

VOL. 1

NO. 19

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of hon. members a front page article which appeared in today's Daily News under the byline of Mr. W.R. Callahan. This is the article, "Orders to Constabulary men" and then in huge headlines "GIVE MORE TICKETS OR ELSE!". The article alleges that I as Minister of Justice ordered the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary to increase their volume of ticketing. The article states that the authority came, "From the top- the minister's office". It may be needless to point out that neither Mr. Callahan or anyone of the Daily News contacted me to seek verification or comment in any way. In fact, the last time I was speaking with Mr. Callahan was June 18th.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I will not go into the subject of our conversation but it was very amiable. Later in the article Detective-Sergeant Fraize is quoted as saying "That the Brotherhood is "disgusted" that the orders apparently came down from Justice Minister Gerald Ottenheimer". Now if the quote attributed to the Detective Sergeant is correct, I should point out that at no time has he been in touch with me to check the accuracy of the opinion attributed to me.

Since becoming Minister of Justice I have had one meeting with Chief of Police Browne, that was our initial meeting, a brief one of about twenty minutes and the matter we discussed was the completion, furnishing and opening of the new police building. At no time during the conversation was the matter of ticketing even referred to, nor have I in any other conversation or correspondence with the police even referred to the matter

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: of ticketing. I would hope therefore that before the Daily News or others attribute actions to me that they would have the courtesy to check with me first.

So I want unequivocally to deny that any orders or suggestions about a quota system over ticketing were given by me; the subject matter was not discussed. Furthermore, I wish to go on record as opposing any quota system as an appropriate manner of law enforcement. Police have an obligation to enforce the law-federal, provincial and in this case also municipal. Their obligation and mandate is not to enforce the law a certain number of times, whether maximum or minimum. It is not a question of arithmetic; the obligation of the police is to enforce the law, full stop, not by quota, selectively or otherwise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say about the statement by the hon. the Minister of Justice. As a matter of fact, I had a series of questions that I was going to put to him in this afternoon's session.

I heard the story first on VOXM this morning and later read the article in The Daily News. Mr. Speaker, you know, our provincial police force recently became the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

AN HON. MEMBER: The St. John's police force.

MR. THOMS: It is a provincial police force. Our force has a tremendous reputation and I think all Newfoundlanders have a great deal of respect for it. I have practiced law now in St. John's for some fourteen years and I can say that, apart from the odd ticket that I have received that I did not think I deserved, I still have a great deal of respect for the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

Mr. Speaker, nothing, nothing, absolutely nothing should be done to demean this force and all the energies of our police force should go into the enforcement of the law, curbing of the rising vandalism in the city and maybe throughout the Province, and curbing what is becoming a higher crime rate. Our policemen, Mr. Speaker, should not be meter maids, they should be policemen, but to a large extent they are meter maids and they resent it. New policemen are working very, very hard to get into the CID just so they can get away from the issuing of tickets.

Mr. Speaker, there is a quota system in St. John's today. Now, as I said, I have practiced law here for fourteen years, I have spoken to an awful lot of policemen. There is a quota system. As a matter of fact, new recruits are instructed within the first two or three days of their initiation into the police force that the name of the game is to give out traffic tickets. And I have seen some things go on in St. John's that I dislike. I happen to live

MR. THOMS: on Falkland Street; very recently a left hand turn became illegal coming off Carpasian Road onto Elizabeth Avenue. Every evening and every day during the first two or three weeks, maybe it is still going on, a police car would be hiding behind the Jewish Synagogue -

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I got a ticket there myself a few months ago.

MR. THOMS: - and nab them. This is the sort that brings our police force into ridicule and disrespect and I think something should be done about it.

MR. HICKEY: In 1969 I got five tickets so I lost my licence through the RCMP. So I would go lightly if I were the hon. member.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the Justice Minister himself is opposed to the quota system. I am opposed to the quota system. It should not have any place

Mr. Thoms: in the enforcement of law in this city, but there is a quota system.

And I think that the whole question of the police force and the quota system should be looked into and something should be done about it, and done about it immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House that Dr. William May will be retiring as Chairman of the Worker's Compensation Board with effect from the 15th. of August, 1979. Dr. May has served government long and well, having worked in various capacities, which I will describe, for more than forty years. Dr. May received his education at Bishop Field College here in St. John's. He is sixty-one years of age, married and has three children. Dr. May began his working career as a machinist apprentice with the Newfoundland Railway in 1934, and graduated as a journeyman machinist-fitter in 1939.

During his term with the Railway he was for fifteen years an executive officer of the Local Lodge of The International Association of Machinists. For a five year period he was secretary of the Joint Pensions Committee representing nine Railway Brotherhoods and was secretary of the Legislative Committee of The Newfoundland Federation of Labour for a three year period. He also served as secretary of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour for two years.

In 1949, Dr. May was appointed a member of the Labour Advisory Board, which was established by government to recommend appropriate labour legislation for this Province. He was appointed by government as a member of the first Labour Relations Board in this Province, and served as a member of the Board for three years. In 1950, Dr. May was appointed secretary to the Commission of Worker's Compensation which prepared for the organization and administration of the Worker's Compensation Act in this Province.

Mr. Dinn: He became the first permanent secretary of the Worker's Compensation Board, a position he held for three years.

In 1953, Dr. May was appointed a member of the Provincial Apprenticeship Board and served on that Board for a period of three years. Dr. May was the first Director of Apprenticeship in the Province, a position he held for seven years. He served as principal of the Vocational Institute here in St. John's for a three year period, following which he took up a position in the Vocational Education Division of the Department of Education. He was appointed Director of Vocational Education in 1968, which position he held until 1973 when he became Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower in the Department of Labour and Manpower.

Since 1975, Dr. May has served as Chairman of the Worker's Compensation Board. He was awarded the Queen's Silver Jubilee Medal in 1977, and has been a serving brother of the St. John Ambulance since 1977. The honorary LL.D. degree was bestowed upon him by Memorial University of Newfoundland in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. May has had a rich, colourful, and rewarding career as a public servant. After approximately forty-five years of working life he has earned a well-deserved retirement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: In announcing Dr. May's retirement, I want at the same time to announce his successor. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ed Maynard has been appointed to

MR. DINN:

succeed Dr. May as Chairman of the Worker's Compensation Board

effective August 15, 1979.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Maynard was born

at Green Island Brook in the St. Barbe North district in 1939. He is married and has three children. He received his early education at his home town and later attended St. Bonaventures College here in St. John's. Later he was a student in electronics with the Royal Canadian Air Force in Clinton, Ontario. Mr. Maynard served as a school teacher for a period of two years and as a member of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary for one year. He was a member of the Royal Canadian Air Force for three years. Later he was employed by the Canadian National Telecommunications during which he travelled extensively throughout the Province. Mr. Maynard served as Executive Secretary to the Northern Development Association and was also secretary to the Industrial Development Commission for Hawkes Bay, Port Saunders and Port au Choix. Mr. Maynard was the first business agent/organizer for the Northern Fishermen's Union and later was an organizer with the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union. He served in municipal politics in the St. Barbe area for ten years before successfully contesting the St. Barbe South district for the Progressive Conservative party in October 1971.

AN HON. MEMBER :

A hero.

MR. DINN:

He was re-elected in

March, 1972 and was elected in the new district of St. Barbe in the September 16, 1975 general election. Mr. Maynard was appointed Minister of Labour in January, 1972 and Minister of Forestry and Agriculture in December, 1972. He was appointed Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations on October 1, 1974. He was given the additional portfolio of Public Works and Services on September 9, 1976 and on November 17, 1976 he was appointed Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.



MR. S. NEARY:

What are you going to give Harold?

MR. DINN:

I hope it is something just as well because he would deserve the same.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

In February, 1978 he was given the additional appointment of President of the Treasury Board and in April the additional responsibility of President of the Executive Council. On March 27, 1979 Mr. Maynard was appointed Minister of Industrial Development.

Mr. Speaker, after such a long and varied experience in the field of Worker's Compensation, I believe it is befitting that government should continue to avail of Dr. May's expertise in our endeavour to improve our legislation in that field. Consequently, Dr. May will continue in a part-time role for a period as consultant to the Worker's Compensation Board.

One of his major tasks in that role will be to examine Worker's Compensation in all Canadian jurisdictions with a view to updating or improving, where necessary, our own Worker's Compensation legislation or recommending on new concepts.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request this House to record its appreciation to Dr. May for his long years of devotion to public service and wish him well in his retirement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: And contrary to the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I think this kind of service should be commended.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: I was not talking about Bill May. Bill May happens to be a friend of mine.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: I think it should be a requirement in this House, Mr. Speaker, to order muzzles for certain hon. members.

I would also wish to congratulate Mr. Maynard on his appointment to the post of Chairman of the Worker's Compensation Board. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of my colleague from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), who speaks for us on these matters, perhaps I could be allowed I think the rules are 'a few brief remarks'. I will not be any longer than the minister was and I will not be any more detailed than the minister was.

MR. SIMMONS: You will make more sense.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope I will make more sense, but I may not be in disagreement with some of the things he has announced.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me talk about Dr. May, or Bill May as most of us know him, because I think that all of us who have ever had the opportunity to work with Bill May in any way - I have had the opportunity to work with him as a minister

MR. ROBERTS: with a public servant and as a member dealing with him both as a public servant and as Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board - I think anybody who has had any opportunity to deal with Bill May would feel that his career was one of great distinction and his contribution was immense. Bill May was one of a group of the older public servants, most of whom came in either during the Commission or after Confederation period, most of whom by now have gone from the Public Service. I think of men like Jim Channing, who retired last year as Clerk to the Cabinet, Mr. Walter Marshall, who retired seven or eight years ago, the father of the hon. and learned gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Wm. Marshall), you know, a number of men who made immense contributions - the late Herb Coombs comes to mind - there were a number of them. And Bill May, I think, contributed very greatly. I think his work with what we now call Manpower policies - they have been called Apprenticeship policies and so forth over the years - and his work with the Worker's Compensation Board, both in setting it up back in the early years of Confederation when it was a revolutionary innovation - it was a step that conservative with a small 'c' minds found very hard to accept, it is one that has worked tremendously well - his contributions speak for themselves. We certainly wish him well. We wish him nothing but a long and a successful and a happy retirement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: To turn now to the second matter, the appointment of Mr. Maynard as the new Chairman of the Board, Ed Maynard, well known to most of us, well known certainly to all of us who have had the opportunity to serve with him in the House. My colleagues expressed some feelings of less than enthusiastic approbation of the government's action. I think I read them correctly, I could understand what they say and I would certainly note that this is an act of rank political patronage

August 9, 1979

Tape No. 666

SD - 1

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

It is an act of the rankest political patronage. Having said that -

MR. J. MORGAN:

(Inaudible)

MR. E. ROBERTS:

If the hon. gentleman from Bonavista South (Mr. J. Morgan) would keep his mouth as closed as his mind, he might learn something.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, let me go on to say -

MR. J. MORGAN:

(Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY:

Why does not the beer baron keep quiet?

MR. E. ROBERTS:

- that I do not find the appointment of a former minister of the Crown to be the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board offensive. I think it is political patronage and we should recognize it as such. I have never believed the service as a member of this House or service in the Cabinet of the Province disqualifies a man for further contributions to the public life of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I know Ed Maynard well. I certainly had political arguments with him. I like to think, and I hope, in fact, I did my share of putting him out of this House. My district and his former district are contiguous and I certainly, within the political framework, hope that I helped to defeat him. I am sure in turn he would have done, and did, in fact, do from time to time, what he could to defeat me. But I know Ed Maynard, well, I think many of us know him, he is an able man. He is an able man who made, I think, the best contribution he could as a member and as a minister. In fact, in the previous administration he was one of the ministers who did work - and they did not all work. He was one of those who did. I wish him well at the board. It is a responsible position, it is one for which gifts of administration are needed and I understand he has those

MR. E. ROBERTS:

gifts of administration.

