

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I would like to address a question in the absence of the Premier - I would have discussed some other matters under those circumstances, but these are none the less important and I am sure the Premier has very good reason for not being here - I would like to ask a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett). In view of the concerns of all members about the 1980 road construction programme - we talked a few days ago about those projects which are exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Province plus those that may be subject to a DREE agreement - may I ask initially when the minister might be in a position to indicate to the House and to the public what the purely provincial roads programme for 1980 is going to be?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that information is not usually available until the estimates of the department are approved. I think last year we gave - did we give a list last year of the roads that were to be done?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. C. BRETT: What was being done actually. Well, the information would not be available until the estimates were passed in the House.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I can understand why it would be

MR. D. JAMIESON: necessary to ensure that this non-House had passed the necessary funds, but surely it is not unusual for the government to indicate in advance what its intentions are if and when the necessary funds are put in place. Would the minister therefore consider that kind of declaration? I am sure that within his department at the moment there must be a fairly comprehensive and pretty concise idea of what is likely to be done. Now, there may be some more work necessary departmentally or within the provincial government itself, but would he consider indicating what the projects are going to be, provided and assuming that the House passes the estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: (Sutt) The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, myself along with the staff, we, and the people that came before me, I suppose, we produce a list of the roads in the Province that need upgrading and paving. This goes to the Cabinet, but again. -

MR. S. WEARY: It goes to Priorities first.

MR. C. BRETT: Okay, it goes through the channels, but again

MR. BRETT: usually the amount that we request is probably five times as much as the Budget can stand, so it is very difficult to say what roads will be done until we know the amount of money. We will probably ask for 100 miles and it boils down to our getting fifty, for example. So it is really difficult to give that information until we know exactly what money is available.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I am well aware of the difficulties. I am surprised, however, that they do not apply when it comes to making references to roads which are going to be built if DPEE funds are available. Now I would like to ask the hon. member what is the status of the negotiations with the federal government at Ottawa with regard to a continuation of the roads agreement that has been in place and modified over a number of years? Can he give the House any indication as to (a) when it is likely that a new agreement will, in his judgement, be negotiated and (b) when will the details of it be known?

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

MR. BRETT: As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the Province has not approached Ottawa at this stage with the shopping list either for DPEE or the Trans-Canada Highway. To the best of my knowledge it has not. We are still working on a list of roads that we would like to see done, but I am not absolutely certain when the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Premier, when he will be in a position to present that list. But I understand at this stage of the game it has not been presented.

MR. JAMIESON: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, and then I will recognize the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman's statement. Given the fact that we have, and it is a matter of record, seen public statements by various spokesmen for the government indicating the intentions of the government to get DPEE funds

MR. JAMIESON: or to seek DPEE funds for very specific work and also, of course, we are now at the end of the Trans-Canada Highway agreement, I ask the minister, and I wish there was more time, but since it is a final supplementary, is he confident that since this is now the month of December and the negotiating process has not started, is he confident that the negotiations, even if there is amicability on all sides, which I suggest is a lot to expect, that he can get, indeed, federal funds into road building in time for the 1980 season?

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Well, I would hope that we can, Mr. Speaker, but assuming that we do not it does not mean that there will not be any work next year because we still have \$80 million left in our TCH agreement.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. BRETT: I realize that. I am not sure of the exact amount but there is \$18 to \$20 million left in the DREE agreement. So whether or not a new TCH agreement is reached or whether or not a new DPEE agreement is reached there will still be a significant amount of work done with federal funds next year.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

A supplementary question with regard to the road agreement and DREE. Does the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) know that the road in the Strait of Belle Isle from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay is included under the new DREE agreement? And also, could he inform this House what the plans are in regard to the provincial roads agreement? Will building programmes take place on the Labrador coast next year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I have already said that the list is not completed. All I can say is that the road from Blanc Sablon to Red Bay has very high priority as far as this government is concerned. In fact, it is almost a must that DREE get involved because that is a very, very expensive job and as I have said publicly on a number of occasions, that it is a very bad road. If DREE does not get involved, then obviously the Province is going to have to do it. That would be most unfortunate because it would take much, much longer.

The second part of your question was roads on the coast. We have some settlements in mind. I travelled the coast last year actually right on up to Nain, and I was once concerned with the Southern part of Labrador since that is where our responsibilities lie, and there were several communities where I would like to go in and spend funds to build some roads and upgrade some roads that are there but again I have not reached a definite decision as to exactly what communities will be done next year.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Has the Minister of Transportation and Communications taken into account advising the DREE agreement that the road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay be extended to Mary's Harbour?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: I have to take that as notice. I am not sure.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (BUTT) The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier. I would like to ask the Premier the official position of his government vis-a-vis the savage rate increase announced by the Government of Canada on the East coast ferries?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I think the position of the Government of Newfoundland on that matter has been articulated on a number of occasions, by the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Fower) in the last number of days, and one of which we are extremely concerned and we will continue to argue forcibly in every forum we can that this is unnecessary at this time because we think it not only will impinge upon our ongoing, improving tourist industry but on various other matters of concern to us as it relates to traffic, freight and passenger, that is ongoing across there on a regular basis.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Is the hon. Premier aware - and I presume, as the hon. gentleman just answered my question, that is the official position of the Province; the one expounded on radio, I believe, or television last night where the minister stated he sent a telex to Ottawa but he did not expect to get any reaction to his telex, is that the official reaction of the government? If the Premier has declared war on Ottawa, should he not go a step further and kick the stuffings out of them over this the same as the government did when the Liberals were the government up in Ottawa, when my friend kept the lid, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), kept the lid on? Should the government now not go a step further in this declaration of war on Ottawa?

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: The Question Period, Mr. Speaker, is for the purpose of asking questions, not for the purpose of making speeches or hurling charges and innuendo and trying to make cheap political points.

MR. NEARY: My question to the Premier, is that sufficient -

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, I would ask the hon. gentleman to please put the question.

MR. NEARY: Well, what I am asking the Premier, is it sufficient just to send a telex to Ottawa pointing out the effect on the tourist industry? Or should the government not kick the stuffings out of Ottawa for imposing another hardship on consumers in this Province by driving up the cost of living because these increase will apply in the main to tractor trailers coming across the Gulf on the CN ferries?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we try to have our opposition on any issue done in a rational way. Now the telex was sent yesterday, and if in fact there is no response from the Government of Canada to that telex, we will take other initiatives, and be strong and forceful and aggressive in our opposition to this latest move on increasing these rates. No question. But we are not going to do it on the heels of a telex; we are going to wait and give due notice in the same way that we have done on most things in our dealings with the federal government over the last number of months. As one witness, for example, as we talked about yesterday on the whole question of the fishery, we have been negotiating and communicating both by letter and otherwise on that very vital issue and it was only after a lot of communication back and forth that we took the position we did.



