actions. Now, I did not follow all the legal complexities and I am not going to purport to give the House a legal description of what happened stage by stage. But at one stage the Quebec Superior Court which is is analagous to our Supreme Court, the trial division, the court of first instance for these matters, issued an injunction. I think the court of appeal in Quebec overturned that injunction and then the matter was taken to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Eventually the matter was resolved. It was resolved only within the past two or three months by negotiations, by negotiation between the Indian people on one hand and on the other hand representatives of the Government of Quebec and the James Bay Hydro Corporation.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Very generous.

MR. ROBERTS: A very fair and generous settlement was made, several hundred million dollars. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that if it had not been for the ability of the Indian peoples, and I do not think there were any Inuit people involved in that dispute, the Indian people, if it was not for their ability to go to the court, there would never have been a settlement on those terms, never have been a settlement as generous to

them as the one that was arrived at. I think that is, I thought it was a proud day for Canada. It might have been an expensive one but a proud day. It may mean a few extra cents on every yearly bill for the people who use the James Bay power, but justice was done. The aboriginal peoples, the native people were compensated in cash, the only way they could be, were compensated for the damage done to their rights.

Now I do not know what rights our people have in Labrador. I do not know. I do know that the Government of Canada have given them about \$70,000 to fund a claims study. I think Mr. Tony Williamson is full time director of that project, is he not? It will be a three or four year project and, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! The Province is great at approving Ottawa but they did not have the guts to put any money into it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Agreed. Agreed. It would have come with or without approval by the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the government are so tender of the rights, I hope the minister will stand and move that section (24) be struck or be amended to allow the Indian people and the Inuit people in Labrador to go to court to test their rights. But this government, Mr. Speaker, as that clause stands, this government is determined to say to the people of Labrador, be they Labradorians by birth or be they Inuit or be they Indian, that they shall not go to court to test their rights. There is a section down further, (41), which talks about legal actions against the corporation, the great concession - the Minister of Justice, the House Leader's assistant has been overruled. He can now sue them in court. There is some other provision, section (41), no (42) does not deal with that, but (24) is there, Sir, and it can be designed only for that one purpose. It may have other effects. There may be some types of action which should not be brought, but it will effect the Indian and

Eskimo claims. Maybe they have no substance in law, I do not know. I doubt if anybody knows, but if this become law - by the way, I do not think this is worth the paper it is written on as law. I think any court would hear the claim. That has been the general experience with privative clauses over the years, but if this is good law it has that effect - deliberately designed. It also, Mr. Speaker, will have the effect of nullifying any environmental legislation which this honourable crowd have, I am allowed to use that, I think I am, that is an in order phrase - ever put in.

If we ever get to the point in this Province, as we should, where we have environmental impact legislation, this will nullify any attempt by any citizen group or anybody to bring any legal action. It is a terrible, terrible piece of policy and I am ashamed -

forty-one for the gentleman for Bonavista South, forty-one, specifically exempt section (23), obviously that is (24) that is a misprint. I suggest it is a misprint, and I would look at any learned gentleman in the House. It is obviously a misprint. The Minister of Justice will have amendments in committee, one of them will be to change on page 23, in section (41) to change the word "Section (23) to read (24)." I mean that is obvious because section (23) deals with collective bargaining. That has nothing to do with legal action.

AN HON. MEMBER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he is going to be Minister of Justice a long time, there is no other job open to him, I can assure my friend.

Mr. Speaker, the fact remains it is shameful, shameful position of policy. Now there may be some reasons, I did not hear all of the minister's speech, there may be some reasons, some types of action that they feel should be barred. Well let him in man-fashion - he may have, did he deal with that question?

AN HON. MEMBER: No reference.

MR. ROBERTS: He did not deal with it at all. Well let him when he closes the debate, Sir, in man-fashion deal with that point. There may be some, I do not pretend to know why twenty-four was in there. I was not a part of the drafting process. I have no idea what weird and wonderful thoughts went through the minister's mind or through those of his advisers. I only know the words that have been put to the Chamber. And as those words stand, Sir, it will - it is an anti-environmental thing. It will remove any possibility of anybody testing the matter in the courts, any common law rights or any statute created rights.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes, a year or two or three. They will also have the effect of discriminating and barring any action by the native peoples, the Indian and Inuit peoples and for that matter the Labradorians. We have to find better terminology. You know the fact that they are white is not the important thing. The Labradorians who are not descendant from the original descendants

of Labrador. The descendants of either Newfoundlanders who went to Labrador or people who came directly from England and settled. The settlers, is that a good phrase?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what they call themselves.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, settlers. I have heard them call themselves other phrases too. I thought Labradorian was the most usual phrase.