I find it interesting and noteworthy that the government are carrying on a tradition which from time to time they decried. I assume Mr. George Cross and others will, in due course, get their just rewards.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Harold Collins.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Harold Collins' name has been mentioned. I recall Harold Collins once telling me, to show how the shoe fits on both feet, that he said, the luckiest thing he ever did for the late Jack Robinson, a great friend of mine, a great Newfoundlander, was to defeat Mr. Jack Robinson in 1967 in a by-election in Gander district. The Minister of Justice (Mr. G. Ottenheimer) will recall it vividly. Mr. Jack Robinson thereupon served in the appointment which was conferred upon him as a member of the Civil Service Commission, I think it was called then, served with very great distinction until his illness overcame him and he had to retire and death overtook him. And I remember Harold Collins telling me one night, he was getting, I think, \$10,000 or whatever we got in those days as members of the House, and Jack Robinson was getting whatever the Commissioner was getting, considerable more, perhaps \$15,000 in those days,

MR. E. ROBERTS: and had the security of a Public Service appointment to go with it. So I wish Ed. Maynard well, I think we all do. We do feel it is an act of rank political patronage, we recognize it as such, and I think we should all recognize that politicians do this. Even the new Prime Minister of Canada has not been above rank political patronage. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it is part and parcel of the system.

Let me close by saying as I have said before, and I think it is a principle which we should stand on, that service in this House or service in the elected realm of politics should not disqualify a man or a woman from serving in the Public Service. I think that the gifts that a person has are what should qualify him or her not his associates, not his connections; his contributions are what should count. So I wish Ed. Maynard well. I think we have a good Workmen's Compensation system in this Province. He is going to have to fill big shoes when he follows in Bill May's footsteps. I would hope - I am having considerable trouble with feet, unlike some gentleman opposite who keep them in their mouths I am having trouble getting them out of my mouth. Mr. Speaker, I wish him well, it is a big job and I hope he measures up to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. The minister this afternoon in a Ministerial Statement went on record as saying that he is opposing any quota system as an appropriate manner of law enforcement. My question to the minister is now whether or not he will be looking to determine whether or not a quota system does in fact exist in

MR. L. THOMS: the police force in St. John's today and whether or not he will give the appropriate instructions that this quota system be done away with?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: The second part of the hon. gentleman's question in a sense begs first; it presumes that there is a quota system.

MR. THOMS: I can guarantee him of that.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: My statement is a statement not because it is mine, it is a statement of government policy, that a quota system is not regarded as an appropriate, correct manner of law enforcement and certainly government intends to see that that policy is adhered to. But I am not aware that - I know the hon. gentleman says in his opinion there is a quota system. I am not aware that there is, but that is a question of fact and obviously we are not going to debate it now. But the policy statement is certainly clear and it is a matter in which we are not of different opinions, and that is that a quota system is not an appropriate means of law enforcement whether the law is municipal, provincial, federal or whatever kind.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: I am not quite sure, maybe I just was not hearing it properly, whether or not if in fact you do find that the quota system exists,

MR. THOMS: will you make sure that it is done away with? Just, you know, really a yes or no answer to that one.

Another question is that it has been alleged by Tom Fraize, who is the President of the Police Brotherhood, that last week some time or the week before, some twenty to twenty-five police officers of the patrol division were called into some Staff Sergeant's office, or whatever the case might be, and they were instructed to increase the number of tickets issued or face demotion. My question to the minister is, will you look into see whether or not this in fact happened and make sure that it does not happen again?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, with respect to the second part of the question, I will certainly look into it. With respect to the first part, I think I really can just repeat what I said before, I am not aware, to my knowledge there is not a quota system but certainly the statement of policy, you know, if there were actions or procedures of that nature, then we would not wish law enforcement to be undertaken on a quota system.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, really all I want is an answer which I am really not getting. If a quota system exists, will you do away with it? Will you instruct the Chief of Police to do away with any quota system that exists if in fact a quota system does exist? You are begging the question.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, all I want is a question

MR. THOMS: Yes or no.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I think the hon. gentleman - no, well the hon. gentleman - I will not phrase the hon. gentleman's questions; obviously I would not pretend to; nor would I allow the hon. gentleman to phrase my answers and I may choose other words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. OTTENHEIMER: However, I think I have already answered it and that is that we do not accept a quota system as appropriate. To the best of my knowledge there is no quota system. If there were one we would be in disagreement with it, we would not wish to have a quota system. We are not aware that there is a quota system and we do not wish to have a quota system.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I might point out to hon. members that a question must not be hypothetical. While I realize that a number of questions throughout the session have been allowed which perhaps could have been regarded as hypothetical, I point this out now so it will not be interpreted as if the rule has been held in abeyance.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. WHITE: There is nothing wrong with a hypothetical question.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary. The minister does not allow daylight either.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary related to another law enforcement agency, the RCMP. My good friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) raised some questions about this matter in a committee the other day and I am aware that the minister made some response, but perhaps for the record he ought to be given the opportunity to make a response in the House. My specific question to him at this time, and I may have one or two other supplementaries, is whether or not he has had an opportunity to determine whether there has been any harrassment as alleged by the member for Humber West, or indeed whether he has had an opportunity to initiate an enquiry to see whether such harrassment is indeed taking place?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to a few days ago during consideration of the estimates of the Justice Department. I do not recall which day it was. Does the hon. member? Anyway, the day after that I was in touch with the Chief Superintendent of the RCMP in the Province, and relayed to him the apprehensions or opinions which were expressed by an hon. member which had come to my attention in that way, and asked him to have the matter looked into, and then to inform me, to report to me. I have not heard from him back. He undertook to so do, and I have no doubt I will be hearing from the Chief Superintendent on that matter, I would think within a few days. But I have been in touch with him. He has undertaken to have the matter looked into and then to report to me.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: I am sorry.

MR. BAIRD: They took my plates today.

MR. SIMMONS: If the member would prefer to ask the question, I will yield to him. The member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) has some questions on the subject?

MR. BAIRD: No, no!

MR. SIMMONS: No, no!

Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WHITE: He said, they took his plates today.

MR. SIMMONS: Took his plates today.

MR. NEARY: Upper or lower?

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the Minister of Justice. I should say by way of preamble, if I may, that I believe the member for Humber West has put his finger on a

Mr. Simmons: Very important issue and an issue that bothers a number of people; whether there is substance to the issue is to be decided. I personally feel from the numbers of reports and enquiries I get that there is some substance to the matter, and I would perhaps give the minister an opportunity to re-enforce his first answer because I feel strongly, Mr. Speaker, that the matter of harassment- and another issue other than harassment as such, and that is the matter of alleged hustling is an issue here - and I have had a number of enquiries, a number of unattached, a number of young ladies who have been driving alone at night have reported to me that they have been stopped without an apparent reason, and stopped as many as three times the same night by the same officer who wanted to engage in a chat.

And I wonder would the minister undertake to determine -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: It is not as funny a subject as the minister may think. It is a very serious situation, Mr. Speaker. And I wonder would the minister undertake, once he has his preliminary response from the Chief, to initiate whatever kind of enquiry is required to determine the substance of these charges, these allegations, and more importantly to ensure that the practice does not continue, if it indeed is ongoing as I suspect it is?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the question first. Obviously, there is a difference between legitimate law enforcement and harassment, and, obviously, legitimate law enforcement is necessary. With respect to that - and that is the matter raised in the Committee by the hon. the member for one of the Humber districts - I will be hearing from the Chief Superintendent, I would think, in the quite near future.

The second part of the hon. member's question - I am not sure if it referred to the same geographic area?

MR. SIMMONS: Yes, the Deer Lake area.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. This is the first time this has come to my attention, and, as I understand it, it is a belief or an apprehension by the hon. member that police officers are stopping in their cars to question female pedestrians.

MR. SIMMONS: Female drivers.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Female drivers? Well, actually I understood it was pedestrians.

MR. SIMMONS: No.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, this is really part of the same thing; the drivers just happen to be women rather than men. So I would think that when I hear back from the Chief Superintendent that that will be with respect to the whole area in general, not just men drivers. I thought it was pedestrians, but in the area of motorists, I am quite sure that I will get information on that resulting from my talk with the Chief Superintendent a few days ago.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the same area, in Western Newfoundland - at least I do not know of it happening in any other part of the Province - but I know in Western Newfoundland, especially in the Port aux Basques area, every car after midnight is stopped by the RCMP. And I want to ask the minister if he can tell me if this is the

MR. NEARY: policy all over the Province or does it just apply to Port aux Basques? I laid a complaint several months ago to the hon. gentleman's predecessor about the harassment of the RCMP of drivers after eleven o'clock at night, or midnight, in the Port aux Basques area, and the report I got back was not very satisfactory. And I want the minister to take up that case again, of Port aux Basques. It is like a police state in Port aux Basques. And I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he can tell me if this policy applies to other parts of the Province. I do not know of it happening in Eastern Newfoundland. Is it only happening on the West Coast or the Southwest Coast? It certainly does not happen on the East Coast. Is there a different policy for Western Newfoundland than for Eastern Newfoundland? I wonder if the hon. gentleman could enlighten us on that matter?

MR. SPEAKER: (Stimms)

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware, and indeed,

I would be extremely surprised if there were any policy anywhere - West Coast or Southwest Coast or anywhere-- to stop all cars after a certain hour or at a certain hour. I would be very, very surprised if there were such a policy. Obviously, legitimate law enforcement requires the stopping of people at any hour.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

People would not be immune after midnight or at any specific hour. But I know what the hon. gentleman is getting at. I think it is an allegation or a statement of opinion similar to that brought up in committee by the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and that is of the fine line - or the line, it is obviously a line; how fine it is is hard to say - between harassment and legitimate police enforcement. Now in my conversation with the Chief Superintendent resulting from the allegations made by the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), it was just that area which was drawn to my attention, but I will certainly include the Port aux Basques area in such an enquiry. All I will do until I have obviously the results of - and when I say 'enquiry' now I am not thinking of appointing commissions and all of that. I mean by phoning. I could write or phone, but why write when you can phone? I mean, everything does not have to be done the most bureaucratic way. I mean phoning the man and saying, "This has come to my attention. Will you please check on it." And he says, "Yes." He will do it and will let me know in due course. There has sometimes been a confusion in our terms. If a person makes an enquiry, all of a sudden it is said, "There is an investigation going on," with the connotation of an investigation. What we are thinking of is an enquiry, fact finding, get the facts and then I will report them to the hon. members when I have them.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

hon. member for Burgeo-Bay D'Espoir.

A final supplementary. The

MR. SIMMONS:

I wonder if the minister could indicate to the House whether law enforcement officers can as a matter of routine stop vehicles and request identification and that kind of thing, or must they have a stated purpose, a suspected breach of the law, for example? Can they as a matter of routine stop vehicles and request information without stating any particular reason?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I think most hon. members would be aware that there are specific routine checks sometimes for the safety operation of the vehicle, whether it be the brakes, windshield wipers, other material works, to see the driver's license for compulsory insurance purposes. There has been for years, not only in Newfoundland but as far as I know practically everywhere, planned checks, number one, for driver's licenses or for the motor vehicle registration, the safe operation of the car. I myself have been stopped a number of times and asked to put on the headlights and put them off and blow the horn and that sort of thing. So, yes, there are regular checks for the safety point of view of the vehicle, its registration, its insurance, the driver's right to drive, the fact that he has a license. This certainly is not something new or uncommon and I think that very necessary for safety.

MR. SIMMONS:

Must they have a reason for stopping an individual.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, they do not just stop you. When they stop you they will say, you know, "May I see your driver's license?" They are checking your driver's license or they check your brakes or that type of thing.

MR. SIMMONS:

That is my point. They have been known to stop to check. That is my point.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Just stop and do what?

MR. SIMMONS:

And check.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

They must be checking something.

MR. SIMMONS:

Checking her out.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms)

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. I spent a good deal of time last night going over the list of roads programmes which the government was good enough to give us and was gratified, I must say, to see how

MR. JAMIESON: federal money is being expended, much of which, incidentally, I had something to do with getting in the first instance. The other side is I was quite, indeed, surprised to see how little is actually being expended on what might be described as secondary roads in this particular listing.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that there are so many petitions and so many complaints coming and being brought by members from all sides of the House, and in view of the fact that the construction season this Autumn, I hope, can be helped, would the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) consider a supplementary vote or amount which would be assigned specifically this Autumn to enhance and increase road work on these many roads in the Province, and certainly on the worst of them, so that additional work can be done this year?



MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition will recall that in the Interim Supply bills we took that approach. We did put into the Interim Supply Bill, perhaps in a slightly unusual way, certain amounts that would allow capital works to go ahead which were other than just continuations of contracts from last year.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) will also know that there is a supplementary supply bill proposed, and I am not at this point in time prepared to say what will be in that but such a bill will be brought forward.

MR. JAMIESON:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

I am well aware of the first part of the hon. member's answer. Obviously the interim supply was designed to get some of this work underway. Indeed some of it that is listed has been completed, as I understand it, some time ago. But the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) must know too that there are from many districts represented in this House very, very serious problems right now. I could start naming them from my own district. I am sure colleagues here could. The minister is meeting a deputation this afternoon who were picketing and justifiably concerned about the state of their road. What I am asking is, out of the total budget of the Government of Newfoundland will the minister consider earmarking some special and additional amount now so that there will be an active and expanded Fall roads programme in the secondary road areas where the matter is so serious?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I really think that that question would be more appropriately directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communication, and if he wishes to reply to it that is his prerogative, but at this point in time I will just note the hon. Leader of the Opposition's comments and we will bring them forward for discussion at the appropriate level or at the appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition wish an answer from the Minister of Transportation as well?

MR. JAMIESON: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was going to let some of my colleagues ask but since the suggestion has come from the Minister of Finance, will the Minister of Transportation, in view of the fact that he has these delegations coming—and I can tell him that there are about six more lined up behind the ones that he has already got coming now—will he undertake to use his best offices with the Minister of Finance to do something this Autumn, spring some extra dollars loose so that the worse kinds of cases can be dealt with and so that—I can start the ball rolling specifically—so that the people of Markland, for example, will have a half decent road to drive over this coming Winter and Spring?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, with respect to road construction in the Province, it is not always a matter of dollars and cents as to actually how much you can do. We have the largest Provincial Roads Programme in the Province this year that we have ever had since Confederation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: It is something just over \$25 million. But actually it is the construction season itself which really, not totally but to a large extent, dictates the amount of road work that can be done in any given year.

MR. BRETT:

Hon. members will recall that last year Winter came in this Province in November and Spring came in January and as a result there was literally millions of dollars of road work that did not get completed in the last construction season. As a matter of fact, I am not sure if it was \$8 million or \$12 million that was carried over from last year to this year simply because of the construction season.

If the Minister of Finance or the government were to allocate another \$3 million or \$4 million or \$20 million this Fall I do not think it would be possible to spend it. One, because of the shortness of the construction season. Secondly, not only is this the largest provincial programme we have ever had but - and if the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to take credit, and I am sure he would like to take credit and he does and I give him credit for it - it is the largest DREE programme we have ever had -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT:

- which is ninety-ten, the TCH agreement which was a \$60 million agreement. This year we are spending \$26 million on that. We are not very happy with the fifty-fifty. But all in all, when you add up the provincial programme, the TCH programme, and the DREE programme, it comes to in excess of \$90 million. That, Mr. Speaker, means that almost every single grader, truck, you name it, every piece of highway equipment that is in this Province, and a lot from other provinces, is tied up. They have all the work that

MR. C. BRETT:

they can handle. As a matter of fact, a lot of it will not be finished.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Allocate more money.

MR. C. BRETT:

We can not allocate any more money anyway unless we have another budget. but even if we did, then we could not spend it anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT:

My question again, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Minister of Transportation. And I am wondering, like I see in front of me here, the St. Barbe district I represent, \$4,897,200 for paving and undoubtedly you can tell me exactly the percentage federally funded for that \$4 million, but I am wondering how many dollars would be spent in a district such as St. Barbe, or let us name St. Barbe specifically, how many dollars are actually coming from the Provincial Treasury, provincial funding? The Department of Transportation and Communications Roads Programme 79-80, \$4 million being spent in St. Barbe from Port Saunders to Roddickton intersection which is the St. Barbe area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

That is DREE?

MR. T. BENNETT:

That is the DREE, sure. Now, I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if there are any funds from the provincial, being spent in that district, more especially for side roads, in conjunction with the existing programme of DREE money? Because we do have quite a number of side roads that are very anxious to have attention while equipment and the expertise happen to be in the area, along that shoreline.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member indicated that just about all of that money is DREE money, Well, if that is the

MR. C. BRETT: case then, he can take 10 per cent of \$4,897,200 and come up with the amount that the Province is putting in the programme. The \$10,000, I think, is provincial money.

As I said on many occasions, I share the hon. member's concern. There are a lot of side roads in Trinity North, there are a lot of side roads in Bonavista South, there are a lot of side roads in St. Mary's - The Capes and the government, myself and everybody over here is terribly concerned about it and we are going to do every single solitary thing that we can to see that these roads are paved as fast as they can be. As soon as the money is available I can assure the hon. member that they will be done.

MR. S. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what time he is going to keep a commitment made by one of his predecessors in 1975, to reconstruct and pave the road to Grand Bay West in Channel, Port aux Basque?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: I am not aware of the commitment, Mr. Speaker, but the hon. member from Humber Valley tells me it will be done after the road to Hampton is finished.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. W. Carter). I realize that in the giving answers to questions he may well have some answers to the questions I put to him yesterday. I find myself in a bit of a bind in that I want to ask some questions related to the answers he may have. So first off, my first question, therefore, will be to allow him to put into records certain things that I asked for yesterday. Does he have, at this point in time, any response to the questions which I put to him yesterday on the Fisheries Loan Board?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

I will be responding, Mr. Speaker, when Your Honour calls the appropriate time after Question Period.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

(Inaudible)

ask

supplementaries without the advantage of those answers if he wants to sit on them for a while. Will he confirm whether or not the Chairman, Fisheries Loan Board, has given notice that he is going to terminate his employment with the Fisheries Loan Board and if so, can the minister indicate what the reasons might be?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I might say, I did not want to take the time of Question Period to give the rather lengthy answer I am going to be giving after on the Fisheries Loan Board but yesterday the Chairman, Mr. George, has indicated his intentions of resigning. He has accepted a very important job with the Federal Government. I think he is called Director General of Water Services, a senior job within the Federal Public Service and for that reason he has tendered his resignation as Chairman of our Fisheries Loan Board.

MR. R. SIMMONS:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Does Mr. George's termination of his employment or pending termination have anything to do with the lack of meetings of the Board over the past couple of months?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I understand that one of Mr. George's stated reasons for terminating his employment has to do with a certain lack of freedom in pursuing his responsibilities. To wit the minister has been known -

MR. W. CARTER: It is not going to work 'Roger'.

MR. SIMMONS: - the minister has been known without recourse to The Fisheries Loan Board at all to approve applications directly from his office without allowing the Board to sit on those applications, to adjudicate their merits. And I understand that that is one of the prime reasons why Mr. George has given notice of his termination, the political interference by the minister. Would the minister want to comment on that?

AN HON. MEMBER: A good try 'Roger'.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no.

MR. SIMMONS: Of course he says that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. SIMMONS: Ask Gerry George.

MR. W. CARTER: Ask George (inaudible) too well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Ask Gerry George.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Fisheries with respect to the squid fishery in the Province at the present time in light of the fact that there are some seventeen factory ships going to come to the Province, I understand, over the season and a huge number of people are entering

Mr. F. Rowe: the squid fishery in the Province, I am wondering if the minister could indicate to the House what research has been done in terms of the squid stock, and whether there is any danger of the squid stock being depleted with the amount of fishery that is taking place now? And, also, if he has any information or research on the cyclic nature of the squid?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, some concern has been expressed by a lot of people with respect to the abundance of squid and the amount of harvesting that is going on. I understand that the federal government will be calling a special conference or seminar in the Fall on the squid fishery. And I expect that matter will be discussed at that conference, the matter of research and markets and just how much should we harvest, what the TACs should be and should not be and so on.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the Social Services Committee has considered the estimates referred to them and have passed Heads VI - Education; VII - Justice; VIII - Social Services; IX - Consumer Affairs and Environment; and X - Health without amendment, and will sit again upon request of this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, the Resource Committee on estimates has considered the Heads of Expenditure referred to it, and is pleased to report having passed Head XI - Mines and Energy; XII - Forestry, Resources, and Lands; XIII - Tourism, Recreation and Culture; XIV - Fisheries; XV - Industrial Development; XVI - Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development all without amendment.



August 9, 1979

Tape 674

PK - 3

Mr. Barrett: The Committee will sit again upon request of  
this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Utilities Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing (Mr. N. Windsor), I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act." And on behalf of the hon. the Premier, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Armistice Day Act."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Prevent Discrimination Against Blind Persons."

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend Further The Government British Newfoundland Corporation Limited N. M. Rothschild And Sons (Supplementary Agreement) Act, 1978."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question put to me by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), I think it was, with respect to the filling of the position vacated by the regional fisheries officer in that area -

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was the member for Torngat (Mr. Warren).

MR. W. CARTER:

- Torngat, yes. I can tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that approval has been received from Treasury Board to fill that

MR. W. CARTER: position. Ads have appeared in the newspapers requesting applications from prospective applicants. Interviews will take place shortly, and it is hoped to have the successful applicant hired no later than October 1st. In the meantime, the department has transferred another member of its field staff to Labrador to fill the position on a temporary basis until such time as the new person is recruited.

With respect to the question asked by the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), concerning fish plants in Cartwright and Mary's Harbour, the plant at Cartwright is presently leased to the Eagle River Development Association who propose to process rock cod - and possibly some of the surplus cod as smoked in conjunction with Fishery Products Limited. This is a short-term lease until the end of 1979.

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, next year we can arrange a more substantial operation for the Cartwright plant.

With respect to the plant at Mary's Harbour, the plant was to be leased to Labrador Enterprises Limited, a company owned and operated by Mr. Harvey Rumbolt. A short time ago, he indicated to us that he would not be able to operate the plant due to financial reasons. We have since advertised again for operators to lease the plant. The advertisement appeared in the newspapers today, as a matter of fact. Fishery Products, Nickersons and Notre Dame Bay Fisheries have been the only operators to show any interest to date.

Mr. Speaker, in reply to a question concerning the operation of the Fisheries Loan Board and in response to a statement by the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) that there has not been a meeting of the board since June, I want to tell the House now that there have been four meetings of the Loan Board since April 1st of this year, at which time loans for 118 new vessels, 62 used vessels and applications for 272 loans to purchase miscellaneous equipment were approved, for a total of \$5.5 million.

The most recent meeting of that board, Mr. Speaker, was held on July 27th, at which time loans for 14 new vessels,

MR. W. CARTER: 8 used vessels and 22 miscellaneous items were approved, for a total of \$823,428. Since April 1st of this year, Mr. Speaker, 633 applications have been received by the board from fishermen for loans; 495 of these have been approved; 150 of the applications that have not been approved to date are for the construction of longliners over thirty-five feet in length. These applications have been deferred for several reasons including, one, the uncertainty that exists at present with respect to the federal government's subsidies on boat policy - boats in that class - two, of course,

MR. W. CARTER: the present situation regarding shipyards, practically all of which are overbooked, have more work than they can handle. The third of course, the Fishing Industry Advisory Board study presently underway into boat building in the Province relative costs of vessels and equipment. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that report is soon to be released.

With respect to cash flow of the Loan Board this coming year. Cash flow projections, Mr. Speaker, for the present fiscal year is \$19.2 million as opposed to actual cash flow of 1978/79 of \$13.3 million, I repeat, \$19.2 million this year as opposed to \$13.3 million last year. Commitments to date for the current fiscal year for the 107 vessels in the thirty-five to sixty-five foot class that are now under construction, is \$12.2 million leaving approximately \$7 million for smaller vessels, engines and other miscellaneous equipment.

In cases of emergency or proven hardship, loans are being approved for longliner type vessels. Applications for small loans for the purchase of equipment etcetera are being processed and approved. I might add the approval rate, Mr. Speaker, of applications submitted to the Board range from 85 per cent to 90 per cent. 285 applications for a total of \$1 million was approved by the Loan Board in 1971/72 against loans approved in 1978/79 for a total of \$13.3 million.