PREMIER PECKFORD: As it relates to this one, the same kind of principle will apply, and that is we will begin our opposition in a responsible and reasonable way and if indeed a response unfavourable to us comes back then we will respond again even more aggressively. If there is no response, well, then we will, of course, through the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, and the Ministry of Tourism, and through my own office, take additional action to try to ensure that this kind of increase is not passed along.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what the alternatives are and if the hon. gentleman would be kind enough, seeing now that he just threw something new in there by saying that negotiations have been ongoing for some time, would the hon. the Premier care to table the correspondence, and table the sweetheart telex that was sent by his Minister of Tourism to Ottawa - a little rap on the knuckles - would the hon. gentleman table all the correspondence in connection with any negotiations that may have been going on with Ottawa in connection with the ten per cent increase on the East Coast ferries? That is only fair, to let the House have the information and the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, obviously as the member for LaPoile did not understand the response to my last question. I said the same kind of principles in talking to the federal government would now apply as it relates to this issue as it applied to the cod issue. There have not been ongoing negotiations with the federal government as it related to this rate increase at all.

MR. NEARY: You were not notified.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is the point. Now I bow to one of the ministers if they had previous notification and how long that notification -

MR. NEARY: There was no prior consultation?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I can answer the question without being interrupted by the hon. member for LaPoile?

MR. NEARY: Yes or no? Was there prior consultation?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

Allow the hon. the Premier to answer in silence.

MR. NEARY: He is sulking now, like a little baby.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, whether the Premier or his colleagues are precisely correct in saying that there have been negotiations on this particular rate increase, every

Mr. Jamieson: member of this House knows that it is almost a daily matter for negotiations between Ottawa and Newfoundland, and has been, I suppose, for the last thirty years or so.

My question to the Premier is in relation to the at least one, and maybe two communities that have been established with regard to transportation in Newfoundland, and I relate it to his statement in Bishop's Falls some weeks ago; does this announcement, which, I gather he says he was not familiar with or aware of ahead of time, mean that that group or the groups are not in fact discussing the impact of East Coast ferry rates as part of the total package? Did the Marine Division of CN, whatever it is called now, not in fact advise the government in advance?

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the Leader of the Opposition or the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) get the information. From the answers that I have given, I have indicated that we have opposed the present increase through the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Power). On the notification of the rate increase coming, I was going to bow to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) and the Minister of Tourism who could give additional information on this matter, which in no way, therefore, indicates that we were not informed or that we were informed but additional information was to be forthcoming from the respective ministries.

I have just been handed a letter - because I wanted the minister to reply because I knew that he had some information from the respective Ministry in Ottawa on this very matter, which the minister dealt with - and this is a letter from Mr. Mazankowski on the whole question of the fare increases for the Gulf.

MR. NEARY: What is the date?

PREMIER PECKFORD: On November 30, I guess, it was received here in the Province, or that is the date that is on it.

So, you know, there has been notification - I will bow to the ministers involved to give additional information - but here is a letter from Mr. Mazankowski dealing with the matter that I just had handed to me. The respective ministers can answer in

Premier Peckford: their own right.

MR. NEARY: Are you tabling that?

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I understand. My questions, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, are not argumentative, merely seeking information. Because it is important, I think, that what has really happened here, I find, is another demonstration of Canadian National just simply moving ahead on something when there are consultative processes in place. I am surprised that there was not, through the negotiations and the committees that have been set up, more advanced information and more opportunity for the Government of Newfoundland to continue to express its opposition.

If the Minister of Transport wishes to answer me, that is perfectly all right with me. But I want to ask him, is it in fact the case that either this Terra Transport, or whatever it is called, or East Coast Marine simply went ahead and just advised at the last moment, November 30, that this was being done, when in fact presumably officials of both governments had been meeting ever since those committees were set up several months ago? And it seems to me ridiculous that they should, in the midst of a plan for overall transportation in the Province,

MR. JAMIESON: suggest to the hon. minister, suddenly intrude this particular item without any regard for the consultative process.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I cannot be specific on the dates that we were in touch with Ottawa or the dates that they informed us that a rate increase would take place, but, obviously, we were advised, because on the 21st of September, I officially wrote Mr. Mazankowski strongly opposing the rate increase. Now I do not have the copy of the letter. Obviously, it is downstairs in my files, but we did oppose the rate increase on the 21st of September - that was official - and we got a reply from Mr. Mazankowski on November 30th.

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

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to put a question to the Premier, Sir, in connection with - the Sullivan Royal Commission recommended that a committee be set up representing the provincial government and the federal government, and I believe the Premier confirmed in this House some time ago that Mr. Ed O'Brien, the Director of Transportation, was the provincial representative on that committee. Would there not be consultation between CN or Terra Transport and this liaison committee on which the provincial government is represented? And if not, why was there not consultation with this Committee? Would the hon. gentleman tell us, apart from a couple of letters back and forth, if the provincial government representative reported to the government that CN was going to increase the rate by 10 per cent and thus increase the cost of living in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the specific answer to that question, with Mr. O'Brien in the consultative committee that has been set up with Terra Nova Transport and the others - CN and related transport federal/provincial meetings that have been going ahead

PREMIER PECKFORD:                    whether he was informed and then went ahead and did it. All I can say - and I do not think it is a minor matter, as the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) seems to think about it.

MR. NEARY:                            I think it is a major matter, that is why I brought it up. You think it is minor because you have not attacked the Government of Canada over it.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)                Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:                As soon as the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) was informed or had information relating to the increase, he immediately wrote the minister responsible opposing it in the strongest terms. So we are doing all that we can in the respective ministries to ensure that this increase does not take place. And that to me is the important issue here, whether or not the ministry has, in fact, opposed these increases when it came to their attention. And in obvious answers to questions given by the Minister of Transportation and Communications, we have aggressively opposed the application for increase, no question about that at all. Now, whether, in fact, the mechanics of this particular committee - that Mr. O'Brien was informed and the mechanics saw to it that the minister was informed, the fact of the matter is that as soon as the Minister of Transportation and Communications had knowledge of the increase, he

PREMIER PECKFORD: immediately opposed it on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, which has been our stated policy on this for a number of months.

MR. J. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Premier. It concerns the Fisheries Loan Board. As the Premier is aware, the bounties were cut off for boats in the twenty-five to thirty-five foot class unless there was, I believe, prior approval. Now, does the Premier intend to pay bounties on boats-or does the government intend to pay bounties on boats in the twenty-five to thirty-five foot class in those parts of the Province where the fisherman did not get notice that the regulations were to change on October 31st?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will take notice of that, Mr. Speaker, and may I say in taking notice that very shortly we intend to make a statement as it relates to the overall programmes of the Fisheries Loan Board in the next number of days.

