



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th, Session

Number 9

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 11:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to inform the House that Private Members Day will be tomorrow, Tuesday, if the House concurs. I hope the House will concur because Wednesday will be Budget Day which is normally Private Members Day. The official opposition have agreed or suggested that tomorrow would be their choice for Private Members Day.

Another point, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to make a statement now that the government intends to ask the House, and notice of motion will be given tomorrow, to appoint a select committee of the House in connection with matters pertaining to the inshore fishery. What we propose is to ask the House to appoint a select committee and the resolution will contain the names of the members who we would like to suggest the House should serve on it. I will not move the motion today so that we can get from the Leader of the Opposition the names of the persons he wants to represent them on the committee.

The idea would be to appoint a select committee. We are going to ask the member for Placentia East to chair the committee, a select committee on the inshore fishery to consider the present condition of the inshore fishery of the Island of Newfoundland and the coast of Labrador, the problems facing inshore fishermen, fish plant operators and those involved in the inshore fishery and to consider any matters having an influence upon or pertaining to the said inshore fishery, the usual power to call for persons and papers and to hear evidence from interested parties and to report back to the House by April 30. That date was chosen, of course, because the Government of Canada is supposed to have concluded their studies by that time and to be announcing or ready to announce what measures they are going to take in connection with the East Coast fishery for

the rest of this year. At that time the provincial government will have to decide what steps it will have to take this year in connection particularly with the inshore fishery.

Now, we do not expect, Mr. Speaker - this is not a royal commission - a royal commission report. This select committee would give interested parties here in the Province of Newfoundland a chance to outline what they consider to be the present state of the fishery and the problems and what they suggest are some of the answers or some of the things that government may do. Since their meetings would be public, it will give a chance for the problems of the inshore fishery to be discussed and reported to the public. It will be some value in explaining to the public just what the main problems are and to get publicity for them. It will not be asked to consider any problems in connection with the offshore fishery or the present trawler situation. The committee would be asked to restrict itself to the problems particularly that affect the inshore fishery.

The committee itself could hold its hearings during the next six or eight weeks in the mornings or sometimes during the afternoon so long as we have a quorum in the House. Then it can report to the House as to what it thinks the main problems are or any suggestions the committee may have as to what approaches the government should take or what the real problems of the fishery are. The Department of Fisheries will provide staff or secretary for the committee and other necessary arrangements will have to be made by the chairman and the committee. We will see that whatever staff is needed is provided.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the committee also if it wishes can arrange to go to five or six centers of the province so it will be easier for people to make -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not just Placentia East.

MR. CROSBIE: Not just Placentia East - to make any representations they want to. So, as we see it, this could be a valuable opportunity

March 7, 1975

Tape 270

IB-3

for members of the House to be fully informed on what the situation is,
and the public, and for us to have a chance to hear what the views
of the committee then are as to what should be done. So, tomorrow

I will give notice of that once I have had a chance to confer with the Leader of the Opposition as to whom the Opposition would like to have on the committee.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice of the following resolution, that a select committee of this House consisting of the Member for St. John's South as Chairman, and the Minister of Education, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Member for St. Georges, the Member for Grand Falls, the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Hermitage, be appointed to consider the law and the regulations that should govern the financing of provincial election campaigns, including all questions with reference to election contributions and expenses, the possible financing of election expenses from the Public Treasury, the possible limitations upon amounts to be spent by candidates and political parties during election campaigns, the disclosure of contributions made to candidates and political parties for election purposes and all matters pertaining thereto, with power to call for persons, papers and records and all other materials to examine witnesses under oath and to hear evidence from all interested parties and with the power to sit while the House is in session or is adjourned.

Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that we would ask the House to appoint such a committee which can sit either while the House is in session or after the House closes in May because it may be necessary for them to sit longer than that. There is a lot of information now available on the law in other provinces, royal commission reports. We have asked the Province of Ontario to forward us their new legislation and the royal commission report they had there. There is the federal legislation royal commission report so there is a lot of information that will be available for that committee. Of course, they also can hear submissions from any interested

parties and, hopefully, recommend legislation that could be introduced in the next session of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other notices of motion?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Health.

DR.A. ROWE: Answer to question number four on the Order Paper of the sixth of March: No payments were made by the Department of Health during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1974, to Nacom Limited, McLean Public Relations or to International Events. The honourable member can give the names of any other companies - which I do not know - I shall endeavour to answer the portion of his question. Parts two, three and four of the question are not applicable.

In answer to the question posed by the honourable Member for Labrador South, I understand there is an amount of \$4.5 million of federal funding available for 1975-76, but this amount is not for Labrador in general, but only for communities designated as native settlements. The disbursement of this fund is under the control of the Joint Federal-Provincial Committee and an agreement for assistance to natives. The co-ordinator for this committee is an official of the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation and I would suggest that the honourable member might communicate with the honourable minister of that department for further information.

The fact is that we have no information in the Department of Health that \$1 million of this amount of \$4.5 million is earmarked for help. That is the specific answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a reply to a question asked by the honourable Member from Bell Island which appeared on the Order Paper of March 6, presently.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. NEAHEY: Mr. Speaker, I put a question to the Minister of Health last week about the health hazards at both Buchans and St. Lawrence, but I think the minister must have misunderstood my question because he did not answer the part dealing with the deaths of miners in St. Lawrence as a result of exposure to radiation in the mine. Would the minister care now to make a statement on that situation there, if there is anything to the reports or if the minister's department are investigating the situation at St. Lawrence?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Health.

DR. ROWE: Distinctly, the portion regarding Buchans, I have looked up the Hansard of that date, and there is no mention of St. Lawrence. I have a statement which I will be prepared to give to the House within the next day or two on the St. Lawrence situation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister also care to include in his statement the health hazard at the phosphorous plant at Long Harbour, the dust situation at the pelletizing plant in Labrador City, and a report on Baie Verte, asbestosis, you know, as reported in Baie Verte? I would like to have all -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, there is a report rumoured, you know, in Baie Verte. There is some concern about it, let me put it that way. I would like to have the whole thing -

AN HON. MEMBER: The health hazards.

MR. NEARY: Right, the health hazards - the whole thing included in one report.

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that, now that he has included several others, it is obviously going to take quite a bit longer to get the relevant information, but in due course, I will be happy to make the statements on these various areas.

MR. NEARY: I thank the minister.

Mr. Speaker, I put a question to the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation about the government's involvement in the summer games. I still do not have the answer. Does the minister have the information today?

HON. T. DOYLE (Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation): No.

MR. NEARY: No, still no answer.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Sir, could inform the House what action he has taken or the government have taken on a request to investigate car prices in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the minister going to answer the question? The Member for Bonavista South, Sir, requested the minister to investigate car prices in the province. What action has the minister taken on this request?

HON. G. DAWE (Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment): (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well has the minister received any requests to investigate car prices in this province? Does the minister intend to investigate car prices in this province?

MR. DAWE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with the minister's answer, and I wish to debate it, Sir, on Thursday afternoon during the late show.

Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Tourism care to inform the House if tenders have been called yet for restoration work on the former CN coastal vessel known as the Kyle?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. V. HICKEY (Minister of Tourism): I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, I got the question right. Have tenders been called for restoration of the Kyle? Who said we were restoring that?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Health during the election.

MR. EVANS: What about the Titanic?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there have been no tenders called for the restoration of the Kyle. I will get the honourable member some details on the Kyle in a matter of a few days to sort that problem out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Premier. In view of the announcement made by the Minister of Fisheries of the select committee of the House, I am wondering what now becomes of the Premier's stated intention of last Fall to establish a board of enquiry to study all aspects of the fishery? Would there be a board of enquiry in addition to this select committee?

HON. J. C. CROSBIE (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, the position on that is that there are a number of studies underway now with the federal government and with the provincial government. The House is also going to be asked to appoint a select committee, as I just said, on the inshore fishery. There has been no industrial enquiry commission appointed or any royal commission appointed for several reasons. Among the reasons are, the difficulties we are having in finding a suitable chairman, that is one reason, and another major reason is because everybody involved in the fishery is being, and they have been consulted, have been so busy submitting briefs and putting information before the various agencies of the federal government and the province and busy in connection with other matters that are now currently in dispute, both the union and the Fisheries Association, that they suggested to us that we should delay the appointment of any such commission of enquiry. They simply do not have the staff and resources to be submitting briefs and appearing before it, as well as everything else they are doing in connection with the present crisis. A third reason is that while such an enquiry may very well be quite valuable, even if appointed now it is extremely unlikely that it would report for at least a year. What we are grappling with now is a plan for this year that is going to ensure that the fishery survives this year, until the next two or three, and then developing any plan like that, we cannot wait for the report of the royal commission that will not be in for at least twelve months. So while

the government have not decided not to go ahead with such a Commission of Enquiry it has not been appointed yet, and it is unlikely that it would be for perhaps several months more when we are clear as to what is happening this year. In the meantime if honourable gentlemen have any suggestions as to who would be an appropriate chairman for such a body we would be glad to receive their suggestions.

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

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. In view of the fact that many of our local farmers are in financial difficulties because of the marketing conditions, and also in view of the fact that the agricultural ministers in our sister Atlantic Provinces have approached the federal government for financing aid for their local farmers, has the minister also approached the federal government for aid for our local farmers in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Mr. Speaker, in response to that I presume the honourable member is making reference to some of the problems which exist in the potato business in Musgravetown. The officials of the department were in Musgravetown about three weeks ago, and met with those farmers who cared to attend. A fair amount of information has been documented. The situation is being monitored daily. As time goes on we will determine what might or might not be necessary to be done.

With regards to the second part of the question, we are in daily contact, you might say, with the federal minister concerning not only potatoes but a lot of other commodities. I hope to be in a position in a few days to make a statement on it.

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

MR. NFARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Tourism could answer a question to the House. Could the minister inform the House what action he has taken to recover excess travel allowances made in connection with the Silver Anniversary Celebrations as reported

in the Auditor-General's Report?

MR. SPEAKER: That question could go on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could inform the House if the practice of issuing excess travel allowances in his department in connection with Confederation Celebrations are still continuing or not?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Member for Bell Island is changing words of the question which is essentially the same question as asked previously.

MR. NEARY: No, no, Sir, I asked the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: That question is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister if the practice was still continuing.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, will the minister inform the House of the whereabouts of films, and slides produced for his department by George McLean? And has he found the hundred prints that could not be accounted for as reported on page 23 of the Auditor-General's Report?

MR. SPEAKER: That question can go on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the minister responsible for dumps tell us if a decision has been taken yet on the location of a regional dump for the St. John's area, or has a decision been made to locate the dump in the Harbour Main District, or in the minister's own district?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for an answer from the minister responsible for dumps.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable Member for Bell Island is aware that a minister is not required to answer a question. I waited for a very short while, and there was no reply from the minister.

MR. NEARY: The senior Member for Harbour Main, Sir. Is the minister going to answer the question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

HON. G. DAVE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND ENVIRONMENT): I was under the impression that it was a rule of this House that when a person was referred to he would either be referred to as the honourable member, or the honourable minister of such and such a department. We do not know to whom he is referring the question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Is not the Minister of Provincial Affairs better known as "Tooh"?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Would he care to tell us if the government have yet taken the decision on where the regional dump is going to be located for the St. John's area?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The rephrasing of the question by the honourable Member for Bell Island is out of order. The Chair recognizes another honourable member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has recognized another honourable member. I guess since no other honourable member has a question, I will recognize the honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if the Minister of Public Works was acting on instructions from the Minister of Justice when he carried out a recent inspection of Fort Townshend accompanied by one or two police officers who were on duty at the time.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was all alone.

MR. ROBERTS: What does he mean all alone, a policeman was demoted because of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

HON. T. A. HICKMAN: It is an internal matter that came before a duly constituted tribunal under the provisions of the Newfoundland Constabulary Act. It is now the subject matter of an appeal from the decision of that tribunal.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 3, second reading of a bill entitled, "An Act Respecting the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Electric Corporation." I think the honourable Member for Hermitage adjourned the debate and he has five minutes left.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would just like to reiterate one of the points I was making late on Friday, in response to the Premier's statement on Friday in which he indicated that it was his government's intention to introduce legislation to, I presume, nullify the effects of section 26 of the bill before us, and other sections relating to the answerability or the lack of it, the answerability of the Cabinet to the House on matters of borrowing for the Lower Churchill Development in particular.

At that time I said, and I would like to repeat, that the Premier's undertaking, verbal undertaking, to introduce that legislation, is not good enough under the circumstances and that the way to remedy the weaknesses, the affronts which are contained in section 26 and 27 and subsequent sections related to the financing, the way to remedy those weaknesses is not in the way the Premier has suggested, to pass the present bill then introduce some legislation which would have the effect of nullifying the present bill, but the way to remedy that situation is to introduce amendments now to section 26 and the other related sections, and I call upon the Premier to do that during committee stage, to introduce the amendments which will have the effect of making the Power Corporation and Cabinet answerable to the House on the matters of borrowing which are provided for in section 26.

If the Premier does not do it, we in the opposition intend to do it, and I give notice on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House, that we will introduce a number of amendments to the offending sections, particularly section 26 and 27 and the others, amendments which will make the Power Corporation and the Cabinet, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, answerable to the House on the matters we have mentioned and to which we take

objection.

We have already drafted a number of amendments and we now give notice that these will be brought before the House during committee stage. I would much prefer that the Premier would see the wisdom of what the Member for St. John's South, the Member for St. John's East, the Member for St. John's North, the Leader of the Opposition, and others on this side of the House have said. I would like for the Premier to see the wisdom of what we have advocated on this matter and introduce himself the amendments which will have the effect of making the House the final control point, the rightful control point, Mr. Speaker, in matters related to incurring large capital debts in the name of the province.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the dilemma that most members of this House have at this particular time. We find the bill commendable, good in many, many respects. A number of the principles, particularly as they relate to the hydro development, are principles we want dearly to support, but we cannot support them if in casting our vote we also lend any credibility to the deliberate attempt in this bill to muzzle the House, to rob the House of its rightful control in money matters.

That is the dilemma, Mr. Speaker. The Premier and his colleagues can solve that dilemma for all of us by introducing amendments to which I have referred, and if not we shall introduce them and the Premier and his colleagues can then solve our dilemma by supporting our amendments, and if he does and if his colleagues support our amendments on the opposition side, we can then find ourselves able to support the bill, a bill which in many respects is a very good bill, but which good is completely obviated, completely wiped out, by this monstrous provision, in section 26 and the other related sections.

I appeal, Mr. Speaker, to all members on both sides of the House to support our amendments if we have to put them on section 26.

March 10, 1975

Tape No. 274

NM - 3

The Minister of Mines says it is nonsense, Well, I will leave him to clarify that when he gets up to speak. It is not nonsense, Mr. Speaker. It is a grave affront to the House when it is suggested that the House should have, I am sorry, the Cabinet should have unlimited borrowing power and there is no way we

on this side of the House can stand for that or can support it and we can only support the bill if provisions are made to wipe out the offending sections.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the honourable members present for allowing me to rise a second time. Being not in a very good condition to conduct a debate on Friday, I have hopefully recovered my senses enough to conduct it in a rational manner this morning. Although section twenty-six seems to get on a lot of peoples' nerves, as I said in my opening remarks, the bill is essentially a reworking of the act which governs the Power Commission, and as such bringing all of the hydro-electric power of the province together. I think it is something that none of us can really argue with the principle of.

There are certain controversial sections of the bill to which I will address myself later, but I think it should be noted at this point that the federal government, even though they are providing considerable amounts of funds for this project, are getting away relatively easy when compared to projects in other parts of the nation, such as the Syncrude Development, the Prince Edward Island project and this kind of thing. One has to ask why. Is it because of bad blood between the federal and provincial governments? Is it because of lack of powerful negotiations on the part of our people who are conducting for the province, or is it because our representatives in Ottawa, in particular Newfoundland's minister in the cabinet, has not done his job?

In all of this, the question that keeps coming back and coming back is where is Don? What is happening up there? Perhaps it is about time we had a new representative in the federal cabinet.

I would like to address myself, Mr. Speaker, to the broad principle of this bill as it effects Labrador. To us this bill and the whole concept which is embodied therein is more than just another act, more than just another corporation, more than just another industrial development. It is symbolic to us in Labrador. It comes at a time when we are questioning ourselves where we are going. We are questioning where we fit into the provincial scheme of things, and

we are casting serious questions on the reasons for the state that we are in today.

The bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro-Electric Corporation" is to us a symbol of something that goes to the very roots of our society in Labrador. We have seen from the earliest days of colonization an extractive process whereby the resources of Labrador have been tapped for the benefit of those outside. We have received from those resources, I believe, the mere scraps from the table.

In the early days of the fishing industry, perhaps the world's greatest fishing effort was conducted on the Labrador Coast

when thousands and thousands of fishing vessels, not just from the Island of Newfoundland, but from the Maritimes and from the New England States, went to fish in Labrador waters and the whole industrial, commercial enterprise connected with that fishery was not in the least concerned with the plight of the people on the Labrador Coast and any benefits we derived from that fishery were incidental, the scraps from the table. We saw, following that, the opening of the largest open pit iron ore mine in the nation, perhaps in North America, if I am correct. What did we get out of it? A few paltry dollars in royalties, the bulk of which came to benefit the people on the Island of Newfoundland. We are not complaining that the money was spent on the Island of Newfoundland. What we are complaining about was that we did not get our fair and equitable share. We did not even get the jobs. Manpower did not see fit to recruit on the Labrador Coast and we were told that we were unfit even for the menial labour jobs because, one reason was given, we could not even read the safety signs, adding insult to injury.

Following that, North America's last remaining stand of black spruce forest was tapped. An industrial plant was supposed to have been built in Labrador to utilize that forest. At the eleventh hour we were told that the plant was going to be taken from Labrador and put on the Island. We do not begrudge the people of Stephenville their plant, but we do feel insulted and injured to think that it was done for political reasons and that our raw material is being used without our getting the benefit of it.

Even today, we have a rough time trying to get our people from the Coast jobs in the woods there. Coincidentally with this, we see the Native Association, the Innuit Brotherhood beginning to wonder exactly what claim they have to the land. Native land rights have surfaced in Western Canada and is coming eastward with the organization of Innuit Tapiritsad and the Native Association.

Now we see that after Churchill Falls, the development of the Churchill Falls where again we did not get any of the benefit of the hydro power - we got very, very little benefit of the jobs at Churchill-

we see what is being called the Lower Churchill misnomer. It is the Gull Island project. When Mr. Smallwood decided to change the name of the falls without asking our permission, he did not change the name of the river. It is the Hamilton River and the Churchill Falls is on the Hamilton. There is no such thing as a Lower Churchill. At any rate, we have to ask ourselves now whether or not we are going to get any more benefit out of the Gull Island project than we have out of Churchill Falls, out of Labrador West iron ore mines, out of Labrador Linerboard's Woods Operation or out of the fishery.

If we are not, Sir, then we would be just as happy if it did not go ahead at all because it is certainly going to have an effect on the environment. It is certainly going to have an effect on our social life and on our culture and unless we get some material benefit, then it will all be to the detriment of the people of Labrador. This is why the Gull Island project and this act is symbolic to our whole problem.

One section, twenty-four, has been said to have been put in there to interrupt or intercede or to stop the claims of native peoples to any land which they might think they own, in the words of a gentleman from Goose Bay. I have a different opinion on section twenty-four, but I would just like to address myself to this particular problem. One honourable gentleman opposite said that, I believe it was the honourable Minister of Justice, I stand to be corrected, said that with our entry into Confederation, the native peoples came in as ordinary citizens and therefore, they have no rights other than any other ordinary citizen.

Well, of course, since we have a federal-provincial agreement and since they are, after all, the original people that statement stands in dispute. Whatever people think about section twenty-four and its reasons for being there, I would like to lay on the honourable members opposite an entirely new idea, new from their point of view, I should think. Nobody should have any fear of the native land claims in Labrador. The native peoples in Labrador are not talking about blocks of real estate. The native peoples in Labrador are very likely not going to come along and say, "You cannot touch that piece of land because it belongs to us or you cannot cross that piece of land because it is ours."