But in any event the section is there. I challenge any honourable gentleman, whether he is learned in the law or not, to dispute my interpretation. Look at the gentleman for St. John's South, am I right in -

MR. WELLS: I think he is wrong.

MR. ROBERTS: He thinks I am wrong. Well I hope the honourable gentleman then will say so. I think he will say so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, no, I could be wrong. The honourable gentleman has been known to be wrong, too. That is why he is sitting where he is.

But it says, "No action or proceedings by way of injunction mandamus, prohibition or any other restraining process or proceeding of any nature which may have the effect of terminating, suspending, curtailing" -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I will sit down at 6:00 o'clock and then when the bill is called again the honourable gentleman can

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I do not want to yield before 6:00, Sir, seriously -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He can give me a lesson in law. I am sorry I cannot afford the fees that he has to charge because he is at the Bar downtown. "But they have the effect of terminating, suspending, curtailing, limiting or hindering." But we all know all about words. We thought there was a Public Tendering Act, naive little buddies that we were. We always thought that there was a Public Tendering Act. There was.

It turns out that the words, you know, the honeyed words. I may well be wrong. I may well be wrong but I may well not be wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I see the gentleman for Labrador West has now found his voice and his courage at the same time, and he says, "I am". We shall see.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the honourable gentleman would do well to listen to the honourable gentleman for St. John's South on a number of other points too. If the honourable gentleman for Labrador West really listen to the gentleman for St. John's South, he will be sitting beside him in a place of honour in that administration, namely on the backbenches.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I have dealt with two points. If I am wrong, I am wrong. But I raise the issue and I expect and hope it will be discussed and I invite the gentleman for St. John's South by all means to, you know, if I am wrong I am sure he will get a certain pleasure in telling me so.

But I would like to see an affirmative statement that if the Indian and Inuit peoples and the Labradorians have a claim they have a right to test it in the court. Indeed I would like to see this government go so far as to say they will fund it, because the people living in Nain, the people living in Northwest River or the people living in Cartwright really do not have the funds to have access, the people in Forteau or in Rigolet or anywhere along the coast of Labrador - let the government say, we will fund them. We will make a grant of \$50,000 or \$100,000 and they can go and hire their lawyers and do their research and then take the matter to court.

The minister skated over it. We will see what it means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will make two other points.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not even refer to it.

MR. ROBERTS: I am told the minister did not refer to it. I did not hear all the minister's -

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well fine, I am merely raising a point for the minister to refer to. This is a major principle of the bill. This is second reading stage and if the honourable gentleman goes even to the most basic seminar in parliamentary procedures he will be told that in second reading we talk about the principle of the bill. Okay.

Now, Sir, the next point is that this act drives another great loophole in The Public Tender Act because this corporation is under no obligation to call any tenders. All Your Honour has to do is have a look at section 17 (1) (a) and (b) and the corporation can go ahead and do what it wants. For example (d) "contract with any person for the purchase of petroleum products notwithstanding the provisions of any other act." Now how baldly naked can they be. We have a Public Tender Act and we are told it is a great step forward.

We on this side support it. If there were abuses in the past we say let it end them. Now in the minister trots a bill that would allow him or his creature, the corporation, all of the directors will hold office at the pleasure of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The cleverness of it. To go out for example and make a deal say with Imperial Oil to purchase petroleum for \$100 a barrel instead of \$12 a barrel.

MR. BARRY: Do you know why that was put in?

MR. ROBERTS: I have no idea why it was put in but I know why it should come out. I know why it should come out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, they do not want to buy it from Golden Eagle and I am familiar with the act that was passed about fifteen years

ago. I read it. Then let them say so. It says, "notwithstanding any other act," and that would include The Public Tender Act. The honeyed words of the minister. You know, he may think we are too green to burn, with Craig Dobbin, or too green to burn with Trizec.

MR. BARRY: You voted for that last year.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we may well have voted for it. Sure, and the honourable gentlemen opposite voted for the Tory Government. We are all allowed to be forgiven our mistakes. They may even be forgiven theirs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a fourth point - Is that clock correct?

My watch says six minutes to six and that one says six o'clock.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I have not got the rules open. Do we adjourn automatically at six? We need a motion to adjourn. Well then I shall move the adjournment of this debate, Sir, and the House Leader or his assistant can do as they wish.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been noted that the honourable Leader of the Opposition has adjourned the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, with the assistance of my assistant, I would like to move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, whatever the date is, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved and seconded that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow, Monday, at 11:00 A.M. Those in favour "aye". Those against "nay", carried. I do now leave the Chair until tomorrow, Monday, 11:00 A.M.



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 2

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

*Justice
Members*
*Public
accounts, 84
Committee*