MR. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, as a preliminary to the supplementary that on the West coast there were no newspaper reports, no notifications in the papers or in the electronic media, and this has been checked by the Fishermen's Association, and the notification to the inspector in the area, the fellow who goes around and measures the boats, who usually has contact with the fishermen, arrived on November 23rd. And would not the Premier agree that in those circumstances where neither the fisheries officials-or if the fisheries official in the area knew, he did not inform the fishermen and where there was no media those fishermen should receive the bounty, particularly those fishermen who had started their boats under the old programme and now are looking for the

MR. J. HODDER:                   bounty to buy engines and the wherewithal to get their boats ready for the Spring?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:           Number one, Mr. Speaker, I thought it had to do with boats below twenty-five feet - not twenty-five to thirty-five - so I make that distinction; that is my recollection, it is twenty-five and below. Secondly, to the hon. member's question, obviously it would seem from what the hon. member says that the fishermen so concerned have a very strong case, and I will take the matter and make sure it is discussed in the next twenty-four hours with people in the Department of Fisheries and if what the hon. member says is true and there are cases of that, well I am sure we will look upon them extremely sympathetically and take the necessary moves to ensure that they are not discriminated against because of lack of information due to the fact that information flow in certain parts of the Province might not be as good as in other parts of the Province.

MR. F. ROWE:                   Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. F. ROWE:                   Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier a question. It arises out of the answer he gave to the first question from my colleague. He said that he will be making an announcement shortly with regard to the Fisheries Loan Board. Now, about three and a half weeks ago the Premier promised the House that he would have a statement within two weeks with regard to the Fisheries Loan Board and that is over a week old now. Could the Premier indicate to the House exactly when he will be making a statement with respect to status of the Fisheries Loan Board?



MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I think the hon. the House Leader, the President of the Council, responded to questions on this matter yesterday.

MR. F. ROWE:

But he did not give any answers.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

As I indicated in my previous answer to the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), we are in the final stages of putting together a statement on the Fisheries Loan Board. The matter has been under review, under study by a special committee, internally within government, and that report is now in and Cabinet is now studying it. There is a Cabinet meeting tomorrow to further discuss it and hopefully within the next three or four days we will be able to make a fairly comprehensive statement as it relates to the ongoing activities of the Fisheries Loan Board. Whether that is Friday or Monday - it could stretch into Tuesday, just from an administrative point of view - is the kind of time parameters I am talking about. But I would think no later than Tuesday, and I am just saying Tuesday as the mere fact of giving myself enough time knowing what has to be done to get to that stage. Hopefully it might even be Friday, but I would not want to be bound to Friday because it might stretch into Monday. So between Friday and Tuesday seems like a reasonable period of time in which we will be able to do it and I regret that we are not able to do it before that time. It is just impossible given all the other things that we have had to do. And I appreciate the hon. member is still on his feet and wants to get up and speak and I am sure as soon as I am finished with this answer, Mr. Speaker, that he can get up again and ask another question. I thank him for standing and I think we should draw our bayonets, Mr. Speaker, and go at it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I regret, you know, that the Premier is treating this so lightly. I am asking the question not

MR. F. ROWE: to embarrass the hon. the Premier but in view of the fact that there are hundreds of fishermen out there wanting to know the answer to that particular question and I am disappointed that the Premier is treating it so lightly. A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEAPY: He cannot get his picture in the paper.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in view of the confrontation with Ottawa now and the state of the Fisheries Loan Board and, in fact, the state, I would say, of the Department of Fisheries, when does the Premier expect to be able to announce a full-time Minister of Fisheries, which is badly needed in this Province at the present time?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I was not being light with the question. I was being light with the stance of the hon. member, the physical stance as he had stood as I was speaking, so I was only making light of something that had nothing to do with the issue at hand to which the hon. member was addressing himself. That is number one. The whole question of when there will be a full-time Minister of Fisheries - my answer to that is the same as it was before; very, very shortly.

MR. F. ROWE: How short is very, very shortly?

PREMIER PECKFORD: A good question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan). Some weeks ago the minister initiated a feasibility study to ascertain the forest industry potential somewhere in an area between Gander and Bonavista. Maybe the minister can indicate the precise area in speaking to the question. My question is, I am wondering what set of circumstances prompted this study because my understanding

MR. LUSH: is that there are always ongoing studies in the Department of Forests with respect to forest potential, so I am just wondering whether there are any new sets of circumstances that prompted this study, whether it is related to the recent forest fire in the Gambo-Glovertown area, whether it is related to the Rayo Forestry mill there in Gambo? Just what circumstances prompted this study and when does the minister expect results?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I assume the hon. gentleman asking the question is referring to the announcement made approximately two weeks ago that the two levels of government had agreed upon carrying out a detailed feasibility study for two areas of the Province where there are existing wood supplies, where we feel that these wood supplies can be utilized and turned into an industry for the area to use the existing wood supplies. The tenders were called and a total of thirteen submissions received; these submissions are now being analyzed by the two departments concerned, Industrial Development and the Department of Forestry. We are hoping to be in a position to award a contract to have these studies carried out sometime over the next number of days and we will have the report to government by the Spring of 1980. And we are hoping that the study will result in sufficient evidence to warrant the attraction of industry to establish in either the Great Northern Peninsula or the area from Gambo to Bonavista, that general area where there are existing wood supplies which we feel should be utilized and turned into an industry in the area.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: I wonder if the minister could be more specific in terms of establishing industry. As we all know there are sawmill industries there now, and I referred specifically to the one in Gambo, the Rayo Forest Industries there, can the minister be more specific in what kind of industries he is hoping to be able to

MR. LUSH: establish as a result of these studies?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, as a result of successful negotiations between the company, Bowaters, and this administration, we were successful in arranging, under the existing forest management plans, to have the lands on the Great Northern Peninsula passed back to government from Bowaters, which means we now have a very adequate supply of timber land or forest land in that area which we feel can be utilized for a possibility of a thermo-mechanical pulp plant or a pulp mill or a waifer board plant or any kind of a plant that would manufacture maybe tissue paper or things of that nature, a manufacturing plant using the wood supply which was originally held by Bowaters and as a result negotiation has now been passed back to the Crown.