Appraisals and inspections, Mr. Speaker, 1977/78 there were 209 inspections on new vessels; 1978/79 there were 280 inspections for vessels; 1977/78 there were 1,031 inspections for small boat bounties; 1978/79 there were 1,608 inspections, 202 of which remain to be carried out. Mr. Speaker, there are at present 107 vessels being constructed in the Province in the thirty-five to sixty-five foot class. These vessels are providing 423 man years of employment in the shipyards affected and in the spin-off industries. When these vessels go in operation they will provide

MR. W. CARTER: 3,000 man years of continuous employment for their twelve to fifteen years of economic life. Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board has, in fact, submitted his resignation, not for the reasons given by the member: opposite. The fact is he is bettering himself and that is not an unusual human trait to see in any person.

MR. S. NEARY: That is not the way we heard it.

MR. W. CARTER: That is not the way you want to hear it.

MR. R. SIMMONS: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) A point of privilege, the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I wish really to give notice that I will, as soon as I do the appropriate checking, raise a point of privilege. The point of privilege; I cannot raise it now because I am not sure which of two matters it will be. Either it will be that the minister has just misled the House on the date of the last meeting of the Board or it will be that his officials, in the presence of a witness, misinformed a member of this House on a matter of information which was sought to help the member to do his work in this particular House. The member the official of the minister's department in the presence of a witness informed me, and was asked to check the date and came back and reaffirmed, that the last date of the meeting was June 11th. The minister now affirms the last meeting was July 27th. I have reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the last meeting was June 11th. But

But, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will raise a matter of privilege on one of two matters; either that I have been misled by the minister or that I have been misinformed by one of his officials.

MR. SPEAKER: If and when the hon. member -

MR. W. CARTER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

August 9, 1979

Tape No. 676

DW - 3

MR. SIMMONS: It was not a point of order.

MR. W. CARTER: To the point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: I would like to table, Mr. Speaker,  
the record of the meetings to which I referred a moment ago  
on July 27th. This is an official

MR. W. CARTER:

record from the Fisheries Loan Board handed to me this morning by the Chairman of that Board.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

It is my understanding that the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has given notice of a possible point of privilege. If and when he raises that point of privilege I will then make a ruling on the point of privilege.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: I think, Mr. Speaker, what just happened in the last minute or so is highly irregular in that the minister was allowed to pursue a point of privilege before I even outlined what my point of privilege would be. I just gave notice of it to preserve my rights to do it at the appropriate time. And if we are now going to pursue the matter then let us have a free-for-all on both sides. But I think what the minister was just allowed to do was highly irregular and I think - it cannot be undone now - it goes to show how that minister regularly abuses the rules of this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To the point of order. I have already indicated that if and when the hon. member raises his point of privilege, I will then at that time make a ruling.

OOO

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) known to rig a document before.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order. The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible) by the one you just put up (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!



MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this; so far this session I have put 35 written questions on the Order Paper and I have gotten two answers. The House is drawing to a close - could the government House Leader tell me when I am going to get the answers to the other 35 questions that are outstanding?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): To the point of order. The hon. the House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order, that is a question that the hon. member can launch during Question Period. We have certain procedures in this House that we must follow in order to have the proceedings flowing on in a reasonable, rational way. If the hon. member wishes -

MR. SIMMONS: Tell that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. MARSHALL: - to ask me that during Question Period, Mr. Speaker, I shall respond.

MR. SIMMONS: - to the (inaudible) fisheries (inaudible) and they tell it slowly.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The hon. the member for Strait of Bell Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - with all respect to the learned gentleman opposite, I think it is a perfectly valid point of order. The whole point of it is that my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has put questions on the Order Paper and not got any answers. If there was any order at all in the House, the government would give answers. The Premier has stood in his place time and time again and assured us that the administration wants to be open and forthcoming with information. Here they have an opportunity to put 33 answers on the Order Paper to very pointed and very perceptive

MR. ROBERTS: questions and they have not. I think it is perfectly in order to ask. The one thing that is out of order, Mr. Speaker, is the government who are not answering the questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): On the point of order. I would rule there is not a point of order at this particular time. A minister does not have to answer questions, as hon. members are fully aware.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. MARSHALL: Order 14, Bill No. 26.

MR. SPEAKER: Order 14. The adjourned debate on Bill No. 26.

The hon. the President of the Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, in the few moments I have left -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. MARSHALL: I would like to capsule a few things -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. NEARY: No way!

MR. MARSHALL: - with respect to this bill. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I commend the minister for bringing it in. It is a good measure, it is a real blueprint for sensible development, it shows that this government it determined that the resources of this Province are going to be used for the people of this Province. It also shows that this government has been successful at long last in getting the federal government to recognize that it should be involved in the direction of this Province, the development of this Province but in such a way that they are not going to grapple every last, and squeeze every last bit of benefit out of it and that the benefit is going to stay with the people here.

I also indicated yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that as far as this government has gone, it has capitalized the \$100 million. In effect, when this government makes a mistake

MR. MARSHALL: it capitalizes, really, on its mistake.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: This was no bail-out, Mr. Speaker. I have also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that this is no bail-out, but is really, in essence, a rescuing of our resources from the grappling right hand of the federal government.

It is a good agreement. I think it stands in stark contrast with agreements entered into before with respect to the Upper Churchill. I do not want to get into that in great detail, but in closing I would like to refer to a matter that I spoke of the other day, that I do not think is very well known in this Province, that I think is one of the most disgraceful acts or aspects that has ever been perpetrated through a government of the day and that is the power contract, that infamous contract which gave the power away, of this Province, for many years to the Quebec Hydro Electric Commission and I refer to a power

MR. MARSHALL: contract that I have in my hand with Quebec Hydro Electric Commission and the Churchill Falls Labrador Corporation Limited, which contract, of course, was entered into with the sanction and the knowledge of the then provincial government of the day, provincial Liberal Government.

Section 1(2) Applicable Law:

And I think that this is something that really has not got before the people of this Province full square and it ought to be. And I read and I quote, "This power contract;" in other words this contract that gave away the power to Quebec, "This power contract" - that gave away our power to the Province of Quebec - "shall at all times in all respects be governed by and interpreted by and in accordance with the laws of the province of Quebec. The only courts", it goes on to say, "competent to judge disputes between the parties hereto arising out of this contract are subject to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada when such appeal lies. These courts are the courts of the judicial district of Montreal where for purposes of litigation only as aforesaid, CFLCo elects to domicile for service at 1 Westmount Square in the city of Westmount, district of Montreal, or at such other place in the said district of Montreal to which CFLCo may from time to time give written notice to Hydro Quebec." Now, what a contrast between one contract and the other. I do not know whether the people of Newfoundland are really aware of the fact that not only was the resource given away but it was said at the time in this contract that if any dispute arises with respect to our resources that it was going to be adjudicated by the laws of the Province of Quebec, in the Province of Quebec and the head office of CFLCo which had our resource had to stay in the Province of Quebec. Now, I do not think that there could be any more, really, treacherous act perpetrated on the people of this Province by any group of people than to say that the rights to our resources were to be determined by the laws of the Province of Quebec, by the legislature of Quebec.

MR. MARSHALL:

I think that really this aspect of the agreement itself is not something which the public is fully aware of but it certainly should be aware of.

Now in closing as I say -

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is all balderdash!

MR. MARSHALL:

It is not balderdash. It is here. The hon. member can read it if he wishes to. The hon. member, as all hon. members on the other side, like to shut their eyes to this most disgraceful act perpetrated by their predecessors in office, by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland.

Now, I would think with that, Mr. Speaker, that the debate on this bill would probably end right now. There will probably be a few speakers on our side but I again say that there really would be few people bearing the banner of the Liberal party of Canada or the Liberal party of Newfoundland, both, who would dare to really get on their feet for many years more, or perhaps for the next sixty years anyway, and talk on matters of hydro or to offer improper advice to the people of Newfoundland of what should be done in hydro matters.

So I would expect that there would be very little debate from the other side except perhaps from the Leader of the Opposition who will undoubtedly make, probably, hopefully, certain comments. The Leader of the Opposition, of course, is a , and I mean this sincerely, is a distinguished Newfoundlander who occupied a very high position in the Government of Canada. And I have to say, from my own point of view, that if a nation has to go through the agony of having a government, a Liberal government in power and if the people of the Province as they exercise their democratic rights chose to send Liberals to a legislative form I could not, and I mean this sincerely, think of a more distinguished and capable person than the Leader of the Opposition to be a member of the Cabinet in the Liberal government. But I will be interested myself - that is not to say that I think that Liberal governments are

August 9, 1979

Tape No. 678

AH-3

MR. MARSHALL:

good per se, I want to underline that, but I would like to hear myself - I do not really want to hear and I do not think the people of Newfoundland really want to hear any more from the Liberal party as to hydro development, not from the party that gave it away and said that the laws of the province of Quebec are to apply to our resources - but I

MR. MARSHALL: would like to hear from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) to hear what his view is now with respect to this bill with particular reference, Mr. Speaker, to that provision in the bill, or the overall aspect of the bill which is the most beneficial one as far as I am concerned which means that shares are put in by the federal government, they buy shares but, in effect, it is debt funded.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many million dollars -

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: We can get our resources back without having to give them away. The policy of the federal government as I discerned it, the Federal Liberal Government of which he was a member, was a policy, really, of attempting to get as much central control and federal control over the resources of the Province, as witness the attempt of Mr. Gillespie at the time to get these shares - it is to be in the nature of common shares rather than redeemable shares - and as witness many other acts of that government with respect to offshore jurisdiction. So I would like to hear as I say, to distinguish a Newfoundlander who occupied a position in the federal government, who went along with those policies at that particular time. I know right now that he is back home here in Newfoundland that we can be quite assured of the fact that now - and I welcome his comments, as to whether or not he believes now, really, that the resources of this Province should be developed for the people of this Province, the federal government has no right to them, that in the scheme of the British North American Act and Confederation a Province can only really progress if it has its own resources. I trust that he will wholeheartedly endorse this bill, the major reason of which his endorsement should really be, that the resources

MR. MARSHALL of this Province are safeguarded in the Bill itself for the people of Newfoundland rather than for the people of Canada, rather than for the people of Quebec, that the laws applying to this contract will be the laws of the Province of Newfoundland rather than the laws of the Province of Quebec, that any disputes that arise on it would be decided by our courts rather than the courts in Quebec, that any provincial laws that affect it will be the laws of the people of Newfoundland which will apply to their resources rather than the laws of Quebec applying to our resources. I look forward and invite the hon. Leader of the Opposition's comments with respect to these matters, but trust that no other member of the Liberal party for many years to come in this Province will have the consummate gall to offer advice to this government or to any people with respect to hydro matters. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have never in my whole life heard such a ridiculous conclusion to what started out yesterday to be a fill-in speech to six o'clock when we had made some kind of understanding, indeed, with regard to the adjournment of the debate. The hon. gentleman started out yesterday to say that rather than adjourn he was going to extend it up to the six o'clock deadline, which was agreeable with me, and I enjoyed yesterday and thought that he was doing an extremely skillful, if at the same time highly devious job of filling in time. But this afternoon, this afternoon, he has gone beyond anything that one could expect or would really be anticipating from what my seat-mate calls the, I believe it is, hon. and learned member on the opposite side. Mr. Speaker, I accept fully his challenge, and I will tell him something else and tell him now that if he thinks that any member on this Liberal side of the House is going to refrain from talking about the hydro or the electric or related



MR. JAMIESON: energy policies of the government opposite, then he has another thing coming -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: - because on the one hand we have seen over this last month a consistent and a deliberate effort on the part of the government opposite to put as much space as it possibly can between itself and what it calls its predecessor. In fact, the hon. gentleman went so far yesterday as to say there were two governments, "One party", he said, "two governments". In other words, as of the last election everything is flushed down the drain, we are all to use an expression we are hearing more and more frequently here, 'born again', on the other side.

MR. S. NEARY: Purged.