We are not talking about a real estate deal. We are talking about our claims to the use of the land, our place in the whole environment. If honourable members want to know what it is that makes us in Labrador different, then this is what it is. The whole concept of man's relationship to the land is an entirely different one than was imported from Europe where there were fences and titles and deeds and laws of trespass. When my European ancestors came to Labrador they came there of free choice and entered into the same society with the native peoples whom they found there and came to learn the same laws respecting the use of the land as the natives had.

Sometimes I find it is a curse that I belong to a part of all three races. In this case I find it is a blessing because I can understand what the Native Association is talking about and I can understand the Inuit Tapiritsad when they say that we have claim to this land. We do have claim to this land. It is our land. That is not to say it is not anybody else's land. We are not saying that because this is our land, nobody else can use it. Nobody can own land. The Indians' relationship with their environment, nobody can own land anymore than anybody can own air or water. It is there for everyone. That is why there was no conflict when the white man arrived. He was welcome to come in and use the land the same as the rest of the people there. Nobody could deny him the use of that land because

it was not his, it was everybody's, including those people who arrived.

So, there should be no fear on the part of honourable members opposite that somebody is going to say, "You cannot use Winokapau and fill it up for your Gull Island development because it is our land." What they are saying is that because you are filling up Winokapau and you are denying the right of anybody to walk on the shores of Winokapau that is going to be flooded, therefore there has to be compensation for that land which is taken out of use. There may be some argument as to how much it was used and by whom. That is a different story altogether.

The fact remains that there is no need to put in any clause in this act which would deny the native people or anyone else the right to make representation in any manner whatsoever regarding land claims. What we are saying is that this is our land. This is our land to be used the way that we have used it traditionally. If our society has been changed by the arrival of an alien culture and we no longer use that land that way, then there should be some form of compensation.

You may take a look at the communities of Davis Inlet and Northwest River, and say those bloody lazy Indians, they do not deserve any better any way.

Look at it from inside of the communities' point of view. Those so-called bloody lazy Indians were taken out of that element, out of their environment, placed in communities by patronizing white men, and told, all right here you are. Now you have to live like us. It was utter and total cultural shock. You could not expect them to overnight simply fit into our scheme of things. They are people of the land, and they have been denied the use of that land one way or another, rightly or wrongly. And now with the younger generations becoming more educated, more aware, more sensitive to their heritage and the loss of that heritage, they are demanding that the white society give them back that which it has taken from them, the use of their land in dignity.

I doubt that any group of Indians, or Inuit, or white natives will ever throw a blockade across any development in Labrador, and say you cannot go in because it is our land. But what they are asking, what we are asking, and I think justifiably, is that if this land is going to be used to create a better society then we want a part of that better society. I do not think anybody would agree that we should be denied that. There should be no fear on anyone's part about native land claims. It is difficult for anybody who has not grown up to this concept of man's relationship to his environment to be able to accept that. But it is there.

We have another element, We have those people who have come in from places outside of Labrador and established their homes, and set their roots in Labrador, especially in the Goose Bay area, the area that is immediately adjacent to the Gull Island site. They have a different concept. They have gone and made their commitment to Labrador, and they are going to live their and raise their families there. And when they see all of the resources going out, and very little of it coming back then they take an entirely different attitude. I think this is the group the honourable minister ran up against when he was in Happy

Valley. They too have a justifiable complaint. Perhaps they unfortunately directed their anger against the wrong minister, the very minister who at least took the trouble to go and see them. I think I can say that their anger would be more properly directed to those honourable ministers who do not bother to go up and see them. The honourable member happened to be in the wrong spot at the wrong time.

Mr. Speaker, having made that point I hope I will not dwell on the bill at this point any longer. I simply wanted to make that point and get it out of the way, and we will be dealing with the various clauses as we come to them. I can only say at this point that I would like to see Section (24) eliminated for an entirely different reason, because I think it was put in there to act against any unions that might want to strike, and interrupt the job. I do not think that is the way to deal with it.

I would like to see Section (26) if not eliminated then amended slightly to put the power back into the Legislature, and unless it is amended then, as good as this bill is, I am afraid I cannot go on record as supporting it as long as it places all of the power in the hands of the cabinet, and takes it away from the Legislature.

MR. NEARY: What about the second bill, we do not agree with the things that they should have in this bill.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I am glad the honourable Member from Bell Island brought that up, because while we have heard expressions that steps will be taken to put control back into the Legislature and to overcome the repugnant aspects of this section, I recall standing here all by myself one evening, the wee hours of the morning I believe it was by that time, when we debated the Redistribution Bill and the honourable the Premier gave us assurances that a recount of census would be taken in Labrador West and if necessary, the whole thing changed to give us better representation and to this date we have not seen any action on that and while one should be able to at least expect that the honourable the Premier would be as good as his word, until we get some manifestation of good faith, then I am afraid I can only say at this point, repretably, that I have no faith and I have no faith in any honourable minister opposite saying that steps will be taken through another bill to change this. It has to be done in this section, otherwise I cannot support it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder before the minister closes the debate, would the minister agree for my colleague to speak in this debate should he arrive this afternoon or tomorrow morning, that is my colleague from Labrador North, Sir, he is -

MR. BARRY: Might I suggest that the committee (remainder inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Okay, Sir, that is fine, because he has expressed the desire to speak in the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I do not plan to speak long. It has been a fairly lengthy debate and a worthwhile one, and many matters have been considered and certainly I think it was an example of the kind of debate on a very important act, which is to be welcomed.

First a few words on some of the objections which members have referred to. I think the Premier in his address answered

most of these, answered all of them in outlining the government's intentions, and in closing the debate the Minister of Mines and Energy will no doubt repeat and explain in further detail, if indeed such is necessary.

With respect to the criticisms of the bill, there is only one that I wish to deal with to any extent and that is the section 28 which has caused some controversy and which I think results from some misunderstanding.

Briefly, the other ones; it has been made clear by the Premier that it is not this government's intention to have M.H.A.'s on this board of this corporation or indeed of any corporation. Indeed, it has been indicated that an amendment will be made to that effect. I can see absolutely no problem there, the record of this government in that area is excellent.

In three years of office, not one member of the House of Assembly, one government member, opposition member, any member, in three years this administration has not appointed one member of the House of Assembly to the board of any Crown Corporation. When we came into office, I do not know, when we came into office, I know that there were at least three members of the House of Assembly, who were formerly government supporters, three Liberal members of the House of Assembly, were members of the Power Commission Board. There were some members on other boards as well. So if we examine the record of the administration, when we came into office, three on the Board of the Power Commission and some on some other boards as well. In the three years since this government has been in office, not one M.H.A. on any board. So I think there the record speaks totally for itself.

Some reference was made to section 24 and various possible interpretations of that

Section 24, It was never, and this has been stated by the Premier and others, it was never the intention of this government to put anything into that bill which could in any way be prejudicial to whatever rights a court might determine as adhering to the native people.

It was never - I repeat it - it was never the government's intention in any way to incorporate in this bill anything, not only which could have any adverse affect on any rights they might have, but which could even be interpreted as such, which could be interpreted as such. Because it is possible, and some members have interpreted that section 24 in that manner, then this government wish not only not to do anything which could be prejudicial to the rights, but do anything which could be possible of such an interpretation . I think the position is quite clear there.

With respect to the purchase of petroleum, I think that has been made abundantly clear, and if further comment is necessary there, certainly the Minister of Mines and Energy is the person to do it. This is an extremely complex area and with the oil situation and supply and fluctuations of prices and the possibilities which occur at times, even though prices are high, of a surplus and a much cheaper price within a certain time frame, then in order that the corporation have the authority to purchase these necessary products at the lowest possible price, it is necessary to do it that way.

The objection which most comment has been upon is section 28, and it has been stated that section 28 should be repealed, because it would allow the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, the cabinet, to authorize borrowing by the corporation. It has been suggested that this should be repealed. This government have stated, its leader, the Premier, has stated that in fact what is the government's intention to do is to bring in another bill dealing specifically with the financing of this development, getting authority from the House to raise the money necessary, and giving the information that is required, that the House and the public would have a right to know, of giving it when that specific bill is brought in, in terms of

the amount of money, the terms or conditions and the state of development or progress of the entire development. I would certainly think that that assurance is unequivocal, clear, binding, and I can see no reason, no logical reason, why any member of the legislature on any side of the House should doubt it. I can see political reasons, I can see perhaps personal reasons, but I can see no logical rational reason why the unequivocal assurance of the government expressed by the Premier and by others cannot be accepted.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On this whole matter, it is interesting to review briefly the history of the borrowing power, and the rights of the House. In 1966 the former administration brought in an amendment to the then Revenue And Audit Act, which denied to the House the right of prior knowledge and prior approval for government borrowing. That act enabled the former administration to borrow on the authority of the cabinet, and only later on did it have to be approved by the House. After the money was borrowed, after indeed it could have been spent, after all of this, then the House was asked to give approval. So, it was the former administration through its amendment to the Revenue And Audit Act in 1966 denied this legislature the right of prior knowledge and prior approval, and in so doing denied one of the traditional rights of any parliament. that of control of expenditure. That was done in 1966. That was done by the last Liberal Administration we had. That is what they did.

In 1973, this government rectified that position. This government passed a new Financial Administration Act which returned to the House of Assembly the right of prior knowledge and prior approval and now the cabinet cannot go out and borrow huge sums without the prior consent of this legislature. So the actions

speak a great deal louder than the words. The records of the two administrations in terms of control by this House of the spending power and the borrowing power, the records are clear. There is the revenue. There was the act brought in by the former administration in 1966 to oust the jurisdiction of the House.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I have no idea what would happen then. We know what the two administrations' records are. The former administration, the Liberal administration, ousted the jurisdiction of the House to get all of this control in borrowing in the hands of the cabinet.

This administration, soon after its election to office, returned that authority to the House as far as the borrowing is concerned. Now, certainly, Mr. Speaker, what this administration has denied to itself, to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, it is not going to allow one of its servants or creatures, a crown corporation. Certainly this would not be our intention.

We have ourselves in the Finance Administration Act, this government on its own initiative, not on a Private Members Bill from the opposition, not as the result of a resolution by the opposition but on our own initiative, because we felt it was the right way. This government has made it law that borrowing must have the prior approval of the House of Assembly. Certainly when that is applicable to the government, it is going to be applicable for the kind of development we are envisioning costing around \$1.6 billion.

Now, it has been said, "Well the way to assure this is by an amendment to the act." That is absurd, Mr. Speaker, totally absurd. Do honourable gentlemen really think that by changing a few words, a few phrases, in this section, a project as important, as essential, as costly, as complex, that that is the way this government wishes to get the approval of the legislature? Absolutely not. We wish to do it in a specific bill where all of the information available can be made known to members where the amount -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Of course. Where the amount and the conditions and

the planning and progress up to date can be made known with a specific bill. So, if the legislature is asked specifically to approve or not to a certain course of action with financial and industrial and consequences of the broadest social and economic kind, it is by bringing in a specific bill on this specific and important project, not by amending a section in a bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, the reasons that the honourable gentlemen put forward are not convincing whatsoever and certainly a project of that nature deserves and should have the fullest kind of airing in the legislature and the way to do that is through a specific bill where apart from the first reading, there is the second reading debate on the principle, in the Committee of the Whole House where every item can be gone into. This is the way of doing it, where the legislature has the possibility of participation at all of the stages, all of the legislative stages. That is why this government is committed to bringing in a specific bill and not the silly pussyfooting by changing a few words in a section of the bill.

Of course, the most important comment of all I think is the fact that the actions speak louder than words. We see what they did in 1966 and we see what this administration did in 1973.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just a few words with respect of the overall principle of the bill. It can be put many ways. I regard it as to facilitate the development of our huge hydro potential in order that this province and its people can gain control of their own economic destiny, and there runs from that as well social destiny because I am not sure that anybody - as a matter of fact, I am quite sure they cannot - one cannot have control of one's social destiny unless there is control as well of one's economic destiny.

With the development of the hydro potential and with, hopefully, Ottawa's agreement to the controlled ownership, jurisdiction by the Province of the

unrenewable resources of the Continental Shelf, this Province will be a have Province. We will be able to contribute in terms of equalization to other provinces and not have to continue, as we have for the past quarter century, as a recipient. I think, Mr. Speaker, this is not just a question of money going one way or money going the other. Think what effect this will have on the pride and confidence of Newfoundlanders. I can think of very few things more to be desired in terms of the confidence of our people, their faith in themselves, and their Province and their future than this - when this likelihood will one day, hopefully, become a reality, when we can then contribute in terms of equalization to other Canadians and not in financial terms, and I am speaking only in financial terms, be merely recipients because in other than financial terms, I feel that we are very significant contributors, but speaking only in the financial terms. The effect that that would have is, I think, almost impossible to gauge and is something to be desired.

It is necessary, as well, to have developments like this, and I do not view this kind of a development as an end in itself, no. One can I suppose, project, you know, a huge corporate organization running efficiently generating great revenues and, you know, this can appeal to a corporate mentality, if you wish, or a managerial mentality. I regard it myself from a prospective as a means, I regard it as a means to an end and the end would be the objective, if you wish, to strengthen and diversify our industrial complex and our economic base and to generate amounts of revenue for the social development of the Province, in terms of health, in terms of education, in terms of peoples' welfare, in the qualitative and social aspects. That has to be the overall objective and this, an important, and, I believe, necessary means to achieve it.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I am very pleased to join with other gentlemen on this side of the House in supporting the principle of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER (Dunphy): The minister now speaks, he will close the debate.

HON. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, when this bill was presented, I thought it was the usual, enlightened, exciting, awesome piece of legislation, Mr.

Speaker, that is customary in preceding from this government and particularly from the Department of Mines and Energy. Mr. Speaker, if you will pardon the expression, all hell broke lose the second day, I think it was, that we were into debate. I did not mind the first day, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition made some points and some of them were -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Valid.

MR. BARRY: No, I will not say valid, Mr. Speaker. He raised some valid concerns, but few of the points that he made were valid in terms of any of the recommendations, and quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, as I will point out in a moment, few of the concerns were of any substance. But, that was to be expected. He was speaking as Leader of the Opposition and while I am - from one side of his mouth he was complimenting government, indirectly, of course, never directly. He was saying that this was a bill that he could support in principle. All of a sudden, Mr. Speaker, we found that the principle of this bill was not the type of corporation that the government was proposing to assist in the formulation of energy policy. It was not even, Mr. Speaker, the energy policy of government, and I think that is a point that has been overlooked, that at the very beginning of this debate we threw open the floor to a full wide ranging energy debate, Mr. Speaker, even though, technically, I suppose, Your Honour could have pulled us to rein more often.

It was indicated

when I spoke, Mr. Speaker, confirmed when the Leader of the Opposition started speaking that this was the opportunity that the opposition had been requesting for some time to have a full wide-ranging debate on the energy policy of this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we find after three or four days of debate in this House? Do we find that the opposition have laid our energy policy in shambles? Have the opposition torn to shreds, Mr. Speaker, this government's policy with respect to energy development? Has it made, Mr. Speaker, one valid point in criticism of this government's energy policy?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that if you go back over the Hansard, the debate on this bill, which, Mr. Speaker, the opposition confirmed and certified that they were prepared to use for an opportunity to have a full wide ranging energy debate, you will find, Mr. Speaker, that there is no criticism whatsoever of the government's energy policy. None.

Mr. Speaker, you will find that the Leader of the Opposition in his usual mischievous way started off on the first day and he threw out four red herrings. He threw them out, Mr. Speaker, on a string. I have to confess that he got a certain response in the House. I have to confess that on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition succeeded for a time, for a time, Mr. Speaker, in creating misunderstanding amongst the members of the House, in creating misunderstanding, I would submit, in the minds of the public with respect to the matters that he raised, matters, Mr. Speaker, not relating to energy policy. Nor I would submit, even relating to the bill before the House, Mr. Speaker. What were these four red herrings, Mr. Speaker?

Well, the Leader of the Opposition started off by talking about, while he agreed with the principle with the bill, four flaws that he saw in the bill - four flaws, Mr. Speaker. The flawed Leader came up with four flaws. What was the first flaw? The first so-called flaw, Mr. Speaker, was the section - Section (68) dealing with -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: No. It was dealing with M.H.A.'s, Mr. Speaker. Section (68) which permits, the way the Act now reads, which would permit a member of the House of Assembly to take a position on the Board of the Corporation, and not have to forfeit his seat under the Legislative Disabilities Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I knew this section was in here. And I have to take responsibility, Mr. Speaker, for this section appearing. And I have to take a certain amount of responsibility, I suppose, for the possibility of it creating a misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, amongst the members of the House, and amongst the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I looked at this section, and I said, now we have been in power for three years. We have had the power, Mr. Speaker, government have had the power to appoint members of the House of Assembly to the Board of the Corporation. Government have never exercised its power. As a matter of fact, it have corrected mistakes of the past in removing previous M.H.A.'s from appointments. I knew, Mr. Speaker, that this government had no intention of ever appointing members of the House in the normal course of events to the Board of the Corporation. But I said to myself, what about the possibility of some time in the future - what about the possibility of there being a real hot shot in the energy field, a real energy expert,

possibly one of the greatest experts on energy that the province, the country, maybe even the world has ever seen, and he, Mr. Speaker, has the misfortune, good fortune, I will leave it up to honourable members, to stand for election, Mr. Speaker, and become elected to the House.

I said to myself -

MR. NEARY: Poor fellow.

MR. BARRY: "Now why should not government have the opportunity, have the option, of getting this person involved in the corporation if that possibility arose," Mr. Speaker. I said, "Well let us keep the option open and let us stick that section in there. It is nothing to be ashamed about. It is nothing done under the table." It is not changing the law, Mr. Speaker, and as a matter of fact none of the so called four flaws in any way changed the existing situation. That power, Mr. Speaker, if government wanted to exercise that power it would not have to bring in this bill in order to do it. It would not have to bring in this bill, Mr. Speaker, in order to do any of the things that the Leader of the Opposition is afraid we might do because each of those, Mr. Speaker, are provided for in the existing legislation, subject only to the section 24, that the Leader of the Opposition used to mischievously create concern in the minds of the native peoples that we were interfering with their rights, not the intent, Mr. Speaker, not the effect of this section, but that was the only new section.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: All the other sections, Mr. Speaker, including the section with respect to loans and guarantees, merely continue the form of existing legislation. They do not change the existing rights of government. They merely continue the existing legislation.

So when I came to this section on M.H.A.'s I said, "Look, that is not a problem. It is not an issue as far as I am concerned. I am interested in getting a good Hydro Corporation

but why not keep the option open, if government has the opportunity of sometime in the future, of finding an expert on energy, on hydro electric energy particularly, in a member of the House who has been elected, then why have the government's hands tied from getting him fully involved.

MR. NEARY: Do you think George McLean would be foolish enough to -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, could we control this Bell Island monster, the cookie monster? Is there any way of controlling it at all, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MURPHY: Better get Judge Mifflin after him.

MR. THOMS: I ask the Speaker if he would ask the honourable minister to withdraw that statement as he referred to the member for Bell Island as a monster. This, Mr. Speaker, is definitely unparliamentary.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order -

MR. HICKMAN: To that point of order, I am not aware of anything in Beauchesne which says that to use the word monster is unparliamentary but if Your Honour wishes to adjourn for a couple of minutes to consult with the table -

MR. MURPHY: We will get pictures of other monsters.

MR. HICKMAN: I am sure that we can make parliamentary history.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would not want to be considered as insulting Dracula, so I withdraw that.

Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the Leader of the Opposition has engaged in some one-upmanship, gamesmanship some fishing, some use of red herring to confuse issues, to draw the public's attention away from the fact, Mr. Speaker, that he had nothing to contribute to the development of the energy policy of this province, absolutely nothing, Mr. Speaker.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues could not find one criticism, Mr. Speaker, of this province's energy policy nor could they find one constructive

suggestion as to what this government should be doing in the field of energy policy. We caught them, Mr. Speaker, with their trousers down. We offered them the opportunity for a wide ranging energy debate, a full wide ranging energy debate, Mr. Speaker, they did not have the ammunition to take us up on that offer.