On the other peninsula, the Bonavista Peninsula, and the general Port Blandford, Clarendville, Gambo area, there are adequate wood supplies there which cannot be utilized by the existing small sawmill operators, or in fact by the larger sawmill operators, and we feel that this wood should be utilized. It is mostly over-mature and we want the wood to be utilized by means of some kind of industry, as I mentioned, along the lines of a thermo-mechanical pulp plant, a waifer board plant or a tissue manufacturing plant, something of that nature. And we are hoping that the results of the studies will show that and show the feasibility of attracting that kind of industry in the area.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I suddenly realized in asking my questions with regard to the increase in ferry rates that I had made a statement which I have no doubt that unless I say something now CN's public affairs and public relations people will be denying all over the place before tomorrow. I said that it was CN or Terra Transport that increased the rates. Obviously they will reply to that and say that in fact they have to have the authority of the Government of Canada to do so, and I know that to be the case. And I just wanted to make that clear so that I do not have to go on for the next two or three days saying that I had put the emphasis in the wrong place.

I would also, in conjunction with that, Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, I was not sure whether either the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) or the hon. the Premier had indicated whether they were going to table the correspondence in question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that is really, with the greatest respect, that is not a point of order; at the very best it is a point of explanation. And, you know, the explanation mark for my point is followed with a question mark, because it is not really a point of order.

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

MR. NEARY: Okay. You have to rule on that one first.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, this is merely a difference of opinion.

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

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): On a point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: In my cross-examination of the Premier and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) in connection with the 10 per cent increase on the East Coast ferries, the Minister of Transportation produced a letter and quoted from that letter, and my understanding of the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker, is that if you quote from a letter, even if you quote a date, if you refer to a letter then you have to table that letter in the House.

So I would ask Your Honour to direct the Minister of Transportation to table the correspondence.

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: There is no point of order. The hon. minister did not quote from any letter, number one. Number two, if there was to be a point of order, a point of order has to be taken up immediately. You cannot take points of orders about what happened five minutes ago, you know, five hours ago, five days ago, five years ago. For that matter, you will get complete disruption of the House. And number two, if the hon. gentleman you know, the hon. gentleman is in a very testy mood today. This is the Question Period which has been brought in by this government for the benefit of the Opposition and he would be well-advised to use it as such.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To the point of order. The gentleman does not have a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Hon. members, I wish to welcome to the galleries this afternoon, thirty young people from across Canada who are in St. John's performing volunteer work at Pippy Park and the Rotary Park under St. John's project Katimavik. The co-ordinator is Mr. Jim Winter and the group leader is Mr. Eric Austin. I am sure all hon. members join with me in welcoming this group to our House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. STEWART:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to present a petition on behalf of 602 residents of Harbour Breton. Before I read the prayer of the petition, I would like to say that I strongly support the petition. I have visited the Anglican school at Harbour Breton and the conditions under which the students have to study are definitely not adequate for this day and age. Just to give you a few examples, both the primary, elementary and high school are under one roof; there are no adequate dressing rooms for either wing; inadequate gymnasium - really, it amounts to one gymnasium for approximately 500 students; there is no library in either school - the present library is used as a classroom; no room for the public health nurse to see students; there are no showers for students using the gymnasium; no extra classroom space; no resource centre. The present classrooms are too small. To give you an example, we have forty-five students in a classroom 23' X 23'. We have nineteen students in the library, which is 21' X 16', and we have seventeen students in a resource room, which is 23' X 16'. The present lab also must be used as a part-time classroom and, really, the list goes on and on.

The prayer of the petition reads as follows: "To the hon. House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador, the petition of the undersigned citizens of the town of Harbour Breton humbly sayeth that the present school is inadequate for the provision of an acceptable standard of education for the youth of the integrated school

MR. STEWART: system of Harbour Breton; that there is a lack of classroom space to accommodate present and future enrolment. Library, resource room and laboratory facilities are presently used for classroom space; that the gymnasium facilities are inadequate. At present, two schools, King Academy, primary, elementary and high schools, total enrolment of 450 students, are using an auditorium for gym purposes; that there are, under the present system, no dressing rooms, shower facilities and storage space; that the acute lack of space makes it impossible to offer any more than the core subjects, areas such as math, language, science and social studies. The students cannot presently hope to get into other areas such as home economics and industrial arts, etc.; that since Harbour Breton is a growing community, the present school cannot hope to meet the future needs of an increasing population; that projected enrolment for the next four years show a startling increase in the high school; that in light of the aforementioned circumstances, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador take immediate action to alleviate the problem, namely, that a new high school facility be provided for the integrated high school students of Harbour Breton."

I would like for this petition to be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department it concerns.



MR. SPEAKER: (GUTT)

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support this petition from, I believe it was as the hon. member said, 600 people who signed a petition for a new school in Harbour Breton. I noted when he spoke that he said that the school had an improper gym, they had no librarians, no proper washroom facilities etcetera. Mr. Speaker, this graphically describes the condition which the DEC and the MEC are in in this Province at the present time. Recently, the government, in trying to alleviate this situation, granted \$12 million to the DEC which will be split up amongst these various committees to try and alleviate this. But this \$12 million - I have talked to several superintendents of school boards now and they will tell me that they will not even be able to meet their interest rates this year and that there will be no new school construction in this Province this year. And when we see a school in Harbour Breton of this nature and in this condition and we realize that there is just no money in the Province for new school construction and we realize that school boards are up their ears in debt and do not know if they can meet their day to day commitments as far as interest is concerned, we start to wonder, Mr. Speaker, if really the rural areas of this Province are getting the same type of education as we find in the urban areas of the Province.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, on top of all this that those areas of the Province which received DREE grants which were 90 per cent federal and 10 per cent provincial, that now the provincial Department of Education are now asking that those school boards, and many of them - the ones that I am familiar with are the intergrated school boards which are in quite a difficult financial position, have now been asked to pay some of the provincial portion of the DREE grant.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, this again, as well points out the problems which we face as far as bringing in the Grade XII programme is concerned. Here is a school - the minister says that she is going ahead with Grade XII one year or the next but here we see an example of a school which is an inadequate school and an inadequate school according to the member, supported by the member there, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the only school across the Province. And I understand that the property committee has met once now to decide what kind of upgrading we are going to have to bring in new programmes in our school, and I believe it was the day before yesterday. I do not know if they have got a report to the minister yet but I would like to hear the minister tell us how the money will be made available to provide the proper educational facilities in Harbour Breton and across this Province and at the same time, how we are going to be able to bring in a new programme which is going to need even more expanded school facilities. So I certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that when I sit down the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) will support this petition.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the petition presented so ably by the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) on behalf of the 602 residents of Harbour Breton who signed it seeking a new high school in that community. I will be very happy to bring this request to the attention of the Integrated Education Committee which, as all hon. members know, under our constitution has the responsibility of managing government authorizations for proceeding with school construction and for setting priorities for a school building. The announcement which I made a couple of weeks of government's special action this year to enable the Denominational Education Committee to proceed with \$12 million worth of school construction is now being acted on by the church committees. There is no reason to think that this is not going to result in the action contemplated, namely, over the next couple of years, the construction of \$12 million worth of new buildings. The question of how that new special authorization

December 5, 1979

Tape No. 1624

DW - 3

MS. VERGE: is managed and which buildings will be funded out of that rests entirely with the church committees and the question of whether Harbour Breton benefits from it rests with the Intergrated Education Committee.