MR. JAMIESON: Purged, he said. Then he goes dredging up and going back and back and back and inviting me to do something which, quite frankly, I had no intention of doing and that is to talk about matters which occurred during the period when I was in the federal government at Ottawa. I do not feel, by the way, that it is part of my responsibility, nor indeed perhaps appropriate, but since I have been invited by the hon. gentleman, I will do so and I hope I will do so in a rational and a fair manner and not indulge in the kind of circuitous argument that we heard from the hon. member and which, incidentally, is really quite beneath a man who is supposed to be the Leader

MR. JAMIESON: of the government in this House here and to talk about this body in that particular fashion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all, that we endorse the principle of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. JAMIESON: The hon. gentleman asked me for answers and now he appears to be willing to leave the room when I am giving him those answers. And incidentally, I do not see anyone here at the moment who can, indeed, either confirm what I propose to say, or indeed, can deny it. But let me again, I hope, as I have said, in a rational and a dispassionate manner, try to deal with the principle of this bill, itself, which we endorse. I find it very remarkable and very strange that suddenly a document which, if my own files will bear me out, is not one jot or tittle different than was negotiated with the previous federal government in Ottawa. I do not believe that there is a comma changed from what it was before the federal election took place. I find it strikingly unusual now that this government opposite should be hailing this document which does not have a Tory word in it as far as the federal government is concerned. It is, I believe, signed by Alastair Gillespie, Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and by Premier Moores.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: But, Mr. Speaker, I will come to that part of the debate in just a moment. I want now to say that while we support the principle of this bill, I agree wholly and totally with the comments from this side of the House yesterday, those from the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) and from the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), that while there are good prospects in this bill, we should not give the people of Newfoundland the impression that in point of fact, this now means that the green light has been given to the Churchill Falls development - quite the contrary. There are going to be more difficult questions to answer after this study is completed than there are at the

MR. JAMIESON: present time, and it is only when the work that is envisaged in this report is produced that this government is going to have to make some extremely hard and very difficult decisions. And quite honestly, on the basis of their record over the past eight years in energy matters, I have no confidence that they are going to be able to make those decisions in the best interests of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador despite all their Motherhood statements, despite all their declarations that we have heard in this House, which quite frankly are nauseating in their Motherhood approach and in their generality without being specific, for the people of Newfoundland. It is only when we see the report that comes out of this particular bill that we will be in a position to know just exactly whether we are going to go ahead with the Labrador hydro development or not.

Now, talking of that record and going back over the last eight years or so, let me remind the House that, of course, long before the so-called nationalization of Brinco took place, the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland were in almost constant negotiation as to how it might be possible to develop the Lower Churchill. I can recall from my own meetings, literally dozens of them, there were two fundamental problems involved - they were marketing and financing. Those were the basis issues prior to the moves by this government - this same government,

Mr. Jamieson: not some brand new government-to move into nationalization. Mr. Speaker, we had on the federal side, no hand whatever, nor indeed was there any reason why we should have had any hand in the decision to move as they did with regards to the takeover of BRINCO. But what was clear both before and after that event, the fundamental difficulties were not removed by the sheer act of nationalization.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: The marketing problem was still there, The financing problem was still there.

Error number one costly, frightfully costly error number one on the part of this government, was to proceed with the nationalization without knowing what the next steps were going to be. Because what was the argument that was put forward at that time? It is on the record, I am sure that we could find it even in the public print, the argument was, and it had validity insofar as it went, that the Government of Newfoundland wished to proceed more expeditiously and more rapidly with the Lower Churchill Development than they felt would be possible if they left it in private hands. There may have been other reasons as well, reasons by the way with which I may not argue. But that was the basic point.

Now, what has occurred from that date to this? Not one kilowatt of electricity has been generated, therefore the situation remains what it was before, in those terms at least, that the idea of nationalizing so that you could proceed with the development failed. Now, let me say in terms of what the federal government did or did not do, if you wish to put it that way, The proposition that was put initially was examined in all of its details and the Government of Newfoundland changed its mind a half a dozen times within the first year or so after acquiring CFLCo or whatever the formal name of the organization is. From one meeting to the next we never knew quite what they were going to come up with. And, furthermore, they would even make declarations to the effect that they were going to proceed

Mr. Jamieson: on their own.

Now, in 1975 or whatever the year of the great boom was on each side of the Gulf, in 1975, I was present at meetings, there are gentlemen, there may be one left in this House, but there are former members of this government who were present at the meetings, when it was clearly stated not only, by the way, not only by authorities on the federal side, not only by independent experts, but also by many private and reputable organizations that, in fact, this procedure that was being followed by the government, with the present Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Barry), present or part of the operation, that it could not proceed on that basis at that time. Now, that was as late as the middle of 1975. At the end of 1975, however, or whenever it was the decision was made, a great start was undertaken with regard to the - a tunnel, I believe, was the original objective or the original intent, and three months later, three months later, I think, it could not have been any more than that, they concluded - what? - that it was too expensive or that they had gone the wrong route. Now that was surely something that they knew in the middle of the year just as well as they knew it at the end of the year.

And my hon. friend who turned himself inside out, a chameleon, a change colour from one to the next knows damn well that I am right -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: - and that he was one of those who had the guts to quit rather than support that kind of operation.

Now, that was the situation. Insofar as the federal government was concerned, we gave them good sound solid advice and they ought to have taken it. And if they had taken it we would not be in the hole as we were until this bail-out occurred of some \$65 million or \$110 million, whichever it is that the hon. members opposite will eventually arrive at as being the appropriate figure.

But I do not want to take too much time on this. I want to talk, however, about one thing which is very relevant to this

Mr. Jamieson: bill, very relevant, and that is this; the hon. member said to me, "What about this business of equity? Was the federal government, in fact, insisting upon equity?" The answer and I can give it very quickly-and, by the way, I do not know if it is all on the public record, I think it probably is, my hon. friend will have to remember a large sequence of events

MR. D. JAMIESON: which occurred just about the same time, the OPEC crisis, the variety of discussions that went on with regard to this new energy challenge that we in the Western world faced - there were a number of proposals put forward by all provinces and by the Federal Government among them, for instance, perhaps the hon. gentleman does not know this, among them was an argument that the Federal Government ought to pay 50 per cent of the cost of the first nuclear plant in any province. Again, I, in discussion with members of the government opposite, sought a means through which we might be able to convert that kind of a commitment saying we do not need nuclear, we have got Churchill, will we transpose that onto the Churchill Falls project. We examined it, by the way, very co-operatively, no problems, no great argument with those who were in negotiating for the other side.

At the same time, there was a proposition put forward with regard to assistance with transmission lines, long range transmission lines. We examined that to see what its relevancy was to the Lower Churchill project. That was another part and piece of the total discussion which was going on. And the hon. member has to bear this in mind because unless he sees it in this perspective he will continue to have his mind abused by some kind of a feeling that the Federal Government was acquisitive with regard to wanting to hold equity shares. Precisely at the same time, developments were occurring in Western Canada, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the Tar Sands. And if you will recall there were a number of propositions being put forward by some of the Western provinces who were saying that, in fact, they wanted a federal equity position because of the enormity, the enormity of the costs involved and their desire to have a federal/provincial partnership. Now, that is again, a matter of record, I would have to search in detail to see precisely how those Tar Sands projects came about on which, by the way, so many Newfoundlanders are now working. But it was not a federal initiative exclusively, it was a question of examining with the provinces what

MR. D. JAMIESON:

was the best way to go.

Now, in the case of Newfoundland, what was it here? The problem was escalating costs, which the hon. member forecast, one of the few who saw it. The decision had been made that Newfoundland could not proceed, there was \$65 or \$110 million in two holes in the ground and did, on the ground at that point, nothing. That was the situation. The Government of Canada, Mr. Gillespie, who was my colleague at that time, and I, in conversation with some members of your government in Newfoundland here at that time, looked at a whole range of options. One of them was that we would start with the half-cost nuclear proposal, translate those funds into some developmental funds, look at the transmission line proposal, see how much we could extract from that. Now, what happened at that stage? What happened? The ratio of debt to equity scared the heck out of everybody including most of you on the government side here in Newfoundland. The situation was that given the fact that the Government of Newfoundland or its agency now owned this organization 100 per cent, therefore, whether it was going to be the government or its agency, it would have to go on the back of one very, very sizable bond issue in some form or other to get this started. Now, that was the difficulty. The Newfoundland credit simply could not sustain it and at that stage in the game the idea was put forward that we would not only participate, that Canada would not only participate but that it was prepared to take equity so that it would in a sense be a partner in the organization.

Now, let me make it perfectly clear, and if there is any document to the contrary I would be very surprised, that we never said, certainly I never understood, that that was a rigid or a hard or a fast position. And the evidence that I am right and that the hon. gentleman is making a straw man here is, I repeat, the bill itself. Because as a result of the negotiations and the talk with the representatives of Newfoundland, the Government of Canada, not



August 9, 1979

Tape No. 682

SD - 3

MR. D. JAMIESON: the present Conservative Government of Canada, the previous Government of Canada agreed with the arrangements which the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) brought out. This is not something that is one sided, there are two signatures on it, So I repeat once again and I will leave the subject here because there are more important aspects of this that I would like to get on to, that those are the facts of the case, that there is no evidence to the best of my knowledge and I would



MR. JAMIESON: has, in fact, allowed certain kinds of equity by others including, I believe, some federal agencies, but that is beside the point. The key now is that it is settled to the satisfaction of members opposite, and I hope it will work.

Now, there is a lot more that I could do by way of talking about history, but I want to say to hon. gentlemen that if they want to spend all of their time talking about what past Liberal Governments did, then let me tell them that there is every reason for them to expect that we will spend at least the same amount of time talking about what they call past Tory Governments did.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Because there is not even a separation in between -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: You are a continuing administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Now, Mr. Speaker, so much for the hon. member's, as I said, intriguing kind of intervention in this debate. I am, for the life of me, at a loss to understand what he was talking about or what the motivation was, because what I want to do in this debate is something much more important than recall the absolute mess that this government has made of energy policy in this Province from the day one, from the very start.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. JAMIESON: It has been a consistent change of mind, change of pattern, so that nobody, including hon. members opposite, know what they are doing on energy. And my hon. friend should have been the last man in this House to get up and to try to make the speech he did for the very reason that he knows that he knew they did not have a policy when they went ahead, and, my dear Mr. Speaker, they do not have one to this day. And that is what I want to say I am concerned about.

Now, yesterday, by coincidence - and here I hope that I can dispense with any partisanship - because I want to

MR. JAMIESON: ask the minister some really quite serious questions and I want to ask them in a constructive sort of way - but by coincidence yesterday, the hon. gentleman made two statements within an hour, one having to do with the Upper Salmon and then when he introduced the bill. We all, of course, welcomed the statement with regard to the Upper Salmon through my colleague, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). But in all of the euphoria

MR. D. JAMIESON: which we share, in the pleasures that we share over the fact that there is going to be development and there are going to be jobs, I do not believe that it penetrated to the minds of most of us in this House, and I have seen nothing in the media, that this is going to be forty-one mil power. The paper says forty-one my recollection is, but forty odd - it is hairsplitting -

MR. E. ROBERTS: (inaudible) forty-one mils, forty.

MR. D. JAMIESON: All right, let us say forty mil power. Now, what I am making reference to here is not that there is anything wrong with what Hydro has done in this case, I am quite sure those assessments are right but it does demonstrate what an incredibly challenging period the Western World is in as well as tiny Newfoundland in this whole energy crisis in which we find ourselves. Because forty mil power or forty-one mil power must be the most expensive, I would suspect, that we have generated so far.

MR. L. BARRY: Over a period that is just to burn, if you had your plants up you could use the oil that is available now. That is over thirty.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Yes, I agree but we are now nudging up to the forty and beyond. What this is going to mean to the consumer, I am talking about the ordinary consumer because so far as I can see, with the possible exception of the liner-board revitalized plan taking a chunk of the power, it is really going to have to be, in a sense, supplied to the ordinary consumers of this Province. This is, presumably, also going to be in addition to the ten and six which is 17 per cent. When this comes on stream we can undoubtedly expect that there are going to be still further increases -

MR. L. BARRY: It is an averaging out. That goes into the provincial grid.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I would suggest to the hon. minister that it probably follows nevertheless. Incidentally I am not doing anything than that a mathematical equation but if the cost of

MR. D. JAMIESON: energy is going to continue to rise, and when one thinks back that it was only ten years or so ago that we were talking four and five mil power or six mil power and eight and nine mil power was considered to be expensive, it does give some indication of the magnitude of the problem that we are facing and the challenge that it is going to put in front of this government and in front of the consumers of this Province. And I say to you, in all sincerity, that we are going to have to ask ourselves how much of this we are going to allow to pass through to the ordinary people and that - I do not envy the Premier of this Province when he has to sit down along with the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and negotiate these matters with the Federal Government and the other provinces in Canada. It is a very serious question.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a second set of figures which are even more shattering in the bill or in the statement with which the minister introduced the bill and once again he is probably right, although he conceded and I acknowledge that it was ballpark figures, but that Gull Island is probably in the range of \$3.3 billion to develop and if I understood him rightly yesterday Muskrat would \$1.71.8 billion.