So obviously they got together in caucus when we gave them this opportunity, they got together in caucus and they decided, Oops it is not going to look very good, Mr. Speaker, It is not going to look

very good if we go for a debate of three or four days, and we do not find any criticism of government on this bill. It is not going to look very good, Mr. Speaker, if we do not find anything new to suggest to government, anything constructive to suggest. What are we going to do? We have a problem. Then, Mr. Speaker, one of the honourable member's colleagues, one of the Leader of the Opposition's colleagues, maybe even the Member for Bell Island, because he is well versed in this technique, Mr. Speaker, he said, well, why do we not try the old red herring gambit? Let us try the old red herring gambit, let us get away from this energy debate business, this nonsense on debating energy. We will be slaughtered, Mr. Speaker, if we try that. We do not know anything about energy. We do not have anything to say about energy. We do not know what type of corporation is good in terms of assisting government so let us not talk about it. Let us get away from that. Let us flake out a few red herrings.

Now let us see is there anything in this bill that is provocative at all? Is there anything that we can warp or twist? Mr. Speaker, they found a number of things. The first thing is the one I just mentioned, section 6(8) with respect to M.H.A.'s. I have no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for this appearing in the bill. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is not bad legislation per se. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only reason there is concern raised, and I submit, concern raised from this side of the House as well, with respect to this section, is because of the way we have seen it abused in the past, Mr. Speaker, by some honourable members opposite who formed part of the previous administration. That is the only reason, Mr. Speaker, why there is any concern raised with respect to that section. So, Mr. Speaker, I might also mention, this was in the bill by the way, as were three of the other four things that were criticized, this was in a bill that was passed unanimously by this honourable House in June of last year, June, 1973.

AN HON. MEMBER: 1974.

MR. BARRY: I am sorry, June 1974.

MR. BARRY: The Leader of the Opposition and all the members present in this honourable House voted unanimously for legislation to incorporate a Power Corporation, to do away with the Power Commission and to set up a Power Corporation. Mr. Speaker, this section with respect to M.H.A.'s, section 6 (8), was contained in that legislation. The Leader of the Opposition says, I have the right to change my mind. I have the privilege. It is a lady's privilege to change her mind. I have the right to change my mind, Mr. Speaker. I have the right to say that I am wrong, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is a lady's man.

MR. BARRY: Yes, he does, Mr. Speaker. Thank goodness, he has that right. He will need it a lot, too. He has the right to say he is wrong. But the thing that gets me, Mr. Speaker, is that he starts then talking about this being a matter of principle. It is a matter of principle that he cannot vote for this. How is it he could vote for it in June, 1974, and he cannot vote for it in March, 1975? We have seen principles changed, Mr. Speaker, from 1971 or pre 1972, when honourable members opposite were either in the previous administration or supporting it. We have seen how their principles have changed since. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that even though many of them have the faces of a robber's horse, that they would be a little more aware, that you can have your principles, like a seesaw, Mr. Speaker, swinging from month to month. How can any member of this honourable House maintain credibility by saying continuously, as the Leader of the Opposition has done, oh! I was wrong. Less than a year ago I was wrong again, Mr. Speaker, on a matter of principle. I want to change my mind, Mr. Speaker. Enough said, I will not go into that any longer. I can go into that all day, Mr. Speaker, but I am afraid I would not be able to eat my lunch if I kept on much longer on that point.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, that section was in the Power Corporation bill, and when I had the Newfoundland Hydro Bill drafted, which I might point out was ready in the last session, ready, printed up, Mr. Speaker,

March 10, 1975

Tape no. 285

Page 3

during the last session, and which the intent was when this
House adjourned prior to Christmas that we would come back and
finish off the old session, pass the

Newfoundland Hydro Bill. Now, after it was printed up, Mr. Speaker, last December and distributed, some of my colleagues came around and said, "Well, look we have had some second thoughts about this section (68), let us take it out. Let us not give any possibility of abuse twenty years in the future, thirty years in the future if we have a less enlightened government than the one we have now, Mr. Speaker." So, I said, Okay. I am not hung up on that. Let us take it out. We will take it out at committee stage.

Then, Mr. Speaker, lo and behold! The session terminated and the bill was, I guess, just renumbered. It did not have to be reprinted. It was already printed up. It was renumbered and submitted to this session of the House. Mr. Speaker, this section, we will take it out. There is nobody hung up in this section of the House on this section. There are even some concerns raised, Mr. Speaker, about it. I have agreed that it would be taken out, Mr. Speaker, because of concern raised by my colleagues. It is unfortunate that we had the Leader of the Opposition and others go on a two day, three day rampage on this section, attempting to detract from the main part of the bill, Mr. Speaker, but we will take it out. We are not hung up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the next section that the Leader of the Opposition referred to, section twenty-four. The Leader of the Opposition - this has to be one of his more mischievous moments, one of the most mischievous moments in this honourable House's history, I submit. I suppose to a certain extent I can understand it. While a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition admits to not having practiced and we will not hold that against him. When he then sets himself out after hearing from three or four eminent lawyers who are present, Mr. Speaker, as members of the House, after being told that it was not the intent, after being explained why this would not in any way interfere with native claims, the claims of native peoples, to any rights that they might have, Mr. Speaker, still we have him go on and on and on about the way

this government is interfering with native rights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government realizes that this is a very sensitive area. We saw that these mischievous statements by the Leader of the Opposition had the effect, I guess, which he intended. They created a genuine concern in the minds of the native peoples of our province that their position was being changed, being modified, before they had had an opportunity to research their rights because, Mr. Speaker, this is what is happening now.

This government has met with representatives of our native people and we have said, "We do not know what your rights are." They have indicated that they do not know what their rights are. They have certain ideas, but they indicated that they needed funds in order to research their claims. So, this government said, "Okay, let us get some funds." The federal government we knew had funds available. The Native Association said to us, "Okay, we need your support. We will not be able to get funds from the federal government without the support of the provincial government. Will you support us?" This government without hesitation said, yes, we will. If we can have this research carried out by federal funds instead of provincial funds, this makes funds available within the province for other things, Mr. Speaker, other things, we submit, of benefit to the native people as well as to all the people of our province. So, we said, "We will support you in your application for federal funds."

Mr. Speaker, we understand, we know that the funds have been available and we understand that the Native Association is now in the process of researching its rights to determine just exactly what its rights are, a process,

Mr. Speaker, which we understand, could take up to three or four years because, Mr. Speaker, it is a very large subject, a very complicated subject. We have said, Mr. Speaker, that when the Native Association or when the native peoples, they are doing it, and we have a number of native associations now, we have the Innuite Association, as well as the Native Association, and while there is representation, I believe, by the Innuite Association on the Native Association, I also believe that there is some variance of policy at times and there may be some differences with respect to rights, I am not sure. But this is a complicated area and this government has said, when you have finished your research, come to us, make a proposal. Let us know what you believe your rights are. Let us know what you believe should be done, and this government will seriously consider, Mr. Speaker, any such proposal.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we do not want, in any way, to change their position before the native people are in a position to know just what their rights are and what they should do. We do not think it is fair to enact any legislation that would interfere with the eventual outcome of any claims that they make. Mr. Speaker, that was our intent when this legislation was drafted and it still is our intent. I submit there is nothing in section twenty-four, Mr. Speaker, that would, in any way, interfere with the rights of the native peoples. But, Mr. Speaker, the damage has been done now. The damage has been done. There has been doubt raised by the Leader of the Opposition in his very clever attack on this section twenty-four of the act. Mr. Speaker, just to avoid the problems that are going to arise because of the very sensitive nature of this area, Mr. Speaker, that everybody knows, Mr. Speaker, we are going to remove this section, not because we believe it, in any way, interferes with the rights of native people.

Mr. Speaker, here is one member of the House who does not need the Leader of the Opposition to tell him about native rights or does not need the Leader of the Opposition to tell him about the constitutional position of the native people.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Smart lawyer.

MR. BARRY: I had - smart lawyer, okay, thanks for the compliment, Mr. Speaker, but I did have the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of being the lawyer who first incorporated the Native Rights Association in the Province. I was the first lawyer, Mr. Speaker, to act for the Association. I incorporated them. I believe that they are entitled, Mr. Speaker, to the opportunity of researching their rights and Mr. Speaker, I believe then they are entitled to put their position to government. This government does not intend to, in any way, Mr. Speaker, interfere with their ability to so do.

Just in passing, Mr. Speaker, it might be of interest to honourable members of this House as to where the section twenty-four came from. Now this was recommended to me by officials who were assisting in drafting the Act as something that could be of benefit to the Corporation, Mr. Speaker, that could prevent a disgruntle citizen, Mr. Speaker, from interfering with the supply of power, not the development of power sources, from interfering with the supply of power, as the section reads, for example, from preventing a corporation from going across his land or going on to his land, to put up a transformer to make emergency repairs, for example, to a transformer, if you had half a city blacked out, Mr. Speaker, and you had a citizen attempt to block the Corporation

in carrying out necessary repairs. It would be clear, Mr. Speaker, from this section that any person so doing would be holding himself liable in law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the same thing will apply if this section is removed. It just spells it out. It makes it more obvious, Mr. Speaker, but the same law will apply as I understand it because this section basically does not change the fact that the Crown Corporation that we are setting up here, the Hydro-Electric Corporation, will be an agent of the Crown as was the Power Commission, as was the Power Corporation. So will Newfoundland Hydro be an agent of the Crown.

Mr. Speaker, the restrictions that are set out in this section are the normal restrictions that apply with respect to actions against the Crown, as I understand it. You cannot go out and get an injunction against the Crown in the same way that you can with respect to an ordinary citizen. So, Mr. Speaker, while this section would have made it more clear, we submit, to the ordinary individual as to what his rights were or were not, there will be no great harm done in deleting it. There may be a lot of harm done in keeping it in because of the mischievous statements of the Leader of the Opposition.

Just in passing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this was not a section that we put in there without any research or without any thought or anything else. I might mention that the Acts of Ontario and Quebec have sections to the same effect, and the Act of Manitoba has wording exactly like the section twenty-four. I would like to bring to the attention of the House that even the Province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker, has a section to the same effect in its Hydro Act. I will mention it.

"No extraordinary recourse contemplated in articles (they mention articles of the Code of Civil Procedure, Mr. Speaker) shall be exercised and no injunction shall be granted against the commission or the commissioners."

Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that this section was part of Quebec law, the James Bay native people had no problem, Mr. Speaker,

in taking certain action with respect to the development of James Bay. Mr. Speaker, I submit that our native people would not have had their rights in any way impaired or hindered by Section twenty-four. Mr. Speaker, as I say, because of the concern that has now been aroused in this highly sensitive area, Mr. Speaker, we will delete that section, when, Mr. Speaker, something not crucial to the bill, not a fundamental part of the bill, not a matter of principle as the Leader of the Opposition is attempting to say it is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what else do we have here? What other great - oh yes, the Public Tender Act. He went back then. He had gotten up as far as section twenty-four but then the Leader of the Opposition went back to section seventeen (d), Mr. Speaker, and said, Oh, this is a terrible affront, a terrible skirting of the Public Tender Act. What nonsense! Section seventeen (d) says, "The corporation may contract with any person for the purchase of petroleum products, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act." Another section, Mr. Speaker, by the way, I might mention that was voted for by the Leader of the Opposition in June of 1974, that is present in the existing act, that the Corporation would have the power to do if this act was never passed. Mr. Speaker, we are not changing any law here. That is the law today.

Why was that section put in last year's act? It was put in, Mr. Speaker, primarily because there was some problems because of the Golden Eagle Act. Some restrictions were being caused. In the very manner which the honourable members opposite are saying should be done, the Golden Eagle Act, passed by the previous administration, supported by members opposite, restricted the ability of the Power Corporation to go out to public tender, restricted the ability of the corporation to get the best price for petroleum products.

Mr. Speaker, this government put in that section just to enable the Corporation to get a more competitive price. Mr. Speaker, we are not changing it. If the honourable members opposite do not like it, they can vote against this bill. That is their right, but this government is not changing that section, Mr. Speaker. We see no reason to. The honourable the members opposite can howl about an affront to the Public Tenders Act all they want. We are not changing this section, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to point out also that the policy of the Corporation that is being implemented and will be implemented will in no way, Mr. Speaker, will in no way run contrary to the Public Tenders Act. The honourable the members opposite know that.

The final so-called flaw that the Leader of the Opposition brought to the House's attention, Mr. Speaker, and that received the most coverage in the media and the most discussion, I suppose, in the course of debate on both sides of the House, and again, Mr. Speaker, that is something unrelated to energy policy are the sections dealing with loans and guarantees, Mr. Speaker. Again, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that this in no way changes the existing law, that these are the same sections, Mr. Speaker, the same sections that the Leader of the Opposition and honourable members opposite and all the members of this House voted for in June of 1974.

Now, when we are preparing a statute, Mr. Speaker, to review, reorganize the Power Corporation, to set up a Corporation, Mr. Speaker, that is going to be able to assist government in formulating energy policy, Mr. Speaker, we do not then take on a survey and a review of all legislation, all existing legislation of the Province. We do not survey every statute, Mr. Speaker, or every section of every act to determine whether there is legislation that should be changed, Neither, Mr. Speaker, do we, when we find a routine section, yes, a routine section, Mr. Speaker, that is in every Crown Corporation Act, Mr. Speaker, that was passed by this House in June of 1974 in a power corporation act, Mr. Speaker, we do not then engage in a great review of the effects of the Financial Administration Act and the Loan and Guarantee Act and every other act, Mr. Speaker, that in any way relates to this

when we know it is in no way changing existing legislation, it is in no way changing existing law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be, there may be a need to take a review of the relation of the Financial Administration Act to Crown Corporations, to Crown Corporations generally, Mr. Speaker. I am not saying there is not. There may be. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that I am not prepared to admit that this is the place to have that review done and to have that legislation enacted as an amendment to the Newfoundland Hydro Bill, No way, Mr. Speaker, it will never happen, it will not be done. These sections will not be changed, Mr. Speaker, as far as this government is concerned in any substantial way and unfortunately, if members of the opposite side find that they cannot support the bill, well that is unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, there were concerns raised, valid concerns, quite valid concerns, again, again, unfortunately, red herrings, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why, but the Leader of the Opposition threw out a few red herrings again and they were taken up and there were concerns raised on both sides of the House about the fact, Mr. Speaker, that these sections - nothing new in the sections, already existing legislation - that in some way, Mr. Speaker, this was a blatant attempt by this government in this Act to take away the control of the House

over financial expenditures, Mr. Speaker. Did you ever hear the like?

I guess, Mr. Speaker, the reason why the Leader of the Opposition's red herring was taken up, and got some people running after them was because, Mr. Speaker, there was some concern. Well you know we are entering into a large scale project here, \$1.6 billion, Mr. Speaker. That is a lot of money.

Now the House must be kept informed, Mr. Speaker. The House must authorize such expenditures, and must keep control, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that these do not escalate, so that they harm the credit of the province in large scale escalation, large scale overruns. Mr. Speaker, I can understand this concern. But I must also point out to this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, that this government at no time did anything to indicate that it is not prepared to come to this House with information to justify the expenditure of such money. That at no time in the past, Mr. Speaker, in the way we have treated other development such as the refinery project - when the refinery agreements were drawn up for the second refinery, this government did not have to come to the House, Mr. Speaker. But it did. It came to the House, Mr. Speaker, with the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, again you know, I find it difficult to understand how it is that these routine sections -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Yes, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, routine. Even though we are talking about \$1.6 billion for this particular Gull Island project. I find it difficult to understand how so much uproar has been caused by the Leader of the Opposition's remarks on these sections. But, Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid any possibility of doubt by anybody in this House, or anybody outside of this House, the Premier and this government confirms that it has been, is now, and always will be the intention of this government to bring before this House information with respect to the development of the Gull Island project, and Mr. Speaker,

will be bringing before this House a bill requesting authorization of the funds needed for this project.

Mr. Speaker, let me cast a word of warning here. Let no honourable member, Mr. Speaker, become complacent that there are going to be no problems with respect to this honourable House, or even any honourable government, this honourable government, or any other honourable government keeping control, total control, absolute control over a project of this magnitude. Let nobody be lulled into thinking that it is merely a matter of passing a bill, Mr. Speaker, and then there is control over the project. Because, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about is a project where there are no half measures. Building half a transmission line is not going to be any big help. Keeping control of cost for half a dam, or half a dam and part of a transmission line, or a tunnel without the transmission line, these are going to be of no great help in ensuring that the taxpayers dollars are not squandered, and ensuring that the credit of this government is not impaired. Nor, Mr. Speaker, need we assume at the present time that a completion guarantee may not be necessary from this honourable House before that project gets started.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it may be, I do not know for certain at this stage if it is, but it may be, Mr. Speaker, that before anybody lends funds for the

construction of the Gull Island project, and that is any private investor I am referring to, that it will require the commitment of this government to see the project through to completion. Such a commitment, Mr. Speaker, was required with respect to the Upper Churchill development, because you have what they call project financing, Mr. Speaker, because a large part of the security of any investor is based on the fact that this project will be completed, and will be a revenue producer, will be providing revenue to repay the dollars that are loaned.

So, Mr. Speaker, it may be that this House is going to have to make a decision. It may be that this province is going to have to make a decision that we either commit ourselves to the completion of the project or we not start it. It may be as blunt as that, Mr. Speaker. Now at this stage it is still too early to say, but quite conceivably, Mr. Speaker, it may be that any bill authorizing the expenditure of \$1.6 billion or whatever it is, may also have to be tied together with a completion guarantee to any private investors who are putting up dollars. You can see then, Mr. Speaker, why it is not as simple as some honourable members might think to present legislation that is going to see this honourable House keep total control over what happens in the way of expenditures in the Gull Island project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a completion guarantee does not mean that you give up all control, that you just say from day one, okay, we are starting the project, and it is going to be completed regardless of what it costs. That is not what it says, Mr. Speaker. In any project, presumably, there are stages as there will be in this one, when you can have certain dollars committed, and if something turns up, some gigantic reason for a fantastic increase in costs, you might just decide to write off your losses. The same thing would be possible here, Mr. Speaker, but the fact remains that any person in this province, when saying, let us commit \$1.6 billion to the construction of the Gull Island project, must realize that you start the project when you commit - take an arbitrary point - if you got \$500 million in there, if you got \$1 billion

in there, and there is some escalation, what do you do? It is a problem, Mr. Speaker, that faces everybody on a smaller scale - a man who is building his own house, a person who is building an office building, an apartment building. What it comes down to, Mr. Speaker, is cost control at every stage of the project. What it comes down to is keeping a continual flow of information, Mr. Speaker, during the course of the project to, as the cost accountants say, avoid surprises so that at all stages you are making a conscious, rational decision as to where you are going, so you do not have a situation such as developed with, as I understand, the linerboard mill at Stephenville, a project that was supposed to cost - what was it supposed to cost originally, John, the linerboard mill when it started?

MR. CROSBIE: It was \$53 million.

MR. BARRY: \$53 million and it has almost quadrupled.

much of the increase being done without any knowledge of anybody outside, but the Province being tied in to see the thing through.

MR. MURPHY: That was all right, sure. Nothing wrong with that, was it?

MR. BARRY: And what has got to be done, Mr. Speaker, and where I can understand some genuine concern, what has got to be done is insure that adequate information flows from the Corporation, from the builders of the project to government and to this House and to the people of the Province, to avoid surprises, so that at every stage people are in the position - government, the House, people of the Province - are in a position to know what is happening and to avoid problems where possible.

I mentioned this, Mr. Speaker, merely to lay to rest any complainant belief that the mere bringing in of a bill requiring this government to authorize expenditures, that that is going to solve all the problems, that that is going to be the total answer. It is not that easy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier has already said, it is not government's intention to use any provisions of this hydro bill for the purposes of allowing borrowing towards the Lower Churchill project without full reference to the House of Assembly.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: It is not going in this bill and if the honourable member does not like it, the honourable member can vote against the bill. That is the choice the honourable member has, but if it is up to this member, and I am speaking for government, it is not going in this bill. The reason that it is not going in this bill is because there is no need for it to go into this bill because this bill, in no way, changes - because we could forget about this bill. We could tear up this bill tomorrow, tear it up right now. We could withdraw this bill from this honourable House, Mr. Speaker. This government could go out under existing legislation and borrow the money for the Gull Island project. We are not bringing in this bill to give us that power. That power is there now. That power is there now.