4

MS. L. VERGÉ: I will be very happy to discuss this with the Intergrated Education Committee with whom, I might add, the department has a good rapport. As to the other issues raised by the hon. member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I think the more appropriate time to deal with them would be in Question Period so I will not comment on them now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Today being Wednesday, Private Members' Day, I now call Motion 3, moved by the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. L. Woodrow).

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say straight away that we are going to support this resolution. We are going to support it, Mr. Speaker, because it is a kind of a motherhood message that is conveyed in this resolution. The hon. gentleman who introduced this private members' resolution certainly was not very persuasive, did not convince us that the government has done enough in the way of energy conservation. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we would have been very happy if we had heard the hon. gentleman, who seems to be so concerned about energy costs, if the hon. gentleman would have dealt with the matter that was raised by the Newfoundland Light and Power Company some time ago when they said, "It does not make any difference how much wood Newfoundlanders burn, it does not make any difference how much energy how much electricity they save, we are going to sock it to them anyway. We will increase the minimum -

MR. L. BARRY: Who said it?

MR. S. NEARY: Who said it! The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) is over there wanting to know who said it. It was a subject of controversy in this Province on the open line programmes for about two weeks plus the fact that it was in the newspaper, on radio, I had a go at it myself and the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy who is responsible for the high

MR. S. NEARY: electricity rates in this Province, wants to know, who said it. The Light and Power Company said it, the company that -

MR. L. BARRY: Government did not.

MR. S. NEARY: - the company - it is up to the government to do something about it. It is -

MR. BARRY: We are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nationalize them.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Light and Power Company, which is owned in the main by mainlanders, insulted the people of this Province by saying, "You can do what you like to conserve energy," and that is what this resolution is all about, "you can do what you like, you can go out and you can change over to a wood and oil furnace or you can change over to coal" -

MR. BARRY: Agree with you, do not belabour it.

MR. S. NEARY: I am belabouring it, not for the hon. Minister's sake who did not even know that the Light and Power had made such an nonsensical and foolish statement, but there are other people, there are other people who may not know, who may not know the background and, therefore, I have to spell it out in a little more detail. The Light and Power Company said that it did not make any difference, that, if necessary, they would increase the minimum rates, the minimum charges to consumers of electricity in this Province. They were going to get their pound of flesh anyway, that is what they said, and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the government did not lift a finger to do anything about it. They did nothing about it. My old friend, Bas Jamieson, did more about it than the government did, and the minister did not even know they made the statement up to about three minutes ago. It is shameful, Sir, it is shameful! And I also would have liked to have heard the member who introduced this resolution get up and tell us that the Premier of this Province, who used to be Minister of Mines and Energy, who is very conscious of the energy crisis in the world, the storage of oil, and so forth, that the hon. gentleman would have told us that he had persuaded the Premier to turn in his Lincoln

MR. S. HEARY: Continental, turn it in and get a small car, possibly a Honda or a Rabbit. I would recommend the Rabbit because I have been driving one for five years, and the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has a Honda. The hon. the Premier thinks that he has to follow the illusions of grandeur that were set by his predecessor, who used to use the government helicopters, and you talk about saving energy. The hon. gentleman says, "Commend the government for their

Mr. Neary: energy saving programme. And we had a Premier that the hon. gentleman supported in this Province who spent \$110,000 in less than a year, in less than a twelve month period, flying in to Adlatok in Labrador, and commend the government, he says, for the steps they took to conserve energy. \$110,000, has the hon. gentleman thought about that? I would have liked to see the hon. gentleman get up and say, yes, commend the government for their energy saving programme, but send the bill to Frank Duff Moores for his misuse and abuse of government helicopters when he was Premier of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not get personal.

MR. NEARY: Do not get personal. Mr. Speaker, do not get personal, the man should be locked up. That is how personal I will get, that is how strong I feel about that Premier who ran the most corrupt administration in the whole of Canada, in the whole of North America, probably the whole of the Free World.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not relevant.

MR. NEARY: Yes, it is relevant because we are talking about conserving energy. And these helicopters are still being abused by ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame!

MR. NEARY: Yes, still being abused.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY: We had an example where the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture took one to go down to his district to visit his disco back two or three years ago. I did not hear the hon. gentleman get up and say, "Ground the helicopters". One way to conserve energy, ground the helicopters. Ground them. Make the ministers and the government fly commercial airlines. There is an energy saving suggestion for the hon. gentleman. Turning down thermostats is one thing, conserving energy, but that is not the only kind of energy the hon. gentleman is talking about here. We are talking about all.

Mr. Speaker, if I went down to the Public Accounts Committee I would rock her. I have been five years in this

MR. NEARY: House, six years in this House, six years - talk about a voice crying in the wilderness - everything that I have said about the Moores Administration in six or seven years has come true, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - including the trips to Adlatok that I raised on the floor of this House so often and was refused the logs of the helicopters and the government aircraft. The people were refused the information of who went aloft, how many times, and what the trips were for. Now, it is all coming out. I was right! I was right!

AN HON. MEMBER: Come down. Come down.

MR. NEARY: I will come down when Labrador Linerboard comes up, I will guarantee the hon. gentleman that. Labrador Linerboard, which was - I suppose, it was the biggest scandal in Canadian history, Labrador Linerboard. But the Auditor General cannot refer to it in his report because he was not allowed to audit the books.

MR. R. MOOPES: Go on!

MR. NEARY: And that is why it has not appeared before the Public Accounts Committee in case the hon. gentleman is not aware.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) coming down?

MR. NEARY: I will come down. I told the hon. gentleman when Labrador Linerboard comes up, and when the police investigations into that scandal are made known.

But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is to be congratulated. And I am amazed, I am amazed, Sir, that the Premier has by-passed that hon. gentleman, by-passed him when he was making his selection of Cabinet ministers.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) I would like to remind the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) of the rule of relevancy.

MR. NEARY: Where am I irrelevant, Mr. Speaker?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Are you speaking on energy?



MR. NEARY:

Yes. I am congratulating the hon. gentleman who has brought in this Private Members' Resolution. I think the hon. member should be in the Cabinet. I think it is a shame that a man who is so sensitive to the needs of the ordinary people of this Province, one in thirty sitting on the Government Benches -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is right.