MR. S. NEARY: That is on top of that.

MR. D. JAMIESON: That is on top of that. Now those are the -

MR. L. BARRY: That will average out, by the way, at approximately thirty-five in case of Gull forty mil power (inaudible).

MR. D. JAMIESON: Yes, thirty-five or forty mil power. There we are. But the basic problem surely once this group has reported and incidentally, this is work that ought to have been done years ago if I may so, it ought to have been done before the moves were taken that have already been taken. But I have been over all of that past I want to go on now to just cite what I see as

MR.D. JAMIESON: the challenge that I am not at all sure has been grasped yet by the people of this Province and indeed by the Government of this Province. We are talking something over \$5 billion if we are going to develop both the Gull Island site and the Muskrat site. I gather from the hon. minister that if we only go the Muskrat site and let us take the figure of \$1.7 or \$1.8 billion probably a little more by the time escalation sets in, say \$2 billion, we are going to need that in order to meet the demand in this Province from the natural increase between now and 1983 on - this is the way I understand it - which means in other words that just to look after ourselves no industrial expansion, nothing of that nature, there is at least a \$2 billion amount of money that has to be provided or \$1.8 billion whatever it is and get it across the gulf and get it into the Island of Newfoundland. Now I do not, quite frankly, know how the Newfoundland Government proposes to go about this other than I have no doubt to

MR. JAMIESON: say a hundred novenas or Hail Mary's or pray morning, noon and night that the federal government will be extra, ultra generous, that is -

MR. BARRY: They do not have to.  
Do the same as was done for the Tar Sands. It does not have to be.

MR. NEARY: On the Upper Churchill.  
If we have use for the power of the Upper Churchill, we can recall every kilowatt, every bit of it.

MR. JAMIESON: I agree, yes. Right.  
I just want to follow on. With regard to the - I hope the hon. member is right, but I would also like to know if, for instance, the Government of Newfoundland expects that this will be outright grants, will there be some kind of just guarantees that he is looking for from the Government of Canada so that they go to the conventional bond market? How is this thing going to be done, and, incidentally, if it is going to be done in that way, what is going to be the projected level, in a sense, of cost to the people of Newfoundland? Now, that is one side of it. The second point, which really brings me back to something which the President of the Privy Council and which hon. members opposite have said, and he asked me for a declaration on it. I have never had any quarrel or any doubts in my mind that the number one responsibility of the people running the Province of Newfoundland must be to maximize the usefulness of that hydro for the benefit of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I have been on the record for a decade in saying that, no question in my mind. What worries me, however, is this: the hon. minister is also the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Barry) and the Throne Speech, and I think peripherally in the Budget, makes reference to industrial developments of considerable magnitude -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but there is an awful noise in the back out here. Mr. Speaker, if you could get some order in the back out here? There is a terrible noise.



MR. JAMIESON:

I thank the hon. member.

I was about to say that the reference is made to large industrial users, presumably as being necessary even when you take all that Newfoundland needs for its natural growth, there is still going to be considerable power that will have to be used in some other form. Therefore, the natural basic, and I commend the government for it, first principle is that you make the most use of it in Newfoundland in industrial terms or whatever. Now, this means, it seems to me, a problem of very serious timing for the hon. the minister and for the government. What happens next Spring or, say, give it the Summer because these things always tend to lag behind, when as a result of this Bill the distinguished gentlemen who are doing the study come and say, "Here you are, Mr. Minister, here you are, Government of Newfoundland, this is how you can go"? Now, that is going to happen, because the process is in work. Is the industrial demand being identified? Is there a search underway now so that my hon. friend's motherhood kinds of statements will not be left dangling when this report comes in, because somebody is saying, as we have heard for a hundred years in Newfoundland, "If we can only hang on a little longer, there is a great smelting job to be done", or "There is a great aluminum this" or there is something else. Now, if you get to the stage where it is demonstrably capable or possible to develop the power, do you then in fact not use it because you do not have industrial customers? What is the split-off in terms of how much you steer toward Newfoundland for the normal increases and what do you do with the surplus in the meantime? I suggest, half humourously, that the hon. minister about this time next year may find himself in the position of the Australian who got a new boomerang for Christmas and had a neck of a job getting rid of the old one, and this is what I think is going to happen, that unless the industrial development planning parallels, parallels the development with regard to the Lower Churchill or the Muskrat or both, unless that happens, then

MR. JAMIESON: you are going to be left holding the baby again. You are going to have to say at that stage, "Does the hon. the President of the Privy Council, does he prevail in this instance and say we do not develop it because we cannot maximize its benefit for Newfoundland", or is it possible then, is it possible that some of the power might be - and I use the word in the narrow sense of the word - exported or moved Westward? I know some of these questions were asked in Committee. Now, it does not matter to me, at this stage in the game, and I am not asking, I am not expecting that the government has got all of the answers to all of these questions. If it had, then obviously we would not need this study, we would not need this report, but I caution hon. members opposite and I caution the

MR. D. JAMIESON: people of Newfoundland that we will find ourselves in that position and we are going to have to make some very difficult decisions. We will be talking about a load of some kind whether it is bonds, whether it is debt, whatever it is of some \$5 billion if the whole thing goes ahead. Now, that does not frighten me, by the way, because if the thing is structured properly, we can probably make the earnings from it. But I think it is incumbent on the government to start asking these questions now not just of itself but of the people of Newfoundland.

For instance, there is a legitimate quite, I think, defensible point of view that power in itself is a manufactured commodity and that you should squeeze every possible ounce of profit out of it that you can, use those profits then to, in a sense, subsidize power that you already have in existence or you use your surplus to that extent and you have a different kind of industrial strategy which is perhaps more suited. It might mean more, for instance, to have better profits to improve the fishery than to have a smelter or whatever the case might be. I am not saying, I am not putting this as an argument, I am saying it is a legitimate argument that is put in many parts of the world where I have been and where I have talked about these matters. But the issue is, really, whether or not the government is now going in a way, and I hope it is, I hope it is, where it is paralling its efforts, thanks to this bill, to get the studies completed with a honest, hard look at whether there is an industrial capability or or capacity somewhere down the road that can utilize that surplus power.

Now, just in case my time should run out before I make my last two or three points -

MR. NEARY: By leave. (Inaudible) sixty minutes.

MR. MARSHALL: I realize that but I thought I had been on a fair length of time.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman has a half hour left, another hour if he needs it.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Well, I assure the House I will not burden them that long. But there are a couple of other issues here with regard to this planning that do concern me considerably. And I was proud to be the Leader of our young member from Eagle River (Mr. E. Hiscock) yesterday.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. JAMIESON: And that is that I am not sure, I am not sure that we have, in all of our grandiose talk about what we are going to do with industrial development, whether we have asked serious questions of the people of Labrador themselves in this regard. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. and very good friend of mine, the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. J. Goudie) and all of those other things, would share that feeling, that there is a worry that, in fact, the people who are actually on the ground are not really being consulted enough. You know many of us have the opportunity of a particular way of life. One of the things, thanks to some of my friends opposite, that I have is a very secluded kind of place where I can go. To use my analogy in a very narrow kind of sense, I suppose, if I were looking at it, my vista is substantially improved since the Come By Chance flare is no longer there to light up the night sky.

So what I am saying is, that there are people in Labrador, and by the way there are a lot within Newfoundland too, who question whether large scale industrialization, with all of the problems that it generates, the infrastructure difficulties which we are just compounding day after day these days, if this is really the route we ought to go. I believe, also, and I put all of these in what the hon. member may very well say, the hon. minister, and he would be right in a hypothetical way, I put them in this fashion because they ought to be asked now.

We have 560, 570 thousand people in the Province of Newfoundland. Even if we could, would we want to have a kind of industrial base that would generate, perhaps, the need for another 100 or 150 thousand people? This question has never

MR. D. JAMIESON:                    been addressed in all of the sweeping generalizations. For example, I regret that I have to keep going back to the hon. the President of the Privy Council but he was the speaker who raised the point. I think the question we have to ask ourselves is, have we ever done a demographic study that would say that if you put in, and I will just pluck a particular enterprise out of the air, a smelter or whatever, what the labour force in this Province is that is capable of matching it? Or would you face fairly quickly a problem of saying we must bring in a large number of skilled workers and compound the sorts of difficulties that my hon. and respected friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. J. Dinn) runs into quite frequently with regard to some issues already in Labrador.

MR. JAMIESON: So, I am pointing out I hope in a constructive way that this is not just a matter of whether we agree that Lower Churchill should be developed. We have no problem on that. We agree with the principle of the Bill. It is not even a question of whether that power should be maximized for the benefit of Newfoundlanders; of course, it should, there is no question about that. The big, unresolved question I suggest to hon. ministers opposite, and I do not believe that they have addressed themselves to it because it has not come front and centre, is what is the way, what is the way to maximize? And I believe that unless very serious thought is given to that, that we are going to be in awfully precarious straits in a year or so when some of these hard decisions have to be made. Now, why do I believe that? Because in the absence of any real answers so far, and obviously it cannot be definitive until the report is completed, but in the absence of that we can only assume that the financiers in one way or the other are going to be involved because you cannot generate \$5 billion or even \$1.9 or \$2 billion, not even the Government of Canada on its total sweeping commitments could do that without having some kind of agreement from the financiers, the bond houses, or whoever, and it is my experience that they are going to ask one question rather quickly, and that is, "Who are the end users, have you got the customers?" This used to always be the hang-up, and my hon. friend, the President of the Privy Council, asks for history, this was where we came to a grinding halt not once but a dozen times in the discussion, "Where is the big industrial user?" Some of his former colleagues and I traipsed the world, traipsed the world trying to find them; he knows it, I know it, and the story we always got was that until you had an identified large industrial user that you could not produce all of this power and make use of it in the manner which the hon. member wants and I want within the Province of Newfoundland. Therefore, you will come up against this inevitable, inevitable challenge as to whether you are going

MR. JAMIESON: to have to "export"; and I use that in quotes, but move out of the Province some of that power in order to make it economically viable. I would hope that that would not have to happen, provided all of these other things that I have mentioned fitted into place, but it is a very difficult challenge that you are going to face and we are all going to face in Newfoundland in that regard.

Now, one other point and my hon. friend from Lapoile (Mr. Neary) reminded me of it, and quite honestly I do not understand the intricacies of the legal side of it nearly as well as, let us say, some of the members who sat in this House before because it is basically a Newfoundland issue with which I was not directly involved. I hope I have demonstrated that I am reasonably well informed on those matters with which I was involved, but I do understand that there is a recall provision and that there is a way in which we can obtain and get back some of the Upper Churchill power, and that it can, in fact, be used significantly to get us over some of these hurdles. What we want to know, I guess, as a group and as Newfoundlanders is, "Is that option open to us as an alternative, let us say, to development if all of those pieces I have spoken of are not fitted into place; how far along is the government with regard to conversations that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) has had with the Government of Quebec; are we on a confrontation course; is Quebec showing any genuine willingness to renegotiate?" All of these issues are also locked in, because what you have on the one hand is the prospect of five or six billion dollars, you know, the figure is so loose and so big now that you would drop it into the hopper and a billion one way or the other does not seem to turn a hair on anybody's head, but we are going to face that problem or can we diminish to some degree the extent of our over-

MR. JAMIESON: hanging commitment by exercising our rights with regard to Upper Churchill power. Is that basically the point?

MR. NEARY: We do not own all the power from Upper Churchill -

MR. JAMIESON: I understand, that is right.

MR. NEARY: but we have recall rights to the whole works for 300,000 horsepower right away.

MR. JAMIESON: 300,000 horsepower at any time.

MR. NEARY: A year's notice. How is that for giving it away?

MR. JAMIESON: What I want to say as I wind up this intervention of mine is this: that I hope there will be no doubt, either on the other side or in the Province, that insofar as this party is concerned partisanship stops at the Quebec border, that we will totally, fully and without reservation support any and every effort on the part of the government to stop Quebec from tollgating Newfoundland power, whether it is past power or future power. There is no question on that matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Now, having said that -

MR. MORGAN: Why was it not done in the past?