Mr. Speaker, I never heard a murmur about, from the opposition,

March 10, 1975.

Tape 292

RH - 2

from this side or anybody else, about the need for amending such existing legislation. So why the concern now when we merely confirm the existing situation, when we bring in the same sections as are in the bill that were voted upon by honourable members opposite in June of 1974.

Mr. Speaker, it being one o'clock, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being one of the clock, I leave the Chair until three of the clock this afternoon.

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: At one o'clock the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy adjourned the debate.

The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: It has been agreed by the Leader of the Opposition that I can give notice of a resolution in connection with this Select Committee on the fisheries, if you could just revert to notices for a minute.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed the honourable minister should have leave to go back to notices. Agreed.

MR. CROSBIE: I give notice of the following resolution, Mr. Speaker, that a Select Committee of this House, consisting of the Member of Placentia East as Chairman and the Member for Bonavista South, the Member for Harbour Grace, the Member for Trinity North, the Member for Port de Grave, the Member for Bay de Verde, the Member for Fogo, the Member for Bonavista North, and the Member for Labrador South, be appointed to consider the present condition of the inshore fishery of the Island of Newfoundland and coastal Labrador, the problems facing inshore fishermen, fish plant operators, and all those involved in the said inshore fishery and all matters having an influence upon or pertaining to the said inshore fishery, with power to call for persons, papers and records and all other materials, to examine witnesses under oath and to hear evidence from all interested parties, and the said Select Committee to report back to this House with their views or recommendations in connection therewith on or before the 30th day of April, 1975.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy wish to continue?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking before lunch I had gotten to the fourth so called flaw, described by the flawed Leader of the Opposition, that he raised with respect to the Newfoundland Hydro Bill and I pointed out that obviously it was for lack of anything

to say with respect to energy policy that the Leader of the Opposition had gotten onto these four red herrings and I had mentioned, pointed out, how the first three so called flaws are non-issues, non-issues in that they are building out of all proportion the fact that certain sections similiar to existing legislation were contained in the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Electric Corporation Act.

I indicated that the section with respect to M.H.A.'s, government has no real concern about. It was put in originally to keep government's option there in the event that there should be, in the history of our province, at some date, a so-called energy expert, become elected as an M.H.A. then why not have discretion in government to have him appointed. Because of concern raised by my colleagues, because of the abuse the previous administration had put this section to -

MR. NEARY: Joey is gone, boy. Let him rest.

MR. BARRY: Our

people on this side have decided that it is just as well to bring it out, to take the section out, and Mr. Speaker, as I said this morning, we do not have any hard feelings about it. I do not think it is really fundamental to this bill. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition does, but it is another red herring, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Make him withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: With respect to the second point made by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, the false issue again, the mischevious statement by the Leader of the Opposition, implying, not just implying, stating that government were interfering with the rights of our native peoples, again, Mr. Speaker, we have no intention to do this. The section drafted does not do that. But to allay the sincere, genuine concern, Mr. Speaker, which the mischevious statements of the Leader of the Opposition have raised in the minds of our native people around the province we intend to withdraw that section, and I do not know what the moose from Bonavista North wants to make of that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Moose.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Is there something wrong ?

AN HON. MEMBER: Exactly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would remind the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy that he should, when referring to another member, refer to him by his rightful constituency or any other title.

MR. BARRY: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I meant to refer to the honourable bull moose, because of the -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is better to be a bull moose than a -

MR. BARRY: What are they?

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Are they stentorian tones?

AN HON. MEMBER: Bull moose.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: There is nothing personal intended, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the magnitude of the room-filling quality of the honourable member's voice, especially when somebody else is trying to have a few words to say.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to section 17 (d), I pointed out again another red herring, another non-issue. The only reason this is put in is to do the very thing that the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that we are trying to get away from. This section was put in to permit the Power Corporation to purchase petroleum products from anybody rather than being restricted under the terms of the Golden Eagle Act, an act which was brought in by the previous administration, supported by the Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite.

MR. ROBERTS: At the time, I was fighting it night and day.

MR. BARRY: You did not change it when you were in government.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I did not change it, no.

MR. BARRY: The fourth flaw raised by the flawed leader, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to loans and guarantees. Again I pointed out that these sections, Mr. Speaker, do not change existing law. They are in the existing Power Corporation Act. If government wanted to use the power set out here to finance the Gull Island project, it could do it without passing this act, Mr. Speaker, because the legislation is there right now at the present time. This is another issue raised to divert attention, Mr. Speaker, from the very positive and constructive energy policy which this government have put forth before this House for debate. We invited the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to take the opportunity to have a full and wide-ranging energy debate, and Mr. Speaker, he blew it. He could not take us up on it because he did not have the ammunition.

MR. NEARY: Did you hear the latest Newfie joke?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the biggest Newfie joke of all is right across the House from us.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the controls on government spending, there were some valid concerns raised, not by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker,

who in speaking out of his mouth on one side said that he supports the principle of the bill, but then on the other side of his mouth says that he has certain fundamental reservations, certain matters of principle that prevent him from voting for this bill. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition just got through last June voting for the exact, identical, similar sections in the Power Corporation Act but now he finds he cannot vote for these. He has had a revelation, Mr. Speaker. He was struck down by a bolt of lightning from above.

Mr. Speaker, there were some valid concerns raised, as I have mentioned, and as I was getting into before we broke for lunch. As far as I can see the concern that this House should have, the concern that the people of the province should have with respect to the Gull Island project, or any project of similar magnitude, is a concern that they have the information, Mr. Speaker, at all relevant times to be able to evaluate what is happening, to be able to make a rational, conscious decision as to whether they can still support the particular project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at this stage we have supplied, I would submit, as much information on this project as honourable members of this House ever got on any project from the previous administration. I only mention this, Mr. Speaker, just to show the lack of credibility of honourable members opposite. We are not trying to use a standard set by the previous administration. I reject the standards laid down by the previous administration. But, Mr. Speaker, I do have to refer back when I keep seeing honourable members opposite raising points that they blithely ignored when they were in a position to do something about it.

But with respect to controls on government spending, Mr. Speaker, I tried to point out this morning that we should not be complacent. We should not assume that just because this House passes a bill saying that it authorizes the expenditure of such and such

an amount we should not assume this is going to solve all our problems with respect to the Gull Island project, or any other project. You got to have proper cost controls, Mr. Speaker. You got to have a continual updating of information. You got to have the periodic supply of information to government, to the House, to the people of the province so that all concerned can see just what is happening, so that there will be no surprises, Mr. Speaker, no linerboard mill type surprises where the cost of projects all of a sudden have doubled, tripled, quadrupled.

MR. NEARY: What about Spencer Lake type of surprises?

MR. BARRY: No Spencer Lake type of surprises, whatever they are either. No surprises period, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: No George McLean surprises.

MR. BARRY: No surprises period, Mr. Speaker. There shall be no surprises.

MR. NEARY: What about Trizec?

MR. BARRY: No loot bags, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: No first aid party type surprises.

MR. NEARY: What about the Silver Anniversary Celebrations?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable crowd opposite are fully familiar with the type of surprises I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, I also mentioned that it may be, I do not know, but it may very well be, that just as was required on the Upper Churchill, that this government, this province may have to make a commitment, Mr. Speaker, a commitment to guarantee completion of the Lower Churchill project, if this gets underway. Then, Mr. Speaker, you have possibly some possible -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: reconciliation necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, do I have to go over and control that myself or will the honourable House -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Use your black belt.

MR. NEARY: Have you got your belt...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now listen. Mr. Speaker,

it may be necessary for this government, or this province to commit itself, to commit, guarantee the completion of the Lower Churchill project, the Gull Island project. And it may be that it will become necessary to reconcile any limit of borrowing that is set by this House with such a guarantee of completion.

Now personally

I can see ways where this can be brought about. I am open to suggestion from, God help us, the honourable members opposite. I have not had any constructive suggestions yet, but I am open to suggestion from them or honourable members on this side of the House or the general public either, for that. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think a way that we can reconcile these, I do not think it is contradiction, but the principle on the one hand of having some control on the limit of spending, and on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, having the commitment to the Province behind the Gull Island project to encourage investment by private investors. If somebody is putting up \$100 million, Mr. Speaker, and part of his security is the revenue that the Gull Island project is going to produce once it is built, then he will expect to be guaranteed that it is going to be built, not that it is going to be stopped three-quarters of the way or half-way or whatever. But I think a way you can get around this, Mr. Speaker, is to provide with a guarantee of completion, if this is necessary, provide that information is periodically required to be submitted to the House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this government has committed itself to this principle. It has never given, I submit, anybody in this Province or in this House any indication to believe that our policy was other than the one I have just mentioned. For the life of me, I cannot understand, I cannot understand, I can understand why the Leader of the Opposition would raise it, but for the life of me I cannot understand the reaction that he got when he raised it. He got a few of us following the red herring this time, Mr. Speaker, but hopefully, the statement by the Leader of the Government and myself should have allayed that misapprehension. I hope that the honourable Member for Labrador South who was not in the House, I do not think, or he may have been, when the Premier made the statement and who, I think, may not have realized that this is the law right now. It is not something that we are changing. This is the law as it exists today with respect to loans and guarantees. There is no conflict with the Financial Administration Act. There is nothing new, no new power being put in

government by this legislation, these sections twenty-six to whatever they are. I submit, it would be a shame if the honourable member opposite did not feel that he could support this, otherwise, I would submit, worthwhile bill just because of these sections, particularly when the Premier and our government has made the commitment that there will be legislation with respect to the Gull Island project itself and that the borrowing will not be done on the basis of the sections in this bill. These sections are not necessary. This bill is not necessary. We could tear it up, withdraw it from the Order Paper and the power is there right now for government to borrow.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that all members of this honourable House will see fit to support this bill with the two amendment as I have made, but with no amendments to the loan and guarantee section because, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is energy policy, what we are talking about is setting up a Corporation that is going to be in a position to advise government on the development of energy policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could just briefly deal with some of the other specific matters raised by honourable members on the Hydro Bill. The Leader of the Opposition got some headlines the first day by suggesting that we take over all power distribution systems in the Province. He did not explain why, Mr. Speaker. I would be interested in finding out why. When this government decided it was necessary to take over Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation, it was done for a very specific reason, Mr. Speaker. You had a private corporation blocking a policy of government, preventing a policy of government from being carried into effect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it were that any private distribution entity in the Province were blocking the government's policy, were preventing government policy from being carried into effect, then I would see some validity in the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion,

but, Mr. Speaker, nationalization for the sake of nationalization, what is there in that? What it means is that the government would have to take on the additional borrowing that will be necessary, I understand it is in the area of \$50 million or in excess of \$50 million over the next few years, that Newfoundland Light and Power alone sees will be necessary to upgrade its system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, taking over this corporation or any other private distribution system will merely mean by this that this type of money will have to be raised from either the taxpayers of the province or the consumers of electricity in the province. There does not appear to be any conflict at the present time between government policy and having the distribution system run by private corporations. Until I see that there is a conflict, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I will not be able to accept that suggestion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have another suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that we restrict directors on the Board of Newfoundland Hydro to Canadian citizens resident in Newfoundland. Okay, on the face of it there does not appear to be any problem there, but, Mr. Speaker, I submit again it is an unnecessary tying of government's hands or the Power Corporation's hands by having any such clause in the act. It may be, for example, that the province can save money, can get more favourable rates from the bond markets of the world if it has a member of one of the large bond houses, one of the large American bond houses, for example, on the board of directors such as, Mr. Speaker, BRINCO had on its board of directors and such as we today have with respect to Churchill Falls, Labrador Corporation. We have Mr. Tomlinson who is a representative of Morgan, Stanley, a person who has the confidence of American investors who have put up a lot of money for the Upper Churchill.

These investors like to have some independent individual on the board with no axe to grind, who can sort of keep an eye out for their interests. Now, if it is going to save us a few million dollars in interest rates or whatever to do this, I have no great hesitation, Mr. Speaker, in saying that I would be prepared

to put on one non-Canadian on the board of directors. I do not think there is any danger of a coup, a take over, any danger of the policy of the board then being oriented towards a non-Canadian policy, Mr. Speaker. So, I am not prepared to recommend that this restrictive type of clause go into this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to another suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition, which was that there be a duty imposed on the Corporation to protect the environment, Mr. Speaker, and that clause be written into the act. Mr. Speaker, this Corporation just like every other corporation in the province will be subject to the laws provided by this legislature for the protection of our environment. It is the responsibility and duty of the Department of Provincial Affairs and Environment to enforce such legislation. Such legislation should be and will be of general application, Mr. Speaker. There is absolutely no need or reason to have such a specific clause in this bill because this Corporation will be just as aware, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope even more aware of the necessity of avoiding any environmental disturbance as any other corporation would be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a couple of other points that have been raised, none of any great substance. I think some of these have been answered by the Minister of Fisheries, the Premier. Oh yes, here is one statement, Mr. Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition, again in his clever, twisting way is trying to disseminate, I think, what they called in "1984" misinformation, was it?

I think they even had a minister of misinformation in the government at that time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Well the Leader of the Opposition would make a good minister of misinformation, Mr. Speaker, because he takes a set of facts, and he distorts, and he warps, and he twists, and he reads into it something very completely different than any reasonable interpretation of the facts would see there.

He took, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Power Corporation is projecting that there is need for additional generating facilities to meet our energy needs in the late seventies, and the eighties, he took this to mean that government had only recently, he said, discovered that there would be a power shortage. Now, Mr. Speaker, what nonsense! It does not say much, Mr. Speaker, for his opinion of our Newfoundland people that he attempts to pull these red herrings, and these twisted, and warped interpretations of the facts before their eyes for his own political ends, Mr. Speaker.

The Power Corporation and this government are doing what the previous administration should have been doing, Mr. Speaker. We are trying to look ahead. We are trying to meet the needs of our province with respect to energy, not just for the next one or two years, where there will be a crisis situation development in three or four years, unexpected so that we have to deal with it in a hurry. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here, we are trying to develop means of meeting the energy needs of our province for the next twenty years, probably. We are talking about meeting the energy needs of our province in the eighties and nineties, Mr. Speaker.

So this statement that we have only recently discovered that there would be a power shortage is total rubbish! Nonsense!

What has to be done, Mr. Speaker, by the Power Corporation, by any other corporation in this day and age, in this day where circumstances change quite rapidly in many cases, and in a way often that is unexpected, but circumstances do change and therefore, Mr. Speaker,

the policies of corporations must be flexible enough to adapt, and their estimates of what is necessary in order to keep up with future needs must be continuously revised. And this is done, Mr. Speaker, by the Power Corporation, and will be done by Newfoundland Hydro, not just on a yearly bases, Mr. Speaker, but even more frequently than that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: What is that?

MR. ROBERTS: Labrador Linerboard turned down the proposal

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: It was close, I understand.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members have lots of experience in that, coming close in that wing.

MR. NEARY: They will need it to buy off Bill Saunders, you know.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, one of the points that I meant to mention with respect to this section on the loan and guarantee that seems to be causing a lot of difficulty, I believe that there is a failure to consider that - the Financial Administration Act attempts to put a limit on the general borrowing power of government each year so that government cannot just borrow whatever it wants to, and develop whatever it wants to, and develop a completely new policy, and go off on a frolic of its own, say when this House is not in session, or even when it is in session, and not without referring it to the legislature, committing this government, or committing the province to large sums of money.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, without pushing the point, I just raise it for consideration, that there may be a difference between that, putting a limit on the general borrowing power of the province, and looking at a specific project, and looking at the fact that you need a certain number of funds in order to complete a specific project. In other words, it may be, Mr. Speaker, that this province may have to guarantee completion of the Gull Island project. Now that to me does not mean that the House has given up control over expenditures to the

Executive Committee or Executive Council of government. All that means, Mr. Speaker, is that the House is behind this project, is going to do whatever has to be done to see it through to completion. We already have had expressions of support for the project with the information now available for the amount, presumably that has not turned anybody off, \$1.6 billion.

We are not talking about the House, Mr. Speaker, giving up control of the purse to government. We are talking now about making sure that the House is informed at all stages as to what is happening with respect to the Gull Island project and this, Mr. Speaker, this government is committed to.

It may not be possible, Mr. Speaker, to say that this government will periodically bring in bills authorizing another \$200 million or another \$300 million to be spent because, Mr. Speaker, it may be, and most likely will be, that the financial package put together will see the Province having to commit itself over five or six years to drawing down \$200 million or \$300 million as the Premier has listed in his speech several days ago, But it may be that this commitment will be done in one year, in this coming year, that we have commit ourselves to the full amount of the project, the funds to be drawn down over a number of years.

So, this is the difficulty in doing what the Leader of the Opposition just raised as a possibility, of periodically bringing in bills with specific amounts to be guaranteed. But, I think everybody in this honourable House, Mr. Speaker, agrees that there should be sufficient information forthcoming at all times to permit the people of the Province to know where the project stands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition raised another matter that was raised by the Federal Government as well. He talked about the difficulty the Province will have in getting this project off the ground without take or pay contracts, that we must have customers for the power, meaning large scale industrial customers.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, meaning some customers.

MR. BARRY: Well, Mr. Speaker, some customers, and the information with respect to some customers are set out in the Teshmont Zinder Report which indicates, Mr. Speaker, that if there was no new customer ever came into Newfoundland over the next fifteen years, that by the 1990's our present existing domestic and commercial and industrial customers will be using the full amount of the Gull Island power, So that the problem is, Mr. Speaker, to take up the slack in the early years because it is a matter

of getting a balance. You want to have as much powers left to meet your future needs as possible. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, you do not want to have a lot of power built into the system, a lot of capability built into the system, but not able to be used because that means that you losing money. That means that the power you are taking out on the early years will cost that much more than it could if the extra power was being utilized at the same time. That is why it is an advantage to us if we can, to sell surplus power in the early years to Quebec or whomever. Possibly we might attract customers on the Island and give them some reduced rates in the early years, the same as, treat it as surplus power, but by early years, I do not mean forty year contracts. I mean a five, six, seven year incentive to get them to locate, where they start off in a surplus power position recognizing that they move then to new contracts representing fully the true costs of supplying the power.

These are just ideas. These are ways that we can bring down the costs to the consumer in the early years. But, getting back to the necessity of having long term contracts, Mr. Speaker, when we first went up to Ottawa and I have the brief here that we presented to the federal minister, Mr. MacDonald, this was

the same thing that was put to us, look you have got to show us where you can sell all this power. You have got to show us before we commit the federal government to supporting this project, we want to see take or pay contracts.

Now we very forcefully put to the federal government, first of all that if they made that a commitment of their support for the project that that would be putting us behind the eight ball in terms of dealing with any potential customers because the customers would know they had us right where they wanted us. They would know that we could not get federal assistance for the project unless we got their contracts, and therefore they could screw us down, they could beat us down to the lowest possible price. We pointed this out to the federal government.

We also pointed out certain statistics with respect to our province's future load growth. We pointed out, for example, that the amount of energy used per capita or used per household in the province was very much less than that used nationally. We pointed out that the per capita income of the province was lower than other provinces and that as the per capita income increased, which it will have to if any regional economic expansion programmes succeed, as per capita incomes increase so will energy usage.

We pointed out that electric central heating will increase greatly as will the use of electrical appliances. We pointed out that there was a larger percentage of homes without central heating and a larger percentage of homes without the electrical appliances in Newfoundland than in the country generally.

For example, that thirty-six per cent, and these are 1973 figures, I think, thirty-six per cent of our Newfoundland households are without central heating as opposed to only twelve per cent nationally. We pointed out that there are thirty-one per cent of our homes in Newfoundland without hot water heating, or without hot water installed in the home. Thirty-one per cent, this is back

in 1973.

MR. NEARY: This bill is going to change all that.

MR. BARRY: Versus only six per cent nationally.