MR. NEARY:

- so sensitive about the cost of electricity, so sensitive about the energy crisis and the energy needs of this Province, should be by-passed by the Premier of this Province. What a waste, Mr. Speaker, what a waste of talent. And so I congratulate the hon. gentleman for bringing in this Resolution.

But as hon. members know, this Resolution involves more than just turning down thermostats, this Resolution brings into focus, brings before this House an opportunity for members

MR. NEARY: to discuss and debate the energy policy of this government which has been shameful since 1972. Their only claim to fame, Mr. Speaker, their only claim to fame is the \$110 million fire-cracker explosion that they put off on either side of the Straits of Belle Isle - and they could not even do that, they did not use dynamite, they just used a couple of little puffs of powder. Anybody who knows anything about mining, and we have a delegation from St. Lawrence in the gallery today who know all about mining, if they had seen that explosion they would have realized that it was just a little puff of powder. That is all it was. It was not dynamite. Just to put on a show -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - \$110 million, and that is one of the reasons why we are paying such high electricity rates in this Province today. The consumers are asked to pay for that charade. The consumers of electricity in this Province are asked to pay the interest and the principle on \$110 million that was borrowed by this government from Newfoundland Hydro for political electioneering, for a political campaign prior to the 1975 general election. And the Premier of this Province, the born again gentleman that we now have seated across from us, tells us we have to forget the past. He likes to get up and keep reminding us about Churchill Falls and ERCO and all this sort of thing but he does not like to be reminded of what happened when he himself was Minister of Energy and squandered that \$110 million that has never been accounted for in this House. We have never been able to get an accounting for it?

MR. J. CARTER: Does the hon. gentleman realize we have -

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe they are all gone into the bottom drawer of the filing cabinet, I do not know. I hope they put something in the cup if they have. But they are listening. Do not worry. They are listening. And if they are not

MR. NEARY: listening I would say that is tough. I could not care less. I am doing my job in the House as it should be done.

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible) as it should.

MR. NEARY: It is a funny thing, Sir, it is a funny thing about this Province. I get representation, I get correspondence, phone calls from all over Newfoundland, including Bonavista South, the Here and Now programme that appeared on the CBC about the starving cattle in Bonavista South was a result of my representation.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) the hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: And the spruce budworm programme that I did had to do with the hon. gentleman's department.

MR. MORGAN: A lot of fertilizer.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is so inept and incompetent and inefficient and stunned, that the Premier is hoping that the Public Accounts Committee will get rid of him, and save him the trouble of doing it.

Now, coming back to this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I was down in front of Confederation Building when a group of demonstrators came up and I saw the Premier become wild-eyed, starry-eyed and shout and roar and bawl and when he was backed up in the corner he said, "The reason for the high electricity rates is because of the ERCO contract." Because of ERCO, "Because," he said, "of my predecessors." What a cowardly way to try to weazle your way out of something. And I was standing right beside him and I said, "What about the \$110 million you wasted when you were a Minister of Mines and Energy on these two explosions on either side of the Straits of Belle Isle?" He said, "Oh, look, there is the hero there." And then he sulked like he did this afternoon during the Oral Question period, sulked like a baby and ran into Confederation Building.

But these people who were demonstrating the price of energy, the high cost of electricity in this Province made some very valid points, some very valid suggestions and recommendations

MR. NEARY: to the hon. gentleman, and I am going to repeat one of them because there was one that was made that I thought was very worthwhile following up, which is in line, in tune with the hon. gentleman's resolution and that was that there be a complete, no strings attached, no holds barred, public enquiry into Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. And the hon. gentleman has not reacted or responded to that request yet, a very valid request. It is time it was done. I said to myself, these demonstrators, most of whom were females, are right on. Let us have an enquiry. We have never had one. Let us uncover the extravagance, and waste and the patronage and the political.

MR. NEARY: appointments that are going on in Newfoundland Hydro that are condoned by the - and some of them made by the present Premier. But we have to forget that, forget the past, we are not allowed to talk about that. We can talk about Joey when it is convenient and we can talk about the Liberals, but let us not talk about the seven years of Tory reign in this Province, we have to forget that.

Getting back to ERCO for a moment, Mr. Speaker, while I think of it. I read an ad in the paper the other day and I asked a question in this House a couple of days prior to that ad appearing in the newspaper, taking a shot in the dark as far as ERCO is concerned. We have a government in this Province and we have a Premier, Sir, at the present time who is governing by ultimatum and confrontation, lurching from crisis to crisis - governing by confrontation and ultimatums; the first ultimatum, Quebec, the second ultimatum, the Government of Canada, the third ultimatum, ERCO, and so on and so on and so on, ultimatum to the fish companies, ultimatum to this one. If he cannot get his picture in the newspaper by issuing an ultimatum, he just sulks like a little child. Here we have in front of us Oil Week - thirteen pictures in Oil Week. The man must spend half his time, he must allocate half his time to having his picture taken for Oil Week - thirteen pictures. I will lay it on the table of the House so that hon. members can see what their Premier is doing. Confrontation after confrontation, ultimatum after ultimatum, and all, by the way, very shrewdly thought out by his little group of hot shots that he meets with once in a while down at that hotel in Mount Pearl, the little hot shots, these expensive \$40,000 - \$50,000-a-year hot shots he surrounds himself with - all very shrewdly thought out. The hon. gentleman knows that ERCO, according to my interpretation of their ad in the newspaper, voluntarily agreed to up their rates to the cost of power produced at Bay d'Espoir. And the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) in the Premier's absence, told us that that was not good enough, that they would have to contribute to the total system.

MR. NEARY: Well, here is what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker, I will make you a prediction right now. I will make you a forecast right now, that another news conference will be called together rather hurriedly in the next couple of weeks and word will get out there is going to be a major announcement made by the Premier - something like we heard yesterday, the ultimatum going out to Jim McGrath and the Government of Canada - and he will announce that they have knuckled ERCO under, that ERCO have agreed, because of the efforts of this government, to pay the cost - up their rates to the cost of power generated at Bay d'Espoir. And he will claim that a major victory - 'This is great, a major victory!' I am not against it, I am all for it, but what I am saying, Sir, is the cruel game of politics this man is playing. He will claim that as a victory.

MR. BARRY: You are saying they volunteered it?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, they have volunteered it according to that ad.

MR. BARRY: And all of a sudden this year they volunteer it for no reason at all?

MR. NEARY: And he will claim that as a victory and the press will lap it up and they will pump it out to the people of this Province and his picture will be all over the paper. Well, last night, the hon. gentleman declared war on Ottawa and on Jim McGrath when they were kissing cousins there a couple of weeks ago, and he did not even make the National News. That must have been awfully, awfully disappointing and a bitter pill for the hon. gentleman to swallow.