MR. JAMIESON: - having said that, I also want to ask a -

MR. MORGAN: Why was it not done in the past?

MR. JAMIESON: - I deeply regret.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member



MR. JAMIESON: from Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan),  
You know, if hot air were music, he would be a brass band!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. JAMIESON: Please! I am trying to ask some questions  
which are legitimate and I am trying to resolve -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

If I might interrupt the hon. Leader,  
it is now 5:00 P.M. and I can inform the House that I have received notice  
of one matter for debate at 5:30 P.M. when a motion to adjourn will be  
deemed to be before the House, the notice given by the hon. the member for  
Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling). The subject matter is the Task Force on  
fluoride and the question will be directed to the hon. the Minister of  
Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook).

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I assure  
you, I will not be too much longer.

One of the other questions that I wanted  
to ask, and perhaps in the absence of the minister, somebody else can  
answer it - and I ask it out of, I must confess, a certain degree of  
naivete, I am not certain, myself, what the answer to it is - and that  
is whether or not the analogy I have heard used many times is correct in  
the sense of electrical power that the same kind of principle can apply  
as is used in pipeline - in other words, that you provide a right of way -  
and whether or not it is within the power of the Government of Canada to  
exercise - What is it? - 9210 or 9310 - perhaps my learned friend  
would know - but, in any event, a work for the good of Canada, and use  
the same kind of approach so that there would, indeed, be a gateway, as  
it were, or a right of way through the Province of Quebec. I have heard  
that argument put forward as being part of the answer. I have heard  
on the contrary that it is not a feasible alternative because, in fact,  
there is the necessity to link in with existing grids that the idea of a  
totally separate and distinct routing for Labrador power would not be  
practical.

MR. JAMIESON: I do not want to go into it any more deeply, nor, indeed, incidentally, would I want an answer out loud if it were against the strategy of Newfoundland in its negotiations, but I think it is important that we lay to rest once and for all just exactly what the options are that are open to us. Are they only to negotiate with Quebec? Is there something in the B.N.A. Act that can be employed? Is there this possibility of a corridor, if you wish, across Quebec provided the federal government were prepared to declare it as a work for the good of Canada? These are all, again, I emphasize, tremendously important issues, and I have not asked any of these questions in any sense to be argumentative. I think that this whole idea is extremely exciting. I believe that it would be downright criminal, given the state of the energy situation in the world today, if we were not to exploit and to develop every last drop of water - not just the Gull Island, not just the Muskrat, but whatever we possess - because it is undoubtedly a tremendously valuable, renewable resource. Therefore, I would hope that we can do it, but I do suggest to hon. members that there are these fundamental questions that I have raised, and I have raised them out of a deep concern that this project go ahead and that we get the maximum benefits out of it. And I hope that in that same spirit, either when the minister sums up or at some other time at his discretion or whatever, that we can have a total airing. And let me say also that it is not going to be enough just to have an airing of the issue here in this House, that in the spirit of the Premier's willingness, which I commend, to put the large issues out in front of the people of Newfoundland, these various alternatives to which I have referred are so important, they are of such basic importance to our Newfoundland people, not just in terms of cost when we hear about 40 mil and 41 mil power, but also in terms of the whole lifestyle question that was asked so often in the Throne Speech about where we go from here - they are so important in that regard that they deserve a total discussion by the people of this Province, perhaps through a commission, perhaps through a series of public meetings, but in any event, and bearing in mind the position of my two



MR. S. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A point of order, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Did I understand the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to challenge Your Honour's recognition of the Minister of Finance?

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order.

MR. STAGG: I withdraw it now.

MR. NEARY: Okay, that is fine.

MR. SPEAKER: It is withdrawn.  
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying there was some suggestion that this debate end rather hurriedly and I am glad it did not because I think that this is a matter of such importance that if hon. members have a wish to speak to it they should do so. And the fact that it has gone on perhaps for a day longer than originally planned and as necessary really, I think nevertheless there was something to be gained from it.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to respond very directly in any way to the Leader of the Opposition. I enjoyed his remarks and, I suppose, in some respects one can say he is a hard act to follow. But I would just like to make one little point here before getting into the substance of my remarks. I did find it a little ironic, really, if I understood the hon. the Leader of the Opposition correctly, when he said that it passed strange that the previous P.C. administration in this Province should change its mind over a space of three months. I think I picked him up right there that there was some line of thought in the previous administration in one direction and three months later there appeared to be an entirely different line of thought. And this was held up to almost ridicule, shall we say. It seems to me, as a member of the Liberal Association in Ottawa which changed its mind, I think, within a matter of days if not hours after the 1975 election in regard to wage and price control, if our administration's activity is passing

DR. J. COLLINS: strange, I do not know what you would call that. So I just mention that to say that I did not really think that that point had much validity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I understand it right there is support on both sides of the House for this bill. I would suspect that there is unanimous support. There has been a lot of discussion naturally, a lot of the discussion was of matters, if I might put it this way, of waters under the bridge or over the dam however one would want to put it and really, a lot of that discussion was not very apropos and I do not intend to get into it to any great degree. I hope I do not offend in that regard. I might say though, again reverting back to the Leader of the Opposition's remarks, I think he did say that he agreed with all the comments of his colleagues in regard to points that they did bring up in the past and I was sorry to hear that because as I will mention a little bit later on, some of those comments, I do not think, should be ones that we would give approbation to.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just before making really just two points of importance that I wanted to make, I would just like to touch on a few of the lesser issues. One is that some concerns ~~that~~ have been expressed that relate to the people in Labrador. One of the concerns was, what would be the environmental impact of the proposed development on the Lower Churchill? I think it is well to point out that there will be fairly minor environmental impact. This development, whether it is on the Muskrat or on the Gull Island, this is really a run of the river generation development. In other words, there will be very little if any flooding. I understand the geography or the topography of an area is such that the waters run in a deep ravine and the damming that will be necessary will certainly raise the level of the waters there but there will be minimal, really just riverbank, involvement in terms of flooding.

DR. J. COLLINS:

And although there will be some loss of, say, timber and possibly even some impact on trapping and so on and so forth, it is really of a quite minor degree in regard to what one normally thinks of in hydro electric generation where large areas of the country are flooded and essentially rendered unusable.

Another point that came up in terms of Labrador concerns was over native land rights. This is a very large issue that I think one can only make a very brief comment on, and the only comment I would make here is that we in this Province have never really gotten into

Dr. Collins: the issue of native land rights to any great degree because we have always considered the inhabitants of this Province, be they on the Island or be they in Labrador, that they were Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, they were not divided racially. We are a province, we were a country, we are now a province and the citizens of this Island and of the Mainland portion of this Province are citizens of this Province. We are not racially distinct species in terms of our political arrangements, and I would hope that that will never change. And that if there are rights to be adjusted for groups of our people that we will adjust these on the basis of equity and need and these sorts of things, we will never adjust them on the basis of race.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like just to move on to what I - really I made a little note here on red herrings. The first red herring is the BRINCO approach over the Lower Churchill. I think it was stated, if I remember correctly, that a mistake was made when BRINCO was not allowed to develop the Lower Churchill, and the implication was that they would do it with undoubted benefit to this Province. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only regard that, really, as being very facile and rather misleading. BRINCO did bring in a very great development in Labrador. They did not bring it in in such a fashion that the main benefit went to this Province.

Despite any arguments one might put up as to timing and so on and so forth, the fact of the matter is that the development they brought in was not brought in in such a way that this Province got its main benefit from it. And the understanding I have and I have absolutely no reason to doubt, or my understanding is incorrect, the understanding I have is that their proposal for the Lower Churchill was to bring in a development that was very similar, if not identical, to the arrangements they had already brought in on the Upper Churchill. So I think that is a total red herring and we should discard it and forget all about it.

Dr. Collins: The other red herring I think that was brought in was this question of the low head generation of electricity. In the context that we are talking about here, this is totally untried. The information we do have, it is outlandishly expensive, and it is absolutely ridiculous to try to cloud up this major issue that all Newfoundland citizens should be vitally interested in by bringing in obscurities like that. I think this is a red herring that we can dispose of immediately.

Another aspect of things that I think, really, is a red herring too, although I will only say this very briefly, and that is the Leader of the Opposition said "That he had no confidence in this side of the House, this government, the P.C. Government in handling such a big issue as the development of Labrador hydro electric power". Well, you know, I have absolutely no quarrel with his thought on the matter. But I just say it is quite irrelevant. We are not interested, strictly speaking, in whether he has confidence or not, as long as the public have confidence in us this is all that we need and we have no reason to suspect that they have not given us their full confidence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I really now want to get on to just the two points that I think are of some importance over this matter, there are many points, but the two points that struck me as being of considerable importance. The first point, really, is - and I have difficulty in putting it in any other term - the point that I am concerned about is what I might phrase the threat of separation, the threat of Labrador separation. That is maybe putting things a little a little strongly. But it has come through - I have been in this House now for approximately four and a bit years, and this attitude has come through so many times, and it has been so persistent that I do not think it is too strong to say that there has been a stated or certainly an implied threat of separation brought forward



Dr. Collins: time and time again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may be partisan here, and I do not hesitate to be partisan on this point, we have had in this House, since I have been here, we have had six hon. members from Labrador, we had the hon. Joseph Rousseau here, we had the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) who is still with us, we the present member for Menihok (Mr. Walsh), we have also had three hon. members from Labrador on the other side. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is to be noted that only two members have brought up what I think was clearly stated as a threat to separation, and I regret to say that they were not from this side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: They were totally from the other side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the threat of separation I take very seriously.

DR. COLLINS: I do not say that it is -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

DR. COLLINS: There has been a stated threat, and I would say that this is an effective way of operating, and we can only look to Quebec and see how effective it is if one wants to get benefits from a central organization, and in the case of Quebec it is a central government, in the case of Newfoundland it would be the government here on the Island part of the Province. That is an effective way of achieving an end. I have absolutely no quarrel with that approach. However, Mr. Speaker, I say it is a very undesirable tactic. There will be short-term benefits from such a threat but I would say, Mr. Speaker, with all the sincerity that I can muster that that is a very destructive way of going about things, destructive, dangerous to the fabric of this Province, and I would like all hon. members on both sides of the House to foreswear any thought of separation of any part of this Province from the rest of the Province in order to gain short-term benefits. I think that this should be foresworn utterly. Mr. Speaker, it is quite an inconsistent attitude to take in the same breath saying that the other parts of this Province must give more benefits, must put more effort into the development in the Labrador part of the Province. I think it is quite inconsistent to demand that things be brought in there and, at the same time, to make the point that we are not certain we want to stay with you. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it quite clear that I do not believe for one minute -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

DR. COLLINS: - I do not believe for one single minute that the general population in Labrador think this way. I think that this is a move that certain members are making, short-sightedly, I do not really think they have thought this through and thought how serious the implications. I think they are looking for

DR. COLLINS: short-term benefits there, and I would say they are misguided in that, and I would hope that they would not persist in this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

DR. COLLINS: This is where I mentioned earlier on when I said that I was a bit disappointed when the Leader of the Opposition said that he supported the remarks made by his colleagues. I would hope that he had forgotten that those sorts of remarks were made, and that he himself, and I am sure he believes this, I am sure that he is on the side that I am on on this, I am sure that he does not for one minute support that there should be any threat of separation in order to gain short-term regional benefits for any part of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the last point I would like to make would be to refer to the attempt that was made to develop the Lower Churchill initially. Now, there was an attempt a number of years ago. The attempt was not successful, it failed, I think there is no gainsaying that, but, Mr. Speaker, I think it was a very good try and I do not think it was due to lack of planning. The amount of planning that went into that attempt was enormous. One has only to go back to the documents that had been accumulated during that time and which were summarized in a very extensive briefing by the member who is presently the hon. Minister of Finance for Canada. The briefing that he compiled and that he presented in this House at that time was a masterful, very full, very detailed and showed that there had been enormous planning and enormous foresight went into the planning.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the truth of the matter is that there changes in the terms of trade, if I may put it that way. Inflation at that time really take over, and I will say this for the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he pointed this out, that this cost did escalate and it was not due to poor planning, it was due to what had happened in the economy. The other thing regrettably that happened, Mr. Speaker, is that there was an expectation that there would have been more support from the federal government. The federal government did offer a certain amount of support, reasonably generous support, but considering the needs in this part of the country and their espoused interest in regional disparity, one could have expected that the support would be far in advance of what they gave us. There was really a lack of sufficient federal support. Now, the Leader of the Opposition said that marketing was the problem. Well, I agree with him, and I think the lack of federal support was to assist us in marketing. We wanted them to help us to market our power; they had the power to do so; and, Mr. Speaker, they chickened out - that is the only one where - they chickened out in the face of political implications in the Province of Quebec, and this is where that attempt failed, it failed because the terms of trade went against the project and because federal support, reasonably generous though