We pointed out that there were eleven per cent of our Newfoundland homes without refrigerators in Newfoundland, versus one-point-four per cent nationally.

In other words we were showing that Newfoundland's growth in electrical energy demand in the domestic sector alone can be expected to outstrip the national increase and demand by a significant margin as our province caught up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope we never catch up to some of the wasteful habits that are seen both on Mainland Canada, in North America generally, some of the wasteful habits with respect to the consumption of electricity. I suppose the electric toothbrush has to be the ultimate in that, I do not mean to insult anybody who has one, but the electric carving knife and others. You look at either one of these and there is no great use, I suppose, of power, the energy that they use in any one year would not be the same as that used by the person that leaves a sixty watt bulb burning all night because he is nervous in the dark, but still it is the combined, it is the culture that that implies. It is the trend that is shown there, you know, the problems of affluence, Mr. Speaker. Well, I do not want to see our province get to that stage, I do not think we will, but the facts that we quoted to the federal government did indicate that the load growths that we were projecting as reasonable for this province over the next ten, fifteen years, could be accepted and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, we told them, if they were not prepared to support the projected load growths that we were setting out, they were in effect saying they were not prepared to support the idea of this province continuing to be a viable province.

Because, Mr. Speaker, if there is any future for our province you have got to assume that there is going to be a continuing

March 10, 1975

Tape No. 300

NM - 3

growth, a continuing development and that means you have got
to assume a continuing load growth with respect to electricity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after a year and a half I have to say I have to compliment the federal government. I have to say that they did listen to us. They must have, Mr. Speaker, because they have come through with a commitment for \$343 million without requiring us to show them take or pay contract. Their commitment in turn, Mr. Speaker, will assist us in putting together the rest of the financial package because when the federal government committed those funds they in effect said This project is viable. You can bring power across to the Island of Newfoundland by a tunnel. The province can meet the cost from the consumption expected in the province over the next fifteen years, the cost of providing this facility, Mr. Speaker. So, the federal government have said in committing these dollars that they believe this is an economically viable project.

Now, the federal government has not required us to show take or pay contracts. Why, therefore, does the Leader of the Opposition insist on our showing take or pay contracts? Has he read the Techmont, Zinder Report? Has anybody over there read it?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. BARRY: Well then you know that it shows that a reasonable load growth of the province will take up the quantity of energy to be made available from the Lower Churchill. I will not go into the different projections we made, Mr. Speaker. We sent out all sorts of alternatives from a high load growth to a slow load growth to a medium load growth to a minimum load growth and basically, Mr. Speaker, we are saying that approximately eight per cent load growth is not unreasonable. When the federal government was analysing our figures They subjected our figures, Mr. Speaker, to certain assumptions. They assumed much lower load growths than what we consider to be reasonable. Even with those assumptions, the figures they ran through their computers still indicated that this Gull Island project was viable, and the cheapest of the alternatives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I could just briefly - oh yes, there was another reference, Mr. Speaker, to the comparison of the Gull Island project and the electricity from Gull Island to thermal and

nuclear plants and the suggestion was made that because of the large escalation in Gull Island we should look at something else. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that we did just in late 1974, about six months after the Teshmont, Zinder Report was done, we did another review of our figures because of the escalation that took place last year. We found, Mr. Speaker, that while the Gull Island project had escalated by some twenty-three per cent, that the fossil fuel alternatives, the thermal alternative, had increased by some twenty-four per cent and the nuclear alternative had escalated by some thirty-two per cent. There was a smaller escalation on the Gull Island project than there was on either of the alternatives. That is because of the different components that go into each type project.

Gull Island has a higher earth moving component, for example, that does not escalate as much as the nuclear plant with its sophisticated equipment and so on, very complicated, Mr. Speaker, very complicated.

Anyhow, if I could just finish off briefly with a few more interesting points. Somewhere here I have the figures. Oh yes, here we are. Whether take or pay contracts are essential, whether it is going to be necessary for us to sell power to industrial users or whether it is essential that we sell power to Quebec, surplus power to Quebec - well, there is some debate. It is not totally clear. The best opinion that I can formulate from the information the experts give me is that even if there is no surplus power sold to Quebec, and the project you anticipate at being completed in 1980, that Gull is still the most economical alternative compared to

thermal or nuclear as long as borrowing rates are less than eleven per cent. Now, if borrowing rates go above eleven per cent, we have to rework our figures, but they are below that now. They appear to be going down and this is why we say that even if no surplus is sold to Quebec, it appears that the project, the Gull Island project, is still the cheapest way of going about things.

Now, if surplus is sold, of course, it will be even better, even more attractive, even more cheap for our consumers. We also, Mr. Speaker, considered the effect of very low load growths. We considered the effect of the higher escalation. We considered the effect of the increase in borrowing rates, all of which, of course, work adversely on the Gull Island project. If we assume that there is surplus power sold as anticipated in the Teshmont, Zinder Report, to Quebec, interest rates could go up as high as thirteen per cent and Gull Island would still be the preferred alternative. It would still be cheaper than the thermal or nuclear route.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition asked where are we going to use the power, Mr. Speaker. Well, it is not where we are going to use the power, it is where you use it at what period. We can use all the power, we will be able to use all the power of the Lower Churchill, Gull Island and more by the early 1990's. We will need another hydro development in Labrador or a development on the Island. Maybe at that stage our system will be large enough to take in a nuclear plant, if that is more attractive than a hydro development at that stage, but by 1990, Mr. Speaker, we are going to need other developments. Prior to 1990, we will have to start planning and committing ourselves to other developments. There is no stopping, Mr. Speaker, there is no stopping.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: With Gull Island -

MR. BARRY: With Gull Island there will be, if there was no large scale industrial development in the Province, all of the power would not be taken up until around 1990. That is assuming the existing load growth. Now, we have seen amazing things happen with respect to load growth, Mr.

Speaker. Before the Bay D'Espoir went in, there was an increase in load growth of six per cent a year and the Federal Government at the time of Bay D'Espoir, they were very concerned because they could not see how that rate of increase would be any greater than six or seven per cent a year. After Bay D'Espoir, Mr. Speaker, it doubled. I think for a time it tripled. The power was there, so people used it and this is why we brought in these statistics to show just where the Province is behind the rest of the country in terms of the amount of energy used per year per capita. The inference, Mr. Speaker, is that it is likely that Newfoundlanders will tend, because we have the same habits as our fellow Canadians, the same life style and so on, that it is likely that we will increase our consumption the same way as consumption has increased nationally.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that that should answer where the customers for the power are going to come from and who is going to use it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Transportation tunnel - I think I dealt with that, Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks. It is simply a question of whether at this stage our government, with respect to transportation priorities, should commit another \$120 to \$150 million to a transportation tunnel, whether that should take priority as compared to building a Trans-Labrador Highway or paving the Great Northern Peninsula Road or what have you, that we have established that our first priority should be to build an energy carrying tunnel from the Island, but it has to be shown to my satisfaction that this additional \$120, \$150 million should be spent on a transportation tunnel. It has not been shown to me that this need is there at the present time.

I do believe, however, that this is something that we will probably see in a very short period. We will see a transportation link to the mainland. It is an idea, Mr. Speaker, whose time has come or else will very soon come. The other points, Mr. Speaker, if I could just check for a moment, I think I have answered most of them.

Oh yes, the Member for Bell Island attempted to give us a hard time about the harsh words we were laying on the federal government, Mr. Speaker, and again he got back to his policy, and I assume it is the Liberal policy, that we should be going with cap in hand, Mr. Speaker. We should be going tugging our forelock, and kissing their shoes when we go up to Ottawa, because, Mr. Speaker, if we do not, they will not be nice to us, and they will not give us anything. What rubbish, Mr. Speaker! What nonsense! I think that this particular exercise has shown that if you take a proper business-like approach, if you do your homework before you go up, if you get your facts and your figures straight, it does not matter how hard a case, how aggressive a case we put to Ottawa, that they will come through with the goods. Now they have come through with some \$343 million, Mr. Speaker. I think that means something.

Some of the members on this side of the House, I think, the Member for St. John's South raised some questions with respect to the technical feasibility - I am not sure if it was St. John's South or St. John's North, possibly St. John's North.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: Sure, Mr. Speaker, there are doubts. I am not prepared to stand up in this House and say that every aspect of this project is nailed down that there is no possibility of anything going wrong. Mr. Speaker, there are many places where things can go wrong, for example, in the construction of a tunnel, Mr. Speaker. You are dealing with probabilities, you are dealing with some unknown. You do not know with absolute certainty the condition of the rock underneath the Straits of Belle Isle. What you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is you have to get the best possible advice and information, the best likelihood, the best probabilities, and from everything that is given us by the top-notch people in the world, by the best people in the world, they are telling us that this is a project that has a high rate of success, that has an acceptable rate of success, that is something that is viable, that is something that can be constructed, that is something that can be

constructed and have power flowing over the lines at a cost cheaper than any other alternative. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to rely on the opinions of our experts, and this is what we are prepared to do, but do not let anybody start saying that oh, this government is saying there is no possibility of doubt, no possibility of problems. Mr. Speaker, if this is like any other project in the world, there will be problems.

MR. CARTER: Would the minister permit a question?

What about sending the power -

MR. MURPHY: Stand up John, if you are going to ask a question.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister a question.

While I was speaking on the bill, I suggest that it may be wise to consider sending the power down to North America and the Eastern Seaboard of the United States. Would the minister comment on that aspect of it, please?

MR. BARRY: Sure, Mr. Speaker, sure we can send all the power that we can develop in Labrador, we can ship it down to the United States or to Ontario or to Quebec but where does that leave us, Mr. Speaker? What we are talking about now is not developing a project for the sake of developing a project. We are talking about trying to meet the energy needs of this province, trying to bring power where the people are. What we have determined is that in terms of meeting the needs of the people on the Island of Newfoundland, the needs that they will have in the 1980's, that the development of Gull Island and bringing power underneath the Strait of Belle Isle is the cheapest, best way of meeting those needs.

Now we might be taking some chances, Mr. Speaker. Nobody is saying that this is an easy life, nobody is saying that there are no doubts in the minds of people dealing in this project or any other project. What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that if you are going to live, you are going to take risks. What you got to make sure is that you minimize the risk, that you make the risk acceptable, and from the information that I am supplied with, this is an acceptable risk.

March 10, 1975

Tape no. 303

Page 3 - mw

Large stakes, a lot at stake as far as this province is concerned, but
if we can avoid having it become a political football, Mr. Speaker,
if we can

make a business type of approach to the thing. I think that this project can become something that the province will be proud of. I think it is something that will meet our energy needs, that it will show the rest of the world that we can control our destiny down here in Newfoundland. But it is going to take a lot of hard work over the next few years, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know if there is anything else worth mentioning, Mr. Speaker. I think I have covered most of the things. I think that honourable members of the House will have an opportunity to raise any questions that I have missed answering during the committee stage. Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a choice, we have a choice between accepting this energy policy that government are putting forth, attempting to develop the energy potential of Labrador, attempt to bring it to the Island of Newfoundland, attempt to tie the Island of Newfoundland into Labrador, the rest of the province, and the rest of Canada by means of a national grid. Or, Mr. Speaker, we can take the possibly safer, more cautious, more expensive approach of building up our generating capacity in bits and pieces, putting in thermo plants, relying on fossil, fuel fired thermo plants, relying on high priced foreign petroleum product. By 1980, Mr. Speaker, the Power Corporation will be paying close to \$40 million a year, just on bunker C petroleum products, close to \$40 million a year, Mr. Speaker.

You are talking in enormous quantities of dollars. There is a lot at stake. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is an occasion when all members of this House should be able to agree, as this is a project which was imaginative, that is, Mr. Speaker, a project that has all factors coming right. It is a project that grasps the imagination. That appears to be right for this particular time, Mr. Speaker, in our province's history. It is a project that with one fell swoop will end the isolation of our province, in terms of tying us into the rest of Canada, a Canadian electricity grid. It will at the same time, Mr. Speaker, bring hopefully two parts of our

province together, the Island and Labrador, where it will not be, Mr. Speaker, a matter of having the isolation between the two parts of our province that we have had up to now.

As I say we could take the safer approach, In my opinion, that would be a shame. In my opinion, that would be costing our people more in five or six years for the electricity that they wish to consume. And in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it will be dooming our province to economic stagnation. So our choice, Mr. Speaker, is between continued growth, continued economic growth and stagnation.

This bill is not going to meet all our problems, Mr. Speaker. But this bill I submit is a good step in the right direction.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. BARRY: It is a good piece of legislation. We should cast out of our minds the red herrings that were cast into them by the Leader of the Opposition. We should face up to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: We should face up to, Mr. Speaker, the question that is at issue here. Does this House support the energy policy of this government, or does it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: That is what this debate has been all about, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: That bill has not been

MR. BARRY: I support the energy policy of this government. I believe the people of the province support it, Mr. Speaker. Now let us see who does not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could answer a question. I followed as attentively as I could what little sense there was in most of his remarks. But I wonder could he make one thing clear. Do the government propose to amend Sections (26) through (32) at committee stage of this bill?

March 10, 1975

Tape 304 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I have made that abundantly clear that there will be no amendment to Sections (26) through (32). There will be no amendment because -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - no amendment necessary, there is nothing in these sections changing the existing law. The law as it stands today, if this bill never goes through the House, will be unchanged in all substantial matters. I think there are one or two points out in committee, one or two minor changes, Mr. Speaker, but there is nothing here that changes the existing law. The concerns that were expressed, Mr. Speaker, the concerns were expressed were expressed, I believe, because of the concerns of members that government was taking this as their authorization to proceed and lash out \$1.6 billion, commit the Province to \$1.6 billion of expenditure. This government, Mr. Speaker, has said that that is not the case and if there are honourable members here who are not prepared to accept this, then they vote against the bill and they vote against the energy policy of this government.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Is it the pleasure of the House that the Bill be now read a second time? Those in favour "Aye", Those against "Nay", carried.

MR. ROBERTS: We will divide the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order, please! Order, please!

All those in favour of the motion please rise. The honourable the Minister of Mines and Energy; the honourable the Minister of Health; the honourable the Minister of Social Services;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations; the honourable the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation; the honourable the Minister of Education; the honourable the Minister of Fisheries, the honourable the Minister of Finance; the honourable the

Minister of Forestry and Agriculture; the honourable the Minister of Tourism; the honourable the Minister of Rual Development; Mr. Dunphy; Mr. Alyward; Mr. Wells; Mr. Morgan; Mr. Brett; Mr. Senior; Mr. Carter; Mr. Wilson; Mr. Marshall; Mr. Young; Mr. Howard;

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion, please rise. The honourable the Leader of the Opposition;

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

Mr. Gillett; Captain Winsor; Mr. Neary; Mr. Thoms; Mr. Simmons; Mr. Martin.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I declare the motion carried.

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Electric Corporation," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tommorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order (1), the Address in Reply, I think the last day it was adjourned by the honourable Member for Bonavista North. He has fifteen minutes left.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have fifteen minutes left. Do not worry, I -

MR. SPEAKER: I informed the honourable member he had fifteen minutes left.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the debate -

MR. CROSBIE: A year ago.

MR. THOMS: Over a week ago, over, well over a week ago, I was speaking on some of the problems which our farmers are experiencing in the Province at the present time. Mr. Speaker, many of these problems have been brought about by various powers outside of our Province, but many of them, Mr. Speaker, have been brought about by the lack of understanding by the present administration. The present administration, Mr. Speaker, have totally ignored the problems of not only our farmers but our forestry people as well, that is, the people who produce in this Province, the basic industries, Mr. Speaker. An amazing thing about it, Mr. Speaker, the present government continues to ignore the people that are working in this Province. They continue to ignore the problems.

MR. SIMMONS: Hear! Hear! True. Right on.

MR. THOMS: They just stand by and hope the problems will go away. They do nothing to solve them, nothing whatsoever. They just simply ignore the problems and ignore the people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, our problems continue to be with us day after day. Our lackadaisical do-nothing government just stands idly by hoping that they will go away, but, Mr. Speaker, problems do not go away. They stay with us until we have competent people in government who can face the problems, come up with solution which will overcome the problems of our people.

Now, Mr. Speaker,

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: We had a government elected some three years ago, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: We had a government elected, Mr. Speaker, some five years ago who were supposed to have all the answers.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Go out and find your pills, boy.

MR. SIMMONS: Only three, it seems like five or ten.

MR. THOMS: Seems like a life time, you know. But, Mr. Speaker, this government was elected with a vast majority and they were supposed to have all the answers to the problems of the people of Newfoundland, but, Mr. Speaker, when all the problems are presented to them, they do not have the answers. They have a careless attitude. They could not care less about the problems of the people. They have closed off Confederation Building completely from the people of this Province.

MR. SIMMONS: Locked it up.

MR. THOMS: They have closed up the eighth floor of this building. It is out of bounds to any Newfoundlander now. If you are from Toronto, you can get in to see the Premier.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. THOMS: It is true. It is totally true. There is no way to get on the eighth floor of the Confederation Building now. You can pass through the Iron Curtain in Berlin quicker than you can get on the eighth floor

of this building.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Sure, you are not a Newfoundlander, Leo. He is talking about Newfoundlanders.

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, this is the old attitude of this government, the careless, do-nothing attitude of this administration. They have not at all met face to face with the problems, not at all met face to face with the people of the Province. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the problems continue to exist. They continue to grow. They continue to multiply and our cocktail administration just seems to go on and exist, fly high -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - blueberry juice -

MR. THOMS: - fly high on liquor that is paid for by the taxpayers of this Province, continue in this trend of living, Mr. Speaker, while our poor people today continue to try to merely exist.

Why, sure, I was reading in the "Telegram", I believe it was today's, where something over forty-three per cent of our people, forty-three per cent of our children are living in conditions that are not close to the Canadian standard. In other words, they are living in poverty. It would do any minister of the Crown good to read that article in today's "Telegram"

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do you create that -

MR. THOMS: Yes, you created it, sure. It has happened this last three years. Sure you have. You spent more money this last three years than any previous government did in ten.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

This fiscal year I believe the total budget was something like \$752 million. This coming year I would predict it will be well over \$800 billion. Possibly \$830 million or \$840 million, more money than ever the Newfoundland Government saw before. Still we seem to be doing less with more money, way less. As a matter of fact, our people of this province have yet to pinpoint anything that this government have done. This situation continues to exist just because, Mr. Speaker, we have a very incompetent government composed of very incompetent ministers. The only way that we can overcome this problem is for the Premier to take a one way trip down to the Lieutenant-Governor, because a one way trip it will be for sure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in the election of 1972 the Premier made a helicopter visit to my district. He dropped down in at least three places. The first spot he dropped down he promised paved roads. He dropped down in Hare Bay. We were going to have paved roads all over the place. The provincial government was going to pave the roads, the Premier said. To this date not one cent of pavement has been carried out by the provincial government, not one cent. He dropped down in Valleyfield, dropped down on the wharf. He promised the people there a stadium. Today the committee there cannot even get an appointment with the Premier to talk about a possible stadium. This was in March of 1972.

Mr. Speaker, today we have no sign of any promises that the Premier committed in that election. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that members of the Opposition are reluctant to believe the Premier when he promises that he will do this or he will do that or change some aspect of a bill. No wonder we are reluctant to believe him. We just simply do not believe him because he is a man who never keeps his word. He has yet to keep his word.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: It is a fact, is it not? I am irritating the Minister of Education because he knows what I am saying is true.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman obviously has every right to maintain his own positions and criticize the government, but he does not have the right to deny the veracity of a statement by the Premier or any other member, not a minister or any other member. I think the honourable gentleman perhaps did not intend to state that, but my understanding of the rule is that no member has the right to deny the honesty of another member. He may differ in point of view of interpretation, but not to deny the truthfulness of another member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir. This whole matter of the point of order raised by my honourable and learned friend, the Minister of Education, Sir, is merely a matter of opinion between two members. My colleague, Sir, merely questioned the credibility of the administration and of the Premier's statements. He is entitled to do that, Sir. He did not question the honesty or the integrity of the honourable the Premier. It was merely the political credibility of the administration and of the Premier's statements, Sir, and that is all my colleague questioned. I would submit that he is in order, Sir, and that he not be harassed by the Minister of Education and he be allowed to continue on with his speech.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If I may, Mr. Speaker. Certainly if that in fact was what the honourable gentleman said, then obviously he was in order, if that is in fact what he said. If he was stating that the word of the Premier or of any other member could not be accepted, then he was out of order. It is a question of which.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

The Chair interprets the gentleman's statements as somewhat border line. I caution him at this point to be careful in his remarks.