MR. BARRY: Why did ERCO volunteer this year when they did not volunteer for the last fourteen years?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will bet a dollar to donuts that I will be right, that by-and-by we are going to have a news conference. And the next thing, the Premier is going to say, 'Well, we beat them - they knuckled under,' when in turn, they volunteered to do it.

MR. BARRY: Santa Claus is running ERCO.

MR. NEARY:

So, Mr. Speaker, this is our energy policy. This is the kind of an energy policy we have in this Province. That is the kind of a policy we have on just about everything that is run by this government. Their policy is govern by ultimatum and confrontation, lurch

MR. NEARY: from crisis to crisis, get your picture in the paper. That is the main thing for today. If you cannot get it in thirteen times, I would say that is some kind of a record in Newfoundland, do not bother at all. That is all the hon. administration and the hon. gentlemen are interested in but nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we intend to support the private member's resolution brought in by the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) and we commend him for bringing it in but we are not going to support it for the reasons that the hon. gentleman said we should support it, we are going to support it because it was an opportunity for us to have a few words about energy that we would not ordinarily be allowed to debate in this House because of the new rules and because of the way that the Government House Leader, William Khomeini Marshall, has managed to put a muzzle on members of this House, cutting down the amount of time they are allowed to speak, shifting everything off the floor of the House, that we cannot get an opportunity to discuss energy, unemployment, cost of living or anything else. So for that reason we commend the hon. gentleman for bringing this resolution into the House, at least it gives us an opportunity to get a few things off our chests. If we accomplish nothing, and I do not think we will, I do not think the answer to our energy problems, the high cost of electricity and so forth is turning down thermostats, as important as that is. Because Newfoundland Light and Power, as I have said in the beginning, have already let the word out to the people of this Province that you cut back on your electricity, you put in wood and oil or coal and oil or a combination of all two or three and we are going to get our pound of flesh anyway because we will up the minimum charge to consumers in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Putt)

Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. PATTERSON:

Here we go.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!



MR. BARRY: Mr Speaker, a man can only take so much.

MR. NEARY: Do you want me to stay?

MR. MORGAN: Yes. Have the courtesy to stay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: I suggest you do, yes.

MR. NEARY: You are going to talk about me I suppose.

MR. BARRY: I am going to talk about you. I am going to talk about you, which means that I am not going to say very much, but I am going to talk about you.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago I commented - I have to repeat this, if there was any way of harnessing the hon. member's upper lip we would not have to worry about Labrador power or -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) harness your \$80 an hour (inaudible)

MR. BARRY: - or heat or solar energy. With the energy of that mouth, Mr. Speaker, we could drive every generator that is now in this Province. And you are sitting here all day, Mr. Speaker, and you are subjected to that, almost deadline, right across the House. It is cruel and unusual punishment, particularly when the hon. member goes on about items such as ERCO. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose everybody in this House, everybody in the Province is aware of the fact that the hon. member was in government - How many years was the hon. member there after the ERCO contract?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: After the ERCO contract?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. BARRY: How many years was the hon. member in the House after the ERCO contract was entered into and how much is on record here in Hansard, Mr. Speaker, how much is on record complaining about the ERCO contract while the hon. member sat under the thumb of certain past Premiers.

MR. MEASY: Cabinet secrecy, Cabinet solidarity.

MR. BARRY: That is right. You were not allowed to open your mouth. You could not talk about ERCO. You could not talk about EPCO.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear! Told to sit down and shut up he was.

MR. BARRY: And only because there was a change of government we would still not be talking about ERCO. Mr. Speaker, a new day has dawned fortunately and we can talk about EPCO and not only are we talking about ERCO, we are doing something about ERCO. The hon. member says that we can expect EPCO to come in out of the blue, this year, come in and volunteer to increase their power rates. Just like that. Bang! What has happened? Have they been hit by a bolt from the blue to change their business hearts into one of

MR. BARRY: melting charity? They are going to come over - they feel guilty about the rates that they are paying in Newfoundland, and all of a sudden because Christmas 1979 is coming on they are going to come over and give us a Christmas present. That is what is happening?

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is expecting the people of this Province to accept that. The people of this Province know, Mr. Speaker, that we have put certain positions to ERCO, to Albright and Wilson, to the shareholders of Albright and Wilson -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as usual the hon. gentleman is not very well informed. I have here in front of me, Sir, a communique issued by ERCO to its employees.

MR. MORGAN: What is your point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. NEARY: - to its employees at Long Harbour which I am prepared to table, Sir, and here is what it says.

"ERCO has never refused to discuss the power contract with the Province of Newfoundland despite our history of heavy losses. However, we have insisted on a number of points, the most important of which is that any proposed changes must relate to Bay d'Espoir costs."

Now, Mr. Speaker. that is a complete reversal of what the hon. gentleman is saying. The hon. gentleman is not deliberately misleading the House but he is misleading the House and I would like to lay this communique, that was given to me by an employee of ERCO, on the table of the House. So I hope -

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down boy.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you not table yourself?

MR. NEARY: I would like to lay it on the table, Sir, and ask the hon. gentleman to govern -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - to govern himself accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: On the point of order.

MR. BARRY: I am glad the hon. member passed on the information but obviously there is no point of order there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order. It is merely a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

MR. BARRY: Not even a difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker, because I will accept that that is what ERCO is saying. I will accept that they may be putting that forth as a position, as a negotiating position because we are putting it to them that we are not satisfied with the price that they have been paying, the price that they paid while the hon. member opposite was in government, and that was never questioned at that time, and a price that we have been trying to change for a number of years, and a price that we are going to change. The time has come, that price will be changed.

MR. MORGAN: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Now, ERCO can make all the counter proposals they want. Is the hon. member submitting - suggesting that that is the acceptable position for this government, for this Province?

MR. NEARY: Would you mind telling me what kind of a cruel game of politics the Premier is playing?

MR. BARRY: It seems like the hon. member is prepared to accept the first position put by ERCO as being acceptable.

MR. NEARY: No. No.

MR. BARRY: Well, the hon. member should be a little more precise in his comments.

MR. NEARY: I am not playing political games with 'Brian'.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to

MR. BARRY: refer to the statement, the reference the hon. member made to the comment by Newfoundland Light and Power, attributed to Newfoundland Light and Power, and I am glad he did, because it is one that has received a lot of comment in this Province and I would like to put this House on notice, and I would like to put the people of this Province on notice that it is this government's policy that our

Mr. Barry: citizens will save money by conservation.

And if Newfoundland Light and Power attempts to change its rates so as to negate the effect of conservation, if necessary, we will bring in the appropriate legislation to counteract any such move.

MR. NEARY: Now you are talking.