DR. J. COLLINS: it was, was not sufficient to fit the case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a lesson, I think, to be drawn from that first attempt and the hon. Leader of the Opposition himself drew it and I was glad to see this and it is one that we have to be very realistic in this Province. It has been said a number of times that we have a resource and so on and so forth and that is all that is in the equation, that we should get great benefits from that resource and to the extent that is possible I think that is true. But we have to be very realistic, Mr. Speaker. A resource is no good unless it is developed, and development costs money, so that those who will invest in this Province's resources deserve a return, they deserve a good return, they deserve a just return and that it is quite unrealistic, and this has been stated many times in this House, that no one should get benefits from our resources but ourselves. Mr. Speaker, I would love to see that but that is not realistic. We have to make sure that people who come to this Province to invest in this Province on our terms, that they would invest where and in the manner that we set but, nevertheless, when they do come we must allow them to have a fair return on their investment.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I want to make and I think it is a good one, the Leader of the Opposition made. He did say, 'What are we going to do with this power if we do develop it?'; and this is certainly a matter we have to turn our minds to and I would only say to him that we are turning our minds to it daily. He mentioned exports. I am not afraid of the word 'exports' in terms of power. I would just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the way the Province of Quebec has gone and despite what I have said about Quebec, I think Quebec has done many things that we can take lessons from. The Province of Quebec developed at an

DR. J. COLLINS: enormous expense, I just forget the cost now but it was in the many billions and billions of dollars. I would say many more billions of dollars in relation to per capita population than the Lower Churchill will cost this Province in terms of billions per capita population. But anyway, whatever the figure is they undertook that development without assured markets except the market of export. They knew that once they developed it, once the power was there they could get rid of it on terms that were beneficial to them but nevertheless were so short-termed that they could withdraw it, as they needed it, into their own Province. And I would say that we should certainly search diligently for our own long-term users of such power but that if that they are not immediately on the horizon they should not stand in the way of our attempting this development because we know that on a short-term basis, given good will all around, that we will have to work to bring to fruition both with Quebec and with the Federal Government, given that good will we will be able to achieve short-term exports, if such they be, of any power until we can develop the necessary industries to take up the slack and be of long-term benefit to this Province. I do not think we should really look on that as a sell-out, as long as it is on those terms, that the return we get from the exports are very beneficial and as long as they are on terms that we will be able to cut off the exports so that we can use the power ourselves as we develop the appropriate means to do so.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: I will defer to the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) go back and forth.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. the member for Burgeo -  
Bay d'Espoir was not on his feet.

The hon. member for Burgeo -  
Bay d' Espoir.

MR. R. SIMMONS: No, I do not take my right to  
speak here from the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) I take  
it on a long established tradition, Mr. Speaker, that we alternate  
from one side of the House to the other.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to speak. It is a  
courtesy in this House that if one side speaks the other side  
speaks. That is the courtesy I was giving. If the hon. member  
wishes to insult me as a result of my beneficence well, that is  
typical of him.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d' Espoir.  
There was no hon. member on his feet except the hon. member  
for Stephenville so that is why I recognized him.

MR. R. SIMMONS: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. Thank you  
Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to respond for a moment  
to the quite unprecedented remarks from the member for St. John's  
South, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). I really thought  
I would never hear what was said coming from the lips of an  
intelligent man such as that gentleman is. It is shameful, absolutely  
shameful and I am sure he was misstating himself or we misheard  
him. There was something amiss in what he said because I really  
cannot, Mr. Speaker, fathom

Mr. Simmons: his motivation for saying, if he really means what he said today. He insulted every person whoever trod foot in Labrador.

MR. HISCOCK: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: It was a slap in the face to every person who lives in Labrador.

MR. HISCOCK: How about the minister there?

MR. SIMMONS: To suggest that somehow they are all involved down there in some kind of collective blackmail, to suggest that together they ganged up -

MR. HISCOCK: Terrible!

MR. SIMMONS: - and said, they got together in a secret little meeting of 35,000 and said, Now, fellows, let us talk separation so we can get the government over a barrel.

MR. HISCOCK: Terrible!

MR. SIMMONS: What an insult. What a terrible insult to the people of Labrador. And I want in time to hear where the minister for Goose Bay, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) stands on this issue. I invite him first -

MR. ROBERTS: Where is the member gone?

MR. SIMMONS: I invite him first -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, let us see if the member for Naskaupi will endorse it.

MR. SIMMONS: I invite him first to check the tapes, because I want to do it just to make sure that I heard the minister correctly, because if I heard him right, what he said was absolutely astounding, and a personal slap in the face to the member for Naskaupi, a personal slap in the face. A terrible slap in the face, Mr. Speaker. Shameful! Absolutely shameful. And I hope the Premier also will check the tapes because when he hears what that minister said -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



MR. SIMMONS: - he will realize , as I realized, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon that the minister knows just as much about Labrador as he knows about finance.

MR. ROBERTS: Has he ever been to Labrador?

MR. SIMMONS: He knows just as much about Labrador, Mr. Speaker, as he knows about finance.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has never been there.

MR. SIMMONS: One of my colleagues suggested that he has not been there. I rushed to his defence, I believe, he played hockey in Labrador City.

MR. ROBERTS: Badly no doubt.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, he is an authority on Labrador, as he demonstrated this afternoon. What a head-in-the-sand approach, Mr. Speaker. What a head-in-the-sand approach. Some day he should go out beyond the overpass, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Some day he should go out beyond the overpass. He should really do that, Mr. Speaker. Because after what he said today about Labrador, I shudder for tomorrow because tomorrow he might give us another speech on what the motivations of people are out beyond the Isthmus of Avalon. Perhaps he has got some pet theories on that subject too. They cannot be any more devastating, any more degrading, any more insulting than what he had to say about Labradorians today.

And I ask my colleagues for Eagle River and Torngat to get the Hansards -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: - and to send them back to Labrador and ask the people in Labrador what they think about the insulting remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: To suggest that a whole group of people, 25,000, 35,000 people somehow banded together and contrive to seek short-term political advantage, and to do so using separation talk as the lever. What a shameful cock-eyed scheme, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS: Only a - I was going to say, only a warped mind, but I know the minister to be different than that, but only a warped mind could dream that one up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Shameful, absolutely shameful, Mr. Speaker. I have never, never in my experience in this House seen so many people so thoroughly insulted by a member of this House, so thoroughly, thoroughly insulted. I cannot put it, Mr. Speaker, in strong enough terms. And I would hope the minister on reflection tonight will see fit to make a more moderate statement tomorrow and to disassociate himself from his remarks of the day, to say that I was wrong, I was wrong to insult the people of Labrador in that particular way.

MR. HISCOCK: Terrible!

MR. SIMMONS: I just cannot find the language, Mr. Speaker, strong enough to -

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

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): On a point of order, the hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in the course of debate there are misinterpretations made, but I do not think that is the case here. I think the hon. member is deliberately twisting the remarks that I made during my speech -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

DR. COLLINS: - and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member be asked to quote accurately the substance of my remarks or to move to another topic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): On the point of order, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance may not intend to be insulting, but he is being deliberately insulting, whether he realizes it or not. To begin with I do not think he has been misinterpreted, I think he is being accurately interpreted. In any event, that is not a point of order. If he feels he has a point of privilege let him bring it up. But I say, Sir, that the gentleman for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is accurately reporting exactly what the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) said. The Minister of Finance may well not have realized what he said. I am quite prepared to accept that explanation. But, Sir, there has been no point of order brought before the Chair. There has not even been a point of privilege. I do not think there is a basis for one, but if there is any complaint by the hon. Minister of Finance it ought to be in the form of a question of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): On the point of order, I rule that it is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMMONS: It being 5:30 I adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

It being 5:30, a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

A matter for debate raised by the hon. the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) relevant to the Task Force on Fluoride.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The matter that I asked to have brought back is the matter of the report on fluoride. The question was first asked of the Minister of Health and he replied that essentially it was in two other departments, and then from one of the departments we got a long list but specifically have still not had an answer to the question. I must really go back to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), who says that he still has some very serious doubts about whether or not the ERCO plant is operating safely.

This report brought in a number of recommendations. One of the recommendations was number twenty-nine, that recommended that the public should be advised that wild berries gathered within four miles North and Northeast of the ERCO plant may be contaminated. And the recommendation was that the public be advised. That question was not answered by the Minister of Health. He referred it to the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment and that answer did not come back when they provided all the other answers. Now, this is a very serious problem.

Another item in the recommendations refers to an item number thirteen, three very specific recommendations, and the general answer comes back saying environmental considerations are monitored regularly, but it does not carry out the specific recommendations in recommendation thirteen.

Recommendation number twenty-seven requires specifically that two sampling stations be set up, and again,

MR. STIRLING: it refers to the same general thing, item number thirteen applies. So in all those areas I think that the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) who originally brought up this question and obviously, got no response at all from the government side - I think he has some very real points. His points are all still not satisfied, still not answered, and the general public has not been advised. The general public has not been warned that the berries in that area - and within four miles, which is quite a distance from the plant - may be contaminated. And at this stage we still have not seen from the government, either the Department of Health or the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment, a satisfactory public programme to warn people about that business of picking berries in that area.

I would invite the minister to clear up that still unresolved problem.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear! Well said.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make a Ministerial Statement on this matter this morning, but when I came and found that this matter was going to be on the Late Show, then I did not make it. I would like to read it now, because I think it gives the hon. member all the answers that he has requested.

"The Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment has been involved with ERCO in attempting to rectify the environmental problems in Long Harbour since 1973. Over the period, a number of processed modifications have been made to reduce ERCO's impact on both air and water quality.

The most recent event which took place in May to June of this year, was a major redesign and construction of waste air handling system of ERCO's kiln system. The modifications costing about \$1.25 million were undertaken to insure that air flow within the kiln system was properly directed so that waste gases would be treated for removal of fluoride prior to discharge. We are confident that with the

MRS. NEWHOOK: redesigned system, ERCO will be capable of operating the plant in compliance with environmental standards, and we shall continue to closely watch the situation. Monitoring of local air quality has been carried out by Environment Division annually since 1974. These programs have shown that over the years ERCO's fluoride emission rates have been declining as plant modifications have been made. We are at present carrying out further air sampling. Although the program is continuing and results have not been reviewed in detail for this year, we are encouraged by the reductions which have been observed. Water testing has also been carried out, both by Environment Canada and the Environment Division. Fluoride levels in the area waters have consistently been below one part per million. This is the level to which fluoride may be added to drinking water for prevention of dental cavities. At the request of the provincial government, a study of Long Harbour area local, edible berries was carried out by the Canadian Forestry Service. This survey concluded that normal consumption of local fruit did not pose a significant health risk. In its review of the Long Harbour situation, the Canadian Public Health Association confirmed that such fruit could be consumed without undue hazard. Fluoride levels can be further reduced by washing locally grown produce prior to consumption. It should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that the berry sampling to which I refer was carried out in 1974 when ERCO's emission rate was at much higher levels than at present and also, Mr. Speaker, up to the present time whenever an inquiry has been made, our department has advised that the berries be washed, even though we are reasonably sure that there are no risks to the consumer as indicated by the Task Force report. With regard to the monitors listed in that Task report, I would like to say that at the present time our department has two monitoring stations at Long Harbour, that ERCO has three monitoring stations there, and with regard to the installation

August 9, 1979

Tape No. 695

GH-2

MRS. NEWHOOK: of the two extra air monitors our department is at present corresponding with ERCO and a meeting has been set for sometime later this month.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The motion is that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising do now adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, at 10:00 a.m.