MR. THOMS: Our Speaker is indeed a real diplomat.

Mr. Speaker, what I was saying, no one in Newfoundland today trusts the present administration. No one believes them, not even the Minister of Education. We do not believe him either.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. He is really not allowed to say that. He may disagree with me but he is not

allowed to say that any member is in fact a liar.

MR. THOMS: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not call the honourable gentleman a liar. I just simply stated that I would not believe him.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I do not think the honourable gentleman absolutely has the right to say that.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): I think I cautioned the honourable gentleman a moment ago about these border line remarks and he is getting closer to the point. I would caution him once again that he is getting very close to being unparliamentary. I would ask him to be careful.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, we in the District of Bonavista North were indeed promised some paved roads, a stadium, recreation centers and a dozen other things. Mr. Speaker, to this date we have not seen any positive proof whatsoever that these promises would be fulfilled or any proof that there is any intention of fulfilling them. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are indeed disappointed. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we fail to give any credibility to any statement made by any minister of the crown.

Their actions have been somewhat dishonourable. Their incompetence is outstanding.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The honourable gentleman from Bonavista North referred to members of this House of Assembly as being dishonourable. Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of statement is completely unparliamentary. I would ask that the Chair rule that the member would retract that statement.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I retract that statement.

Mr. Speaker, we have been promised many things. Mr. Speaker, if one were to go back to that great election manifesto of March 1, 1972 which was presented to the people of Newfoundland in the form of a Throne Speech, it is full of promises. Maybe one could even interpret it as intentions of a government, but intentions that never did materialize. For example, Mr. Speaker, the government at that

day promised to provide some farm equipment banks for the farmers of this province.

MR. NEARY: Farming gear.

MR. THOMS: No, not necessarily farming gear. Farm equipment banks was the phrase they used. Mr. Speaker, even to this day, three years after, there is no sign whatsoever of any equipment for any of these banks. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there has been no announcement as to what locations these banks are to be set up, where they are to be set up. So, Mr. Speaker, this indeed is proof that this administration is trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, our people will not be fooled. They were fooled once, but they will never be fooled the second time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, you could go through the 1972 Throne Speech and you could pick out any number of subjects whereby this government has completely flopped on the job. Mr. Speaker, in the present Throne Speech it is a twenty-one page document as empty, Mr. Speaker, as a balloon on the other side of the moon.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The honourable gentleman has twenty seconds to finish.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I always thought we were given a five minute warning.

Mr. Speaker, to sum up, we have had three years of Tory rule in Newfoundland now. The three years represent a complete catalogue of mistakes, three years of Tory mistakes, three years of doing nothing, but, Mr. Speaker, their biggest mistake was in itself doing nothing.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): The honourable gentleman's time is up.

MR. THOMS: May I just finish, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Yield the floor for the next speaker.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that God limited the intelligence of this government, it is very unfortunate that he did not also limit their stupidity.

MR. EVANS: Too much blueberry juice.

MR. G. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, and members of this honourable House, it is with great pleasure I stand here today to speak in the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne so ably put by the Member from Bay de Verde and seconded by the Member for Bonavista South.

I may stray somewhat differently than the honourable Member for Bonavista North. I am sure the people in this House and the people in this province and the people from the district which he represents, **deserve** a whole lot better than what he threw forth here today.

It is not bad enough, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WILSON: To not even rise -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WILSON: To not even rise -

MR. EVANS: Yours is built on Waterford Bridge Road.

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): I will caution the Member from Hermitage that he along with others must obey the rules of the House, that when a member is speaking he is to be heard in silence.

MR. WILSON: As I way saying, Mr. Speaker, not even to rise to support this great project that is now being underway to undertake at Churchill Falls, sorry to see that members who have sat in this honourable House, on the same side which it is on, are against this bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WILSON: It is not enough -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: That bill has nothing to do with Churchill Falls.

MR. WILSON: Not enough to do, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: How would he know?

MR. NEARY: Learn to read and write boy.

MR. WILSON: Take your time, you should have done all of that. You are supposed to have all the sense and the knowledge over on that side. I would show you in a few minutes what you fellows did.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I mean to keep clear somewhat of the honourable the Member for Bonavista North because if I had come into this House of Assembly to represent a district which I had great respect for and handled myself no better than has been done by that honourable gentleman, I would go through the door and say, "Elect a new member."

MR. NEARY: Bonavista.

MR. WILSON: Why I am saying that, I am strictly going to try to deal with the issues and the first is, Mr. Speaker, Social Services. "My government will continue the policy of providing assistance at public expense for the Newfoundlanders, who through no fault of their own, are out of employment.

Mr. Speaker, and members of this honourable House, that is one of the first duties that I, as a member and the people of our province have. These people through no fault of their own are out of employment and they have to ask for social assistance. We should point no finger at them. That is number one.

Number two, Mr. Speaker, is fisheries. I am sure it is of great concern to every member of this House of Assembly, and it should be. As a fisherman of years ago it gives me great concern when I turn around and see what is happening now and hear about the great issue of what is being done. We are being deprived, as I said here a few days ago when I spoke, of our seal fishery. While we are being deprived of our seal fishery we are also being deprived of our cod fishery. Because a number of years ago, in thirty-four, thirty-five, thirty-six, thirty-seven, thirty-eight and thirty-nine there was a seal fishery in this country. There could be twenty-two to twenty-five sealing vessels

go to the front, probably a million seals would be killed and their carcasses used to provide bait for the inshore fishery.

Also, there was the offal from the steamers and the food that the people were eating and therefore the fish never had to go out to the Grand Banks to search for caplin. Caplin is a warm and a salt water fish. Now the seals have become so numerous that they are eating up the spawn of the fish and the fish are not getting any inshore bait.

This is the problem. No one else spoke about our seal fishery, they let it die. They went along with the honourable Jack Davis. That is what the Liberal Party did. For twenty-three years this went on. Not one word about it, not one word about it, and I do not want to go back to the past but I have come to the conclusion that we have to look to the future for our younger generation's sake. This is why I am looking forward.

Our seal fishery is being depleted, by whom? By whom? The Russians and the Norwegians can come over and take what they like and, Mr. Speaker, you know what we have to do. I will give you an instance of what we have to do - cat and dog food is imported into the Province of Newfoundland, see it! Where was our great Liberal regime of twenty-three years that could not even find a way to get an industry going even to make dog and cat food?

MR. EVANS: They were afraid they might have been thrown in there.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I think we have to hear more in this honourable House than we have heard from the honourable the Member from Bonavista North and the honourable the Member from Hermitage than they threw out of them the other day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. WILSON: Bonavista North. I am in this honourable House and I am not interested in any booze parties, and I have not become a part of them since I have been in here.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WILSON: Nor any of the members with whom I have been in contact as far as I am concerned and it goes to prove to the whole province, what the P.C. Party has been trying to do since we came here three years ago.

We have done one thing alone in this province and that is take back Churchill Falls, to stabilize - we were able to get borrowing power which we would never have gotten if we did not have it, no way in this world because we were in a sad and lost condition and I am being truthful to all the people in the province and out of the province. Go to the people of the province today and hear what they will tell you.

This is our fisheries, and Mr. Speaker, if you go into a supermarket today what will you find? Cod tongues from Denmark -

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. WILSON: Cod tongues from Denmark coming into a fishing province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Packaged cod tongues?

MR. WILSON: Packaged in Denmark.

MR. NEARY: After three years of Tory Government?

MR. WILSON: After twenty-three years of Liberal Government that banged money into rubber plants, chocolate factories, boot and shoe factories, glove factories and other factories I would not dare to talk about.

I can assure you that the honourable member here, the honourable Member for Port de Grave you might call him, call him what you will - he is not one of the high learned which was pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, the learned and the unlearned - but if I had had twenty-three years in this House of Assembly, as the former Premier had, as unlearned as I am we would not have to import cat food into this province.

MR. EVANS: Now, Roger, now.

MR. WILSON: While I am on fisheries I am going to tell you another thing, Mr. Speaker, we are on the right track now for our cod fishery to be depleted. I wonder, here on the floor of this House of Assembly, what kind of salary Ricky Cashin is getting as leader of that union,

to try to downgrade our fisheries so that it will go the way of our seal fishery - is he getting paid by Jack Davis or some other concern?

SOME HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. WILSON: No laughing.

MR. SIMMONS: Are you asking a question?

MR. WILSON: You belong to a district that I heard you speak about here as a fishing district.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right, very proud of it.

MR. WILSON: What did you do here in this House of Assembly to represent them on the whole?

MR. SIMMONS: On what?

MR. WILSON: Nothing. Nothing. Because you know nothing of it. You will be thrown out of that district next time. That is what they will do with you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

AN HON. MEMBER: Stay on fisheries.

MR. EVANS: You do not have to worry about the Waterford Bridge Hospital. Do not worry about that. You will be okay.

MR. WILSON: I am quite concerned about this fishery strike and I cannot see what is going to happen.

MR. NEARY: Tell your Premier. He was not talking to them.

MR. WILSON: I am telling you because you agree with it. You are the man I am telling it to, you, because you agree with it. If you did not agree with it, you would take a different attitude than you are taking in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Deal with all the strikes that is what the Opposition are going to do -

MR. SIMMONS: What was the Premier's promise to the fishermen that Fall, George?

MR. WILSON: Never mind the promise. The promise of the Premier has been fulfilled here in this House.

MR. EVANS: That was not, burn your boats, was it? That was the other fellow who did that.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, the federal government have come up with another great political gimmick, the winter works programme. We have the younger generation coming out of college in the summer months who cannot get jobs. I say, this is the time for the federal government to hand out that money so that these students can get jobs and earn money to pay their tuition fees, instead of heaving it away in the winter months when nothing can be done. Then, the only ones these programmes come to are the districts that are associated with that great Liberal party. These are the ones that receive it.

MR. SIMMONS: The RDA in reverse.

MR. WILSON: The RDA in reverse. I think the honourable the Member for Hermitage is Hermitage in reverse.

MR. EVANS: Gone over the cliff to Francois.

MR. WILSON: Another thing, Mr. Speaker, I think this government has made great strides during the three years that it has been in office.

If there had been as much done in the past twenty-three years, we would be receiving this \$150 million from the power project that Quebec is getting, and we would have some input. We would not be going with our finger in our mouth if we had them come talking to us to make their agreements with us people.

MR. NEARY: They would go with their finger in the other end.

MR. WILSON: You have had your chance. The Hon. Member for Bell Island had his chance over there, and what has he shown that he has done over on Bell Island?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. WILSON: Show me something you have done over there.

MR. NEARY: Come over, boy.

MR. WILSON: Come over?

MR. NEARY: Tell us about -

MR. WILSON: You could not even get ahead with your mushrooms.

MR. NEARY: Watch your blood pressure now. Do not have a stroke.

He is in a good mood today, but I am afraid he is going to have a stroke.

MR. WILSON: : Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

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

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, we heard in this honourable House from the opposition and mostly from the educational critic, in the person of the the Hon. Member for Hermitage. I was already told, Mr. Speaker, by the opposition, even their leader that they are all educated. I am not putting myself up amongst lawyers, but I will even take my place with them when it comes to the job that I have had to do.

MR. MORGAN: If they only had your common sense, if they only had your common sense.

MR. WILSON: I will tell you what the Leader of the Opposition could do, he could probably buy a bit of common sense and a bit of initiative from the Member for Port-de-Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. WILSON: Even the people who live in that district -

AN HON. MEMBER: Baboon.

MR. WILSON: And as far as education is concerned -

MR. NEARY: Heave it out of you boy.

MR. WILSON: It is all here in the Throne Speech as far as I am concerned. Many a Throne Speech read that everything had been adhered to. At least the principle parts of it have been taken care of. Sir, I am not a great learned scholar about the polytechnical plant or education, as far as that is concerned, but I think myself with the little bit of learning or education I do have I can see a future for those who are interested. We have quite a lot of college students at university, who are interested possibly in things in this province, who do not even have a chance. They do not know their own abilities because they did not grow up in a day and generation when they had to do a hard day's work before someone could show them something. I say here and now, that too often it has been said that they are not ready and willing to do things. They would be ready and willing if they were given the chance to do them. Who gave them a chance in the past twenty-three years? Burn your boats! Three jobs for every man! I have not seen that yet. I had a job one time in the Highways Department, but I found a way to, with the little education I have, make jobs for sixty-five men.

I would like to see the members who are against this bill put something into it. All they do is look across the House and point their fingers - tear apart the Minister of Fisheries, tear apart the Minister of Education, tear apart the Minister of Finance. Is this the way to run a country or a province?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries can take care of himself.

MR. WILSON: Is this the way you want to run a province?

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries -

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (DUNPHY): Order!

MR. WILSON: I do not see it. I think every member in this House of Assembly, who was put here by the people of their districts, should realize that these people deserve better than what has been going on in this House, and it is because of the Opposition who will go to any length to get at any person to try to degrade him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Personal attacks.

MR. WILSON: Personal attacks.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. WILSON: "And my government have agreed to take care of the youth of the province." This has been plainly shown, and this has been done. Do you know why we have to spend so much money on recreation? If the federal government would put the money they are throwing away on winter works programmes into summer jobs, the college students could get jobs they would be interested in and would enjoy doing during the summer and we would not need to spend half as much on recreation.

MR. NEARY: Are you talking about LIP projects? There is no such -

MR. WILSON: I am not even talking about the honourable the Member from Bell Island.

In housing, Mr. Speaker, as far as I see it in housing -

MR. NEARY: Here we are.

MR. WILSON: There has been great concern, as far as I am concerned, by this government in housing. The honourable member need not look across at the Member for Port de Grave and say, here we are.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible)

MR. WILSON: I have received no money from any government, neither Liberal nor Tory, as far as housing is concerned. I have been pounding away since 1942 to manage, and surely I can find a way to do so now. I have had plenty of time to learn that someone is coming up in my place to take over, and I am confident that he will do a better job than even the Member for Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MORGAN: He had no government handouts.

MR. WILSON: Transportaion and Communications - Mr. Sneaker, I am sure every honourable member on this side of the House received a nice pat on the back from the Member for Bonavista North when he got up and said that his district was looking for pavement, he was promised pavement and all the rest of it but got nothing. All I have to say to the honourable member is, it goes to show that he has not done his job. He has been here three years sitting on his backside. not doing anything for his district.

MR. EVANS: That was the Member for Twillingate.

MR. WILSON: Because he has not been pointed out as the learned or the unlearned.

MR. EVANS: You got yours.

MR. WILSON: The man who is pointed out as unlearned, got for his district last year, more pavement than was gotten there for just about the twenty-three years that the Liberals were in power. That proves to me that the member has not been doing his duty.

Co-operation in the Economics Department of this province - I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable the Member for Hermitage is making the most noise over there and, therefore, he claims he knows the most about it.

MR. SIMMONS: No, he does not.

MR. WILSON: I leave it to him to figure out and probably by the time this House closes he may make some contribution to it.

Labour resources and development: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the one - labour resources development. The honourable the Member for Bonavista North got up and spoke about the farmers. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, there is a great potential in this province for farming, a greater potential for farming than there are persons to work the farmlands. But we are not Prince Edward Island. We do not have the machinery. We do not have the land. Therefore, it is more costly for us to go into farming. But for those who are farming, I say here now that this government recognizes the situation and this

P.C. Government have taken it upon themselves to see if they can do something about it, and they have made great strides. Even if the programme announced gets the individual, the small farmer into action raising his own crops, and he raises enough for his own use, and the bigger farmer raises enough to alleviate the importing of potatoes and other vegetables from the mainland, even that, Mr. Speaker, if we did even that we could put this province back to growing our own vegetables as we did in the 1930's. I know in the settlement of Clarke's Beach back in 1928 and in 1930 there were as high as eighteen carloads of potatoes grown and sold on the side. Therefore that leads me to believe that we can get back to the same thing, but there must be some incentive put into it.

On forestry, Mr. Speaker, I have great pride as far as forestry is concerned. I have so much pride in the forestry industry that when I see a stick growing it looms like gold dust. Because I have taken the attitude that the sawmill business which a lot of this province once derived a livelihood from, can still prosper. I think that we may have to make a lot of changes to prepare our small sawmill operators so they can sell their lumber, and be trained to cutting lumber to use in the houses we are building today, to come up to the Central Mortgage and the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing specifications. The day is gone, Mr. Speaker, when you can turn around and lay down a foundation to build a home and get a loan from a finance company with a two by five, or two by six for a floor joist. We need not expect it, that day is gone, and gone forever. Nor can we build a home out of all the logs that are cut in the country when they are cut off in eight foot lengths. It could be done, but it costs extra to build a house and use these materials. Therefore, there has to be a programme to show all concerned that the lumber must be cut into lengths needed for building. That would bring us to a phase where we would have to import less lumber from the mainland, therefore putting more dollars into the pockets of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that in everything in this province automation has played a great part, as it has in other places. It is

a job for the local sawmill operators in Bonavista Bay, or Green Bay, or White Bay, or Trinity Bay, or Conception Bay where most of the lumber is cut to do these things with a puch table. When you are sawing out pieces of two by four or pieces of two by three on the mainland there are ten pieces coming out to our one. Therefore they put out X number of pieces each day, which is X amount more dollars. So again it costs us a great deal more than it does those on the mainland to manufacture our forest stands and turn them into building supplies.

While I am speaking on that, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference probably, in subsidization. At this present time you are able to buy lumber from the mainland all ready dressed, pre-cut and landed as cheap or nearly as cheap as you can buy the rough lumber in our own province. That goes to show that unless there is a change made we will be no better off as far as the lumber business is concerned.

While I am speaking on that, there has always been a way, since I can remember in the sawmill business that when something started up here there was someone from the mainland, some concern who would come down and get on the inside and you would have to buy from a salesman who was operating from the mainland. I am sure there are honourable members in this House who would know that because there was a sawmill started under the great Liberal regime, and, lo and behold, do you know who the lumber had to be bought from in order to get out to it? It had to be bought through Goodfellow Lumber Sales in Montreal. Mr. Speaker, that goes to show that there is something lacking somewhere along the line in this respect.

Wildlife, Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, and this province is concerned, and this government are concerned, it brings in mainlanders, hunters from all over the world, probably, to this province. They have to get a licence to hunt, which is turning in X amount of dollars. Here again I get to the point that there is more wildlife being killed on our highways at this present time that we could have ever imagined twenty years ago. Some of it could be turned into cat and dog food, and we would not have to import that from the

mainland.

Historic resources - Mr. Speaker, we have been told by lots of people that this is only a waste of money. But let us go to Prince Edward Island, or go anywhere in the other provinces and what will we find? We find that even the people who go there from the Province of Newfoundland are visiting those sites and spending money. Why should we not prepare ours, whether it be on Signal Hill, or whether it is in Brigus, or whether it is in Port aux Basques, or whether it is somewhere in Bonavista Bay, and collect X amount of dollars from the people who are coming in here. I compliment the government, and those who are in government who have brought forward this resource.

Mineral resources, Mr. Speaker - here again I think, and I say this with knowledge of the past three years since this P.C. Government took over in this province that there has been more done to try to utilize our mineral resources than has been done since I can remember.

Energy, Mr. Speaker - we have heard a great deal about the importance of energy and we have had a great example that the energy resources will be developed. We have the government, those on the government side, going all out wholeheartedly to try to harness the remainder of Churchill Falls. And we have the opportunity to go ahead opposed to it.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. EVANS: What about the Nearys.

MR. WILSON: Rural development Mr. Speaker - there has been a great lot of criticism of rural development. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I have no projects from rural development myself. Some party said to me the other day - I had built a new sawmill and I got an artesian well dug over there - and he came along and he said, "Well, government did that for you." Thanks be to God I did not need any government to do that for me, not bragging about it, but I was able to do it before I came into this House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, there are probably six or seven who have received rural development funds in my district, and I am proud to say that four out of that six are doing marvellous jobs, marvellous jobs, and some of them already paid back their money after only six months.

MR. NEARY: What is it they are doing?

MR. WILSON: They are sawmilling and making window boxes and doors and whatnot, things they can place on the local market - not things that are being brought in from the mainland like dog food and cat food.

MR. NEARY: Where do they get their materials?

MR. WILSON: They get their materials in a Fox Marsh, Ocean Pond, Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay, wherever it comes from. Let me tell the Honourable the Member for Bell Island, I am not looking for it because they got rural development, I am not even looking for the chance to sue them.

Well, Mr. Speaker, another issue that has come up is elections. I am not very enthused about election expenses because if any man who has it in his mind to run for a district is not prepared, and has no money in his pockets to spend on election expenses, he should stay home. I have proven that. I have proven that one. There is so much spent on elections as I am sure any honourable member sitting in this House knows by now that if a person decides to run in an election and he get \$1,000 today it could well be \$25,000 five months from now, and that goes for the Opposition as well as those on the Government side.

AN HON. MEMBER: If you do not have the money in your pocket stop home.

MR. WILSON: Right.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if the young men and women are to meet the challenges and take advantage of the opportunities in the years ahead, proven leadership will be needed in Newfoundland. I say that right here and now, a person who will sit down and wait for something to be brought to him on a platter is out as far as I am concerned. If he has not the gumption and the gall to go look for it, he is going to have to take a back seat as long as he lives.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member from Burgeo-LaPoile,

Order, please!

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible)

MR. EVANS: No blueberries.

Mr. Speaker, I, as usual, intend to be very brief in my remarks, but I think it is a duty and an obligation of every member of this House to say a few words in support of the great Speech from the Throne which was brought down here on February 26, one of the greatest of our times, that is to anyone who has sense enough to interpret what doing and non-doing means.

The main thrust of my remarks are to be in the area of the fishery, coming from one of the great fishing families of this province, as I do, having spent years in the fishery myself and now representing the greatest fishing district in the whole of Newfoundland, Sir.

Before I get into specifics concerning different sections of the Throne Speech, I did not speak on the bill, the Hydro Bill, I thought there were enough speakers at that time, but there are a few remarks that I wish to address in this direction. We hear so much from the Opposition that we are accusing the former administration of giving away the power to Quebec Hydro. They claim that we got a good rate at that time. Probably it was a good rate then, but was that any excuse for drawing up a sixty-five year contract.

Some of our friends opposite have come out with a statement that we had no other choice, we were surrounded by Quebec. Well, I have not seen Quebec on this side of us. It is the Straits of Bell Isle on this side of Labrador. At the time when negotiations were proceeding in regard to the sales of power from the Upper Churchill, Joe was going to sell it all to Con-Edison down in the U.S. remember? Instead of that, all that dropped out of sight and he made a deal with the Quebec Government which made Santa Claus look like Scrooge and of course, we are paying for that today. And it is possible that we may be able to renegotiate part of the mess but we are certainly going to lose hundreds of millions of dollars a year for the next sixty-five years.

We have also heard remarks, such as one from the Member from Bonavista North, that we are trying to run this Province as a business. Well, has he got over the shock of seeing what the other guy did who tried to run it as a non-business. Government is big business - if you do not run it as such you end up in the red - and we have certainly done that. We have heard so many remarks that we are probably not getting as much as we should be getting from Ottawa because we are in conflict with them. Memories are short on that side of the House. Does anyone remember, as I do, what happened back at the time of the Term 29 fiasco, when the former Premier, or the excuse for a Premier I call him, put crape on the buildings and a flag half-mast and referred to John Diefenbaker as Canada's public enemy number one?

Diefenbaker was the only man who recognized we were down here except when there was an election on and still most of the good results we are getting from Ottawa today preceded from things that Diefenbaker brought into effect while he was Prime Minister of Canada, the greatest man Canada ever produced, or ever will, as far as I am concerned.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: Well, we have finally awakened the Member for Bell Island. I thought he had been asleep ever since the day he gave the blood donations. That is the only way, by the way, they will ever get any new Liberal blood in Newfoundland is by transfusion from some of the few Liberals that are left.

As a P.S. before I get off the bill, probably -

MR. NEARY: Did the Member for St. John's East tell you to say that?

MR. EVANS: No, he did not. I do not need any coaching.

As a rider before I get off the hydro bill, I think it probably would be a good idea if the members of the opposition went home and prayed every night that in the bill there would probably be an electric chair included for the Member from White Bay North. They might get a leader afterwards.

Now, the next subject, as I stated at the start, I intended to dwell more on fisheries than any other subject in the Speech from the Throne. Today, our fishery is facing the greatest dilemma that you could find. I do not think ever you could dream of the situation we are in today in the fishery unless you saw it, and even then you would have to have knowledge enough of the fishery to understand what it is all about.

Today we are faced with scarcity, and at the same time we are faced with a surplus of fish stocks in our cold storages. We have heard remarks, I think it was from the member for Hermitage on Friday, the last day the House was in session here, regarding the dragger programme. I would like for him or someone else to answer this question: If all of our draggers that we even have now, much less new draggers that would have been built under the programme if the situation had warranted such, if we had had them fishing this winter, where would we have stored all the fish that would have been brought in and who would have been paying the fish buyers to store products that they probably would not sell for the next five year or if they did, to sell at a loss?

Today, as I say, we have shortages and there was a resolution brought before this House a few days ago. I did not speak on that resolution as I intended primarily to dwell on the fisheries in this speech, but there is one thing I would like to remind gentlemen on both sides of this House, when we are talking of a 200 mile limit or even to the edge of the Continental Shelf, we are not talking in reference of our shore fishery by any stretch of the imagination. You can ban every dragger from using the Grand Banks for the next 500 years, you will not bring one more codfish into our own waters in Newfoundland than there are today.

Our fish breed in our own waters. I proved that years ago when I fished in Fortune Bay. We had the cod net we called it then, which is now known as the gill net. At that time it was cotton or hemp. If you lost one, it was only a matter of a week or two before it rotted on the bottom and it did not destroy any fish. Now, most of the fish that were brought in, you would have to hoist them up the stage head. Trawled fish averages, or always did, 100 to the quintal. I have seen days when people with gill nets came in with a fish average of four or five to a quintal. For the whole summers voyage it did not go above thirty.

When these fish were ripped for splitting, there was a roe in them that would fill a washing tub. The spawn was running out of them. They did not go on the Grand Banks to spawn. They spawned right

here in our own bays. Before you even talk about upgrading the quantity of fish that is in our waters here in Newfoundland or even to take care of the Hamilton Bank, do not even mention it to me until you have burned the last gill net in Newfoundland. That is the destroyer of our fishery. Who started the subsidy on the gill nets? That was not us, but in effect before we took over. I wish that we had the foresight now, and I think we will, to bring in measures that will cut down on the use of gill nets. It cannot be done immediately, over night, but at least there is one thing that could be done. These gill nets today are headed with nylon twine, and if they are out there for forty years, they are still fishing, but if they were headed with cotton or or hemp or twine if they were on the bottom for a month or so if they were lost, they would just automatically rot, the heading twine would, and the linnet would sink on the bottom and they would not be a menace to our fishery. That is one thing that could be done.

In the area of marketing, it is no good for us as members of this House or members of the public to criticize either federal or provincial governments. Nobody can tell people to eat fish if they do not want to eat it. Nobody can tell them to buy at a higher price if they can buy it for a lower price. That is exactly what is happening to our markets today in case people do not know. There are fish coming in today from Korea and Japan into the United States market, that is selling on the market for thirty-seven cents a pound. Ours is costing seventy-eight cents.

Can you tell some woman who has probably five or six kids, they are in a low income bracket, to go and pay a dollar or more for that fish at the retail level when she can buy hamburger for her kids for about fifty-nine cents a pound?

I have talked to the Federal Department of Fisheries. I have close contacts there. They estimate that this is going to continue for the next four years. I cannot see it changing even then. In these Asian countries which are not governed by labour laws, no unions, they are paying \$1.50 a day for labour. Our plants pay that out in smoke time, when the people are not working at all. They

are probably paying about three cents a pound for fish. There are a lot of areas that we could develop. Probably canned fish, we have got it on the agenda of the federal government's food aid programme to countries that are in trouble in Africa and in Asia. We are not doing any here in Newfoundland. I have been trying ever since the New Year to get something started. I hope I will be successful.

As far as the United States market, which is our main market for fresh fish, there is a lot to be done. In my opinion there should be a central marketing agency set up by the federal government. Today, in the area that I represent, the immediate area, from Rose Blanche to Port aux Basques, there should not have to be one fish frozen. They should be all shipped out every day, fresh, chilled. That is why I say our marketing should have a different slant.

There are lots of people in the United States who do not want frozen fish. They would pay more to get fresh. The only company that is really selling a large amount of fresh fish is National Sea Products. Just imagine, Fishery Products have their main markets, their marketing center in Cleveland. Booth Fisheries are in Chicago, Consolidated Foods. The Lake, Penny interests are in Gloucester, Massachusetts, the New England area, Caribou Fisheries. Lots of their customers, as I say, probably want fresh fish. They cannot supply it because their plants are too far away. It has got to be frozen.

If we had the right type of agency set up to market, any person who wanted fresh fish would only have to contact that board and say, "We want so many thousand pounds of fish fresh today or next week, Jim Hardy or Eric King or Dave Billard or whoever the case might be." That fish would not be going into cold storage and taking up room and making it harder for the fish that has to go into cold storage and be sold. That is one area.

Another thing that can be done - there are a lot of people who do not like fish, but there are still a lot of people who do. You take a pound of the ordinary frozen fish that is frozen dry in cold storage. After three or four months you might as well eat

that piece of paper for what taste or flavour you are going to get from it. That fish - you can prove it to yourself right in your own home. You can freeze it in a plastic container in water and if it is there for a year it does not flake up. It is still good. Some sort of system in that connection has to be done, brought into being, in order to sell our fish to the United States market. You are not going to sell it to everyone because it is going to cost more. It is going to be bulkier. It is going to cost more in transit than all the rest. There are going to be a lot of people who will pay more for our product than they will for the cheaper Japanese product that is coming in.

I guess I always looked a bit further ahead than most guys. I think I did. Years ago - I am not saying this to be political. I am political, you know that, but I am not saying this to be political. Back in the days when the Smallwood Government was lashing out money for so called industries which, I do not know whether he, I suppose he did, figured that they were going to succeed. I did not, but \$53 million, that is including accrued interest, that had come down to us from the Commission of Government and which I call blood money that was wrung out of the fishermen when they were getting six cents a day back in the Commission of Government days. I always contended that that money should have gone back into the fishery instead of developing industries, Make of break, and they broke, of course.

At that time we had a much shorter range than we have today, but even then I said that in order to be able to take care of our sales of fish, we should have made deals with some of our Central and South American neighbours to establish cold storages to be able to handle a lot of our fish, which would have given us a market there. We would not have been so dependant upon the United States for our markets. Today

with the widest range we have worldwide in air freights, I think that our federal government should be developing the opportunity to establish cold storages in Africa and Asia so that we could have a market there for a big part of our frozen fish. You do not have to bother about distribution because if we could only sell what could be consumed in a few of the larger cities in these two continents, we would have no worries about having any fish left in cold storage here in this province, I can assure you.

But there is another matter that I would like to speak on in fisheries, which I am not able to do at the present time because discussions are still going on or due to resume between the union and our fishermen. But this much I will say, I hope that the situation will soon be resolved because the best two months of the year for our dragger fishermen are already gone. The people in Ramea and Gaultois, who are fishing on draggers, well there is \$13,000 made before the rest even sail, if they do not soon hurry up. They are fishing, and they are making more money than they ever dreamed of in their lives.

MR. NEARY: What are you saying, the other crowd are taking back water?

MR. EVANS: I am not saying they are. I said that if it continues much longer, the trawlermen in Ramea and Gaultois will have their \$13,000 made before they start. Whether they should or not, I am not saying that.

MR. NEARY: So what.

MR. EVANS: So what.

MR. NEARY: What is the point?

MR. EVANS: What is the point?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: The point is, Sir, that the coast is the coast that I was born and brought up on and fished there myself, and it is a crime what is happening today to our people that they are not able to work.

MR. NEARY: Whose fault is it?

MR. EVANS: I will leave that to you.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EVANS: I told you that that is already under discussion, therefore we are not at liberty to air it in public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. EVANS: Now to go down the line of this most famous manifesto-health services. I think that our Minister of Health is a credit not only to this government but to the province that he represents.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. EVANS: Speaking personally -

MR. NEARY: Do not carry that to the world.

MR. EVANS: Okay, we will get to that later, when we get to that subject that you have for a leader there. We will bring in the world, the UN and all. In regard to health, in my own immediate area, when I took over as the member for that district, we had one doctor in Port-aux-Basques most of the time. He probably got an assistant, a guy who was coming out learning his trade, as they say, an apprentice, but today, due to the encouragement and the incentive that was offered by this government, and particularly the minister, and the encouragement for private practitioners to come in, today we range from six to eight doctors in that area at all times. We have done an enormous amount of work toward upgrading the hospital, and we have a commitment to build a new hospital in the area within the next two or three years. So there is no one complaining in that degree.

As for education, one point alone, which sounds minor but is not, every year we are going higher and higher in the classification of free school books. This year, I think, it goes up to Grade VIII, and an awful lot of our people really appreciate that. As has been pointed out, the regional college is going to open in September, a milestone in the history of this province. Everything before was in St. John's but no more.

With regard to Municipal Affairs, I have great success with that department, and we have a new, young minister who was out in my district there just before I came in here, and he went away flying

with bells on, They thought the world of him. He said it is a new day in the history of Newfoundland for the people who live in our towns and cities.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Are we going to get to fly our own flag?

MR. EVANS: Definitely, I will tell you more about it tomorrow. I will tell you more about it tomorrow. I am sorry I cannot today. As far as I am concerned, Sir, if you want to go into that area -

AN HON. MEMBER: No thanks to your federal member.

MR. EVANS: None whatsoever. We will tell Jamieson tomorrow, as one of the guys over there said, we would probably be better with a new minister in the cabinet.

But to outline some of the things that I have been able to succeed in getting in the length of time that I have been there. After this year, there will not be a place, not even to the smallest community in my district that will not either have a water supply completed or started, not one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. EVANS: As for housing, we are going in for serviced lots right in the town where I live today, in Isle au Morts. There are twenty-five lots going to be tendered for pretty soon there. Work has already been done on them, and also in Port-aux-Basques, and there are other areas in that direction which I cannot divulge at the present time until the budget has been brought down.

In the area of Transportation and Communications, I have done wonders there. I hope the minister is here so I can congratulate him publicly. As for my district, I fulfilled the only election promise I ever made in six election campaigns. Only last year the road to the people in Grand Bay West, who were isolated by about 100 yards of water for generations, they did not get isolated this winter, they had a road to travel by. This year we are going to pave it as far as I can judge.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. EVANS: It was only built a year ago. The road to Burgeo after this year will only have about twenty to twenty-five miles left. We have paved the road right to Rose Blanche and the roads through the settlements. I hope that every inch of road in the upper part of my district is going to be paved this year. I cannot make a statement on it because, as I have said, the budget is not down, and I cannot anticipate it publicly.

Now Recreation and Rehabilitation - we have got of it, Sir, lots of it, and you want to know, Sir, we got ball fields started and built, and we are on the second one in some places. There is \$100,000 going into Port-aux-Basques for the swimming pool that is being built, and this is by the provincial government. The great federal government in Ottawa only gave them \$30,000. We will put \$45,000 into Burgeo over the next five years for their recreation centre. What did the great federal government, the great white elephant, up there, Don Jamieson give? He gave them \$25,000. That is a lot of difference. Every little place in my district is benefiting. Then we got guys get up, cry babies, I have not got a thing in my district. Get out and work, and haul up your sleeves the same as I did, and you will get it too! There is one man over there, who can vouch for it, my friend Mr. Gillett. I should not call him that, I should not, the member for Twillingate. He has got more than a lot of guys ever got that ever went in Twillingate before. He has worked for it. He got it. If you sit down, the only thing that will come for you, if you sit down, if you sit down past high water mark, the tide will catch you, but nothing else.

In regard to Manpower and Industrial Relations, there are a few words that I have to say here that I do not think anyone has mentioned in this connection. We talk about all the unemployment. Unless we become completely or relatively industrialized here in this province, you are always going to have seasonal unemployment. Even the blueberries do not grow in the wintertime, do they? That is one thing that we can always have to face. The thing that I was going to

mention, and has not been mentioned before is that the figures that we see regarding the number of people who are registered as being unemployed are often misleading.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. EVANS: Not in the direction you mean but the opposite. I know for a fact that a lot of people, who work in fish plants, and other types of industries of that nature,

MR. EVANS: they are not sure of getting a full year's work. When they are off, of course, they register for unemployment insurance benefits and they receive them. When they go back to work again, like when our winter fish strikes in on the South Coast, they do not call the Unemployment Insurance Office and say, "Now, I do not want to be registered any more." They still complete their forms biweekly and they send in their earnings, probably they do not draw any unemployment insurance. They do not when the fishing season is on but they are still registered with Manpower as being unemployed. Thousands of people are registered as unemployed who are actually working.

As for the offshore mineral rights, sure, I would say, "Go to bat and get everything that is out there belong to us," the Continental Shelf, the Labrador Shelf, wherever it may be and the Premier said, he said it as a joke, but I am not joking when I say that we cannot get it any other way, let us go out of Confederation rather than give us what we got there.

Probably if they will listen to us and say, "Okay boys if it is yours, go and work it," because we have a case no other province in Canada has, we were a dominion before any of the rest of them were, and probably if they would go along and play ball with us we might give Trudeau a chance to work in our garden yet, when he becomes one of our poor relations.

MR. NEARY: I am learning.

MR. EVANS: You are learning. You have got a lot to learn.

MR. NEARY: As I told the honourable member for St. George's, I am learning.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard so much criticism from over there, criticism, some of it maybe a bit constructive at times, but in the main it is pitiful.

I have to go back, I cannot resist it, to that famous

leadership convention of last fall, when the Member for White Bay North was reaffirmed as leader. The glorious victory, what a glorious victory, who really is it? An old guy that according to our old fishermen, as the way they would state it, should have been up behind the stove with the cat. The other two would not have even been considered as fair competition in a taffy pulling contest, then he wins a glorious victory. Then Mr. Smallwood gets up and he said, "We are going to make it unanimous. You watch out Mr. Jamieson." It was quite a show. It was a rehash of the Lum and Abner Show that used to be on radio years ago. That was a comedy, but this one, I would say, turned out to be a tragedy, because no party, even something as ridiculous as the Liberal Party of Newfoundland, in being since 1949, deserves the like of what you have for a leader. And talking about going into an election, my God, can you imagine the people of Newfoundland putting him in as Premier.

MR. NEARY: No personalities on that side.

MR. EVANS: No personalities whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: No character assassination.

MR. EVANS: There is no need to assassinate him, Sir. He does it himself, every time he opens his mouth. But I am sure the Member for Bell Island must be waiting for the next leadership convention to come up.

MR. NEARY: I am waiting for the District of LaPoile.

MR. EVANS: Well I would certainly welcome one. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was on Open Line last week, I had a call from Howie Hickman in Grand Bank, CJOX, and after answering quite a number of questions he said, "Have you heard that Steve Neary is going to run against you in the next election?" I said, "No, I have not heard it, but naturally I am expecting he is going to choose another seat. He will never run against Bill Doody in Harbour Main and Bell Island." "Well," he said, "Are you very much concerned about it?" I said, "Concerned, no, somebody had to be the sacrificial lamb." And I said, "I was expecting with my record there, that I was going back

ad infinitum." I said, "there is not much differenc~~t~~ in that and Steve, of course, is there?"

So you are welcome any time you wish to come aboard, Sir, But the Member from White Bay North, well he calls himself the leader, I cannot agree with him, but really when they speak of an election, as I pointed out to him a few days ago, I think he is too young to retire yet. And I am sure that the people of Newfoundland, especially after Wednesday, when the great budget is going to be brought down, will back up in detail what is portrayed here in this Throne Speech, When that is presented I do not think anybody over there, unless he has been taking a lot of blueberry juice, would ever want to hear an election mentioned. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, no question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable member for Bell Island has adjourned the debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: On a point of order, Sir, if I may. Before the honourable gentleman moved the adjournment, which is a motion, I moved the question, which is a motion, and I moved the motion that the question be put previous to the motion that the debate be adjourned. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the motions must be dealt with in the order in which they are made. The honourable member for Bell Island moved the adjournment, but previous to that I made a different motion and that is that the question be put. I would suggest the vote on the first motion must come before the vote on the second motion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, Sir, that is so ridiculous that I should not even have to stand to speak on it at all. The member did not make a motion, Sir. The only motion that was made was by me. I moved the adjournment of the debate. There was no motion made by the Minister of Education, Sir. The reason I moved the adjournment of the debate, Sir, is because I want to speak on another day, not today, and tomorrow is Private Members' Day. Wednesday is Budget Day.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I point out to your honour that the Government House Leader was not in his seat, Sir. The Government House Leader was out of the House when I moved the adjournment.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: May I speak on the point of order, Mr. Speaker? I submit that it is totally irrelevant who was in the House or who was out of the House. The government is the government and whether the honourable the House Leader is here or is not here, the government

is one. I made a motion and that is that the question be put. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that Hansard or the tapes will show that and that that motion must be dealt with before the motion of the honourable member for Bell Island. We will take them one at a time, Sir, but the first motion put was that the motion be put. When I said question that is the motion that the question be put.

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

It is a well known custom, I think, in this legislature that when a member wishes to make a motion that he rise in his place and he is recognized by the Speaker. The Speaker did not recognize the honourable Minister of Education. He did make some comment with regard to question. There was a brief lapse when finally the honourable member for Bell Island rose to adjourn the debate.

So, I will put the question. All of those in favour of the adjournment of the debate say "Aye". All those against the adjournment of the debate "Nay". The motion is lost.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, no, Sir. Mr. Speaker, why is the honourable Minister of Fisheries, the House Leader, so anxious to close this debate, to invoke closure in this honourable House?

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman knows what was agreed. He is supposed to be speaking now.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not agreed that I was supposed to be speaking now.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I know, Mr. Speaker, that I am following two of the big heavyweights.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Two of the three heavyweights. They put the member for St. John's East in between the two heavyweights, Sir, so that he could act as their advisor, and we could see the results of it already in this honourable House this afternoon, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Are you talking to me, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island, the Chair feels,

is not relevant to the Address in Reply although there has been a little bit of latitude allowed in that debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in the Address in Reply. Mr. Speaker, my understanding - I am not questioning Your Honour - my understanding of the Address in Reply is that you can wander all over the countryside, that you can talk about anything you want under the sun, Sir. We have already had rulings on that in this honourable House. There are ample precedents for that sort of thing.

All I am saying, Sir, is that the results of the seating arrangement made by the honourable the Premier were really seen here in this honourable this afternoon as the two heavyweights from the government benches were put up to try and slay the poor old opposition who were trying to do their job in this honourable House.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable member was afraid to speak after them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure, Sir, that the honourable the Minister of Fisheries must have been really pleased to have the member for Burgeo come to his rescue. The poor old Minister of Fisheries is unable to defend himself.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a sort of a non-schedule speech for me this afternoon.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He spent the whole weekend writing it.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I have no notes. I have absolutely nothing prepared, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, there is not much trouble, it is not much trouble at all to take that Throne Speech and to tell the people of Newfoundland just what you think of it.

Sir, that particular Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, and I suppose the ones before that too, we could look back at the election manifesto that we had in 1972 and you could look back at a number of speeches that Joey Smallwood wrote, Sir, that were put in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor of the day, and the only conclusion that you could come to, Mr. Speaker, is that this particular Throne Speech was a rehash, a repeat of Throne Speeches that we have heard, read in this honourable House, I suppose, for the past twelve or fourteen or fifteen years. The only difference that I can see in the Speech, Sir, the only difference that I can see is that I can see the fine finger of the academics that had been hired on by the government over the last three years, I can see their fine finger in this Throne Speech. What I mean by that, Mr. Speaker, is this, that somehow or other the Premier and the members of his administration are continuously being told by the academics, by the crowd that they have sold out to from Memorial University, the administration, that they have sold out to, Sir, and I am thinking of people like the Deputy Minister of Finance, the gentleman that was appointed Chairman of the Public Service Corporation, the honourable and learned gentleman down in the Minister of Mines and Energy's department, all these intellects, Sir, all these academics have had their influence on the Premier and the government in the writing of this Throne Speech. In this way, Mr. Speaker, that they have somehow or other convinced the government that something is about to happen, but, Mr. Speaker, nothing ever happens. Nothing ever happens, Sir, and this is the great weakness, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in this Throne Speech. It conveys, it portrays the thinking of the academics of the so-called intellectuals, the pseudo intellectuals that have been put on the government payrolls because they have their pieces of paper from Memorial University over the last three years. The government, Sir, thinks this is great stuff. The honourable the Premier, the Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Member for Placentia East, the Member for Ferryland, they all think this is great stuff, Sir. They somehow or other have persuaded themselves to believe, that they have to believe in this, that the academics, because they have their little piece of paper from Memorial University or they come from away, experts, that they have to be right, that something is going to happen. What is going to happen, Sir? We have been hearing this now for three years. We have been hearing about all the planning that is going on down on the fifth, sixth and seventh and eighth floors. We have been hearing about priorities, but we never see anything happen, Sir.

The Premier goes on television and on radio and he keeps repeating about things that are about to happen. If we discover oil and gas off Labrador, we are going to be, everything is going to be booming in this Province. If we get the expansion of Come By Chance, everything is going to be rosy down there, but, Mr. Speaker, you go up to the head of the bay, you go up in part of the Harbour Main, Bell Island District, that new district, and you ask the heads of the families, you ask the men in the head of the bay, Sir, what they have to look forward to in the way of employment, because these men in the head of the bay, Sir, have been used to working on construction.

They have been used, Mr. Speaker, many of them to going away in the Spring of the year and coming home in the Fall of the year. They have been used to driving to their jobs, on heavy construction, or light construction around the Avalon Peninsula, like the Health Science Complex that was started by the former Liberal Administration, like the Oil Refinery at Come By Chance. Every year since Confederation, Mr. Speaker, were able to look forward to employment in the Spring of the year. They may be off for a month or two, but were able to look forward in the Spring of the year to a job. They knew there was going to be a job there because the administration of the day, Sir, always had some kind of a project going ahead. Now, Sir, the situation is becoming hopeless for these workers in the head of the bay that have such a great reputation as iron workers, heavy equipment operators. It is a hopeless situation, Sir, They have nothing now to look forward to and they are very worried and concerned about their futures.

The Hon. Premier and the administration keep telling us things are about to happen. Things are going to happen. Well, when are they going to happen, Mr. Speaker? Are they going to happen next Christmas? Is that going to be a Christmas present for the people of Newfoundland, the starting up of the Lower Churchill, the expansion of the Oil Refinery at Come By Chance, water and sewer projects? Or will it be announced just prior to the next election, Sir, hoping that the Tories can con the people in Newfoundland to voting for them again for another term in anticipation of things that are about to happen, that never seem to happen. Because they are told by the intellectuals, and their millionaire buddies, and the pseudo, come from away experts that things are going to happen in this province. Well I would wish, Sir, they would be a little bit more specific, and give us some dates, and tell us when things are going to happen. Are they going to happen next week? Next month? This Summer? Next Christmas? Or prior to the next election? I would suggest, Your Honour, - I would submit to Your Honour that things they are talking about happening, Sir, -

MR. CARTER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: I wonder could we ask the honourable Member for Bell Island to speak up a little we are having some difficulty hearing him.

MR. NEARY: Things that they are talking about happening, Sir, are things that they hoped that they can con the Newfoundland people with in the next provincial general election.

Mr. Speaker, we have been saying for the last three years, Sir, at least I personally have, that this administration had no policy for the inshore fishery. We have been saying that for three years, Sir, and if Your Honour will remember on a number of occasions I mentioned the fact, Sir, both inside and outside of this honourable House that every time the Minister of Fisheries, and the administration went up to Ottawa begging for handouts, that Ottawa would look at them rather askance and say, where is your fisheries programme? Where is your programme? The Minister of Fisheries, who was then Minister of Finance, used to scoff at this, Sir. Now, Mr. Speaker, today I am proven to be right. The Minister of Fisheries, Sir, by his own admission - and Mr. Speaker this is something that I have been trying to prod the minister into, and his predecessors for a long time. Because we knew, Mr. Speaker, that they had no policy for the inshore fishery. That they had wasted the last three years by saying they had a policy that did not exist. We asked them to produce it, and they could not produce it. I kept prodding the minister, I said, why if you do not have a policy of your own, why do you not set up a select committee of the House of Assembly, and let the elected representatives of the people on either side of the House act in an un-partisan way, and develop a policy for the honourable minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Aw, Mr. Speaker, go back and check - I thought the minister listened to me when I spoke on radio. Aw, but the minister criticized it enough.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, today we finally got our answer, we over here in opposition finally got our wish. We got the answer, Sir. There is no policy. They have no policy. And three years after they assumed power, Sir, they are now getting around to setting up a select committee of the House to devise a policy for the minister to help him development a policy. Now how is that for planning and priorities, Sir?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: That is true, Mr. Speaker. It is true.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, three years have been wasted. The minister was very, very careful to point out that this select committee had nothing to do with the trawlermen. He was very quick to point that out because of the present negotiations that are going on. Well, Sir, I think I have the Premier and his administration sized up pretty well on this matter of the trawlermen. I think everybody in Newfoundland got them pretty well sized up. They did not hesitate to leap into the hospital strike there, Sir, a year-and-a-half ago. The Hon. the Premier did not hesitate to get into the strike down at Come By Chance in the oil refinery. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. the Premier and the administration are hesitating to get into this dispute. And the minister knows full well that the round of negotiations that are going around at the present time have very little chance of succeeding, at a very remote possibility of succeeding. Yet, Sir, they hesitate to get into this dispute boots and all. You know why, Mr. Speaker, and this is another reason the Minister of Fisheries is setting up him his select committee now, Sir, because they know the time will come when the government will be forced into this dispute whether they like it or not. And they will probably try to settle for less than the Harris Conciliation Board reports, or even if they settle for that Harris Report the minister knows full well then, Sir, that the inshore fishermen will be out with fire in their eyes, and they will be demanding their -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they will not be demanding \$50,000. But they will be demanding a fair share of the wealth of this province. And the minister knows that, and that is why he is trying to circumvent it. He is going to head it off now. Well, Sir, he can try all this politically manoeuvring, and all the tricks that he knows, Sir. There is no way you are going to con the inshore fishermen of this province, Sir. They know what the problems are. They are watching the trawlermen because, Mr. Speaker, in this province at the present time there is - I suppose you could call it Newfoundland's quite revolution is taking place in this trawlermen's strike. And the inshore fishermen, Sir, are watching, and so are the plant workers.

And I would submit to Your Honour that that is why the government are afraid, are too cowardly to get into this because they know full well that the inshore fishermen are watching, and they will be there with fire in their eyes looking for their share, and so will the plant workers.

Well, Sir, all the government are doing is postponing the inevitable. Because, Mr. Speaker, I have to be very careful how I put this, Sir, because I understand there are delicate negotiations going on which I personally do not think, I do not have any faith in it at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: You would like to sabotage it.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I would not like to sabotage it. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I want to sabotage the system. Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we tried to get -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is about time. Your three years are up.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hundreds of thousands of ordinary Newfoundlanders in this province whose thoughts and sympathies -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: are with the trawlermen even only on general principles, Sir, could very well overlook the real significance of this trawlermen's strike. Mr. Speaker, it is just not a quarrel, as some members of this House, and members of the public may think.

It is not just a quarrel, Sir, over the distribution of profits of the company. The trawlermen, Sir, in my opinion, are in the front line of the battle for recognition of human rights of the ordinary people of this Province, Sir. They are fighting against those who have exploited them down through the years. The ordinary people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, are fighting against 400 years of oppression, domination, economic enslavement and trickery, Sir, first by the colonial governors and then the fishing admirals and later, Mr. Speaker, by dynasty of fish merchants who have exploited our fishermen, Sir, decade by decade, all down through the centuries.

The trawlermen, Mr. Speaker, are in the front lines, they are right up in the forefront of this peaceful revolution that is going on right under our noses, Sir, to upset the tradition of the enslavement and the exploitation of our people by big business and by their front men, Sir, big business exploiting the people by putting up in front their front men, the politicians of this Province who control just about everything in Newfoundland and Labrador in the interest, Sir, of the wealthy few, and that is what this great fight is all about.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that a great weakness in Newfoundland throughout the centuries has been the paternal attitude, Sir, of those in authority towards the ordinary people of this Province demanding, Mr. Speaker, they almost demand that everytime you pass by you tip your cap to them. Well, I know honourable members in this House, Sir, they turn up their nose and they walk down the corridors with their head held back and their nose up in the air, almost demanding that you call them sir or that you tip your hat to them.

Well, Sir, this is what this fight is all about. The trawlermen are fighting to change this outmoded, antiquated, archaic system. They are trying to do away with the two class tradition in this honourable Province, Sir. What they are really saying, Mr. Speaker, the trawlermen are really saying is that neither wealth, family connections, professional status or come from away experts can any longer, Sir, stand in the way of

social and economic justice for the ordinary people of this Province and the day, Mr. Speaker, of the wealthy riding rough shod over our ordinary people, Sir, our ordinary citizens of this Province, riding rough shod over them while they were fattening off their blood, well that day, Sir, fortunately is rapidly coming to an end.

Mr. Speaker, a victory by the trawlermen will dramatically bring down the curtains, Sir, on a very sorrowful history in this Province, in this poor, old Island home of ours, of poverty and exploitation by the few and Mr. Speaker, a victory by the trawlermen, Sir, could very easily revolutionize politics in this Province. How is that, the honourable Member for St. John's North wants to know. Well, I will tell the honourable Member how is that. A resounding victory by the trawlermen, Sir, will awaken all Newfoundlanders, no matter what their occupation might be. It will awaken Newfoundlanders everywhere, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that they are just as good as anybody else in this Province and they are just as good, Sir, as the people who have dominated them down through our history and that the ordinary people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, are more than likely to get good, sound, common sense government from electing to the House of Assembly, Sir, and to town councils and to any other democratic body in Newfoundland, they are likely to get more sound, common sense representation and common sense government by electing ordinary people like themselves, rather than having foisted upon them, Sir, a corporal's guard of millionaires and rich people and well to do people and academics, hand picked, Mr. Speaker, nine chances out of ten, by the back room boys,

not only in the Tory Party, I suppose, Sir, but you can say the same about other political parties in Canada and Newfoundland, Sir. So, Mr. Speaker, the true significance of the trawlermen's strike is that it is a deep rooted movement. It is a major step, Mr. Speaker. It is the first really deep rooted major step, Sir, and probably long overdue, Mr. Speaker, to bring about a social, economic revolution in this province of ours.

Mr. Speaker, in their union, the trawlermen have found solidarity. The trawlermen, Sir, have found solidarity. Mr. Speaker, once that victory is won I would submit to this honourable House and to Your Honour and to the people of this province that we can only complement that victory, Sir, by electing to the House of Assembly in the next provincial election men of courage, Mr. Speaker, men who are dedicated in trying to do something for the good of the ordinary people of this province, honest, forthright men, men who are outspoken, men who are not afraid to provide good, honest, courageous representation to the people who elected them, to lead all Newfoundlanders, Sir, out of the wilderness of this four centuries of oppressive exploitation that we have seen before us as each decade closes, Sir.

MR. EVANS: Be like Joey. Say it often enough and you will believe it.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, I go right back to where I started a half hour or so ago. I go right back to the real culprits behind this Throne Speech. Apart from the minor contributions that are made by honourable gentlemen on the government benches, minor contributions by maybe the honourable Minister of Fisheries and the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy and the honourable Minister of Justice and the honourable Minister of Education - nothing against these honourable gentlemen personally, Mr. Speaker, nothing personal, but one thing they all have in common, Sir, they are all well-to-do men. Mr. Speaker, I might as well get this off my chest now too. One thing that the three gentlemen, the three loners, had the night that I saw

them on television, the one thing that they had in common was that they were all well-to-do.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say this. I do not think that I am too far wrong. I think the people of Newfoundland understand what I am going to say. You have a kind of a queer collection of honourable members on the opposite side. You have Liberals who came back and forth across the House. You have loners. You have people, Sir, who have been flicked out of the cabinet, the member for St. John's North, the Minister without Portfolio, the member for St. John's East. You know, Mr. Speaker, it will give you the impression that the whole thing is falling apart.

Mr. Speaker, when you just stop and think back, the one thing that united all that honourable crowd was that they were all anti-Joey. That is what

united them, Sir. Now they have nothing, Mr. Speaker, to keep them together.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They have nothing to keep them together now, Sir. The Minister of Fisheries - anti Joey, the Member for St. John's East - anti Joey, the Minister of Justice - anti Joey, the Member for St. John's North - anti Joey. And you know now, Sir, you have watched them - like I watched the Hon. Member for St. John's East that night on television. Do you know what his justification was for taking the action that he took? Was that Joey did this. You know if it were not so serious, Sir, it would almost want to make you stop and laugh. I can tell you one thing that it would almost do, it would almost make you throw up on the floor of the house.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am not talking about the House of Assembly, I am talking about my own house.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: One thing that united them, Mr. Speaker, they were all anti Joey. They came into power on a negative platform, Sir. They came in, Mr. Speaker, because these well-to-do, these well healed, these millionaires, these academics, these professionals managed to con the Newfoundland people around to their way of thinking, in this anti Joey movement. And that is why, Mr. Speaker, they got where they are today. And the one thing that united them was that they were all anti Joey, and now there is no Joey around. Now they have no cause. They have nothing to crusade for.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And they are falling apart. They are falling apart, Sir. There are ministers getting flicked right, left, and centre. The Minister of Fisheries where lo and behold, Sir, where does he end up? He ends up at the right arm of Our Father. The right hand. He is now the House Leader. Mr. Speaker, what a checkered career! Look back at it, Sir. Just take a look back. Two or three times back and forth, back and forth across the House. The President of the Treasury Board, Minister of Finance gets flicked out to make way for the big three,

the Premier, the junior Member for Harbour Main, and the President of the Council so that they could have complete control of everything, including that \$1.6 billion, Sir, that they tried to ram through in this Power Corporation Bill. They tried to force it through the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Can I call it 6:00 o'clock now, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: Yes. I am only getting warmed up now, Sir, can I call it 6:00 o'clock. I move the adjournment of the debate, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: It is noted that the honourable Member for Bell Island has adjourned the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred, and that this House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 11, at 3:00 P.M.

On motion the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 11, at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 10, 1975

MAR 10 1975

for Table

In answer to the question asked by the Hon. Member from Bell Island and which appeared on the Order Paper of March 6th:

- (1) Yes.
- (2)
 - (a) Slide Presentation on Scottish Ring Net Fishing made for the Department of Fisheries for training purposes at a cost of \$4,000;
 - (b) Officers Training Slide Presentation for the College of Fisheries for instructional purposes at a cost of \$4,000;
 - (c) Slide Presentation for the Department of Tourism, Division of Historic Sites, for promotional activities, at a cost of \$4,000.
- (3) Total amount paid \$12,000.
- (4) No.

MAR 10 1975

THE HONOURABLE DR. A. T. ROWE, MINISTER OF HEALTH, IN
REPLY TO QUESTION NUMBER 4 OF ORDER PAPER OF 6-MAR-75

- (1) No payments were made by the Department of Health during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1974 to Nacom Limited, McLean Public Relations or to International Events. If the Honourable Member can give me the names of any other companies - which I do not know - I shall endeavour to answer that portion of his question.

Parts (2), (3), and (4) are not applicable