MR. BARRY: Now that is the position of this government,

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And it is the position that I have made several times, and I think this is the first time in this House, several times before the hon. member ever raised the point. And I would like to be more specific, Mr. Speaker, and say that I have, as of several weeks ago, requested officials of the Department of Mines and Energy in conjunction with employees of Newfoundland Hydro, and request<sup>d</sup> the assistance of Newfoundland Light and Power, request<sup>d</sup> any information they can supply to prepare information on what is necessary in the way of changes to our rate structure to ensure that it is obvious and clear that any conservation measures entered into by the people of this Province will result in savings to them.

Now, I have, just to show hon. members that it is not a simple matter to arrive at, what would appear to be a very reasonable position, this matter of marginal costing, bringing in - I am going to have another swipe at you in a moment, but I will alert you if you want to leave for a while.

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave!

MR. BARRY: By leave! I will alert the hon. member when I am about to take another swipe at him.

Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested in a number of quarters and, in fact, it has been looked at in many parts of North America, particularly since 1973 in the energy crisis, this question of how can we structure our rates so that the more people use the more they pay, and particularly when this is at peak periods? The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) I know, this is a very popular subject matter with him and he has raised the point with me, brought it

Mr. Barry: to my attention a number of times that we have to get a better rate structure so that we can recognize when people conserve and penalize when people waste energy, particularly at certain times in the day when it adds to the peak demand of the Province, which means, Mr. Speaker, as the peak goes up there has to be additional generating capacity installed, there has to be more money spent on generating facilities.

If we can keep our peak down, Mr. Speaker, then we have a certain amount of flexibility. People point to, say, buildings leaving their lights on overnight. Well, I agree it is a bad practice, but it is more attitudinal than it is important in the sense of saving energy dollars to the Province. Because lights left on between midnight and six o'clock in the morning are not adding to the peak demand of the Province. It is using energy, that would probably be water that, in some cases might be spilling over a dam if the electricity is not being used. And, in fact, in one sense it means more money to the utility if the energy in the off-peak period is being consumed is being paid for and there is more money coming into the utility.

But, Mr. Speaker, on balance I believe that because of the attitude that will carry over into the peak period that is a wasteful attitude. So our approach would be to recommend that people turn off lights at all times when they are not using them. But the point I am trying to make is that it is really the peak periods, around supper hour in the evenings, or sometimes early in the morning when people awake and turn on their electric stoves and start to cook their breakfast, but particularly around supper hour is the most important time for everybody to be aware of the necessity to turn off any appliances that are not necessary for the particular operation you are engaged in at that time.

MR. BAPPY: It is the one peak a year that everything is geared at in terms of installing generating capacity. You have to try and estimate what is the maximum demand that is going to occur. At some point in the year, one time during the year the demand is going to go up to this point, this maximum peak, and that is usually in the Winter, usually around Christmas time -

MR. JAMIESON: In our climate.

MR. BAPPY: In our climate. As the hon. member rightly points out, if we were in Southern climes our peak would come in the Summer time when we had all our air conditioning on, but we do not have that problem. In fact, there are advantages that accrue from this difference in peaks. It means that we can sell - Canada, I speak of now - can sell energy to the United States in the Summertime when they need it most in the Southern states, if you have a proper grid system set up, and they can sell energy to us in the Wintertime when it is not their peak period. So there can be exchanges worked out and neither one of us then has to put in as much generating capacity as we would otherwise need. It is an example of how co-operation can work to everybody's benefit. Unfortunately at the present time we do not get a great benefit on a North/South basis because the Southern US states are basically sending their energy up to the Northern US states. It never gets across the Canadian border. But that is an example of where differences in latitude can result in the necessity for co-operation and exchange between countries, between provinces, between states and so on. I had the opportunity to do a bit of work and to submit a paper to the inter-provincial premiers on constitutional aspects of inter-provincial energy exchange a number of years ago, and one of these days I hope to get that thing published and I will send a copy across to the Leader of the Opposition at that time.

MR. JAMIESON: No bill, please.

MR. BAPPY: No, this will be a complimentary copy. There will be no bill going with the article. But it is an example. -



MR. JAMIESON: I hope that when I write it is not quite as dull as that.

MR. BAPPY: Oh, it is dull. It is dull. I have to confess I find it dull myself when I read it.

MR. JAMIESON: (Inaudible)

MR. BAPPY: Very, very educational but dull. I have to agree. But it is an example, Mr. Speaker, of how as an academic you can utilize your work two or three times. First you do the work for a client and you bill it out, and then while you are doing the work for the client you are also teaching a class and you are using the material in the class you are teaching and ultimately you put the material into an article and you publish it. So the cycle keeps going. You get paid three times over for it and that is the only way our academics can survive these days. But they survive quite well if they get something like that going.

MR. JAMIESON: There is no doubt about that.

MR. BAPPY: Much better than politicians, I am finding. Mr. Speaker, so on the point that the hon. member for La Poile (Mr. Neary) raised with respect to conservation and with respect to any statements that, well, if you save money by cutting back we are just going to increase rates in other ways, that is not going to happen. No, I am not going to take a swipe at you yet. You can go back. That is not going to happen, Mr. Speaker, because it is this government's policy to ENSURE that conservation will result in savings for the consumer. Now that is the bottom line of this government's policy and whatever legislation we have to implement to bring that into effect will be done.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I am curious to know in that context whether the same will apply, if his theoretical extensions, that I am sure he has written with great skill, whether they show if at some point we are going to wind up with again "a surplus of power", let us say coming from Labrador, and then would we have to in

MR. JAMIESON: fact change some of these habits and indeed suggest to people that they go back to utilizing more electricity? That happened once before.

MR. SPEAKER: (Putt) The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BAPPY: That could happen, Mr. Speaker, The tyranny

MR. L. BARRY: of economics being what it is, but personally I do not think it will happen and I will, in any policies I recommend, try to avoid it because it is not a healthy attitude. But what the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) is referring to is that if you have a system installed that can produce a certain amount of energy, and if at any particular period you do not need all that, you only need 60 per cent of it or 70 per cent, you have, say, 30 or 40 percent surplus, well, if you do not sell it it is water over the dam.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Ontario Hydro is still promoting.

MR. L. BARRY: Ontario Hydro, because of their nuclear programme and so on, have a certain built-in capacity and really if you can encourage off-peak purchases, if you can bring in a system where you encourage people to have their hot water heaters turned on at off-peak periods, then it may be a policy that you could safely bring in. And this is, in fact, an example of the sort of thing we are looking at and we hope to have a couple of pilot projects and I will be making further statements on this before too long. But we are looking at, it has been suggested, it is possible to have hot water heaters set up controlled by the utility so that the utility could turn off the hot water heater of thousands of citizens, if they agree to let this happen, at peak periods when they wanted to cut down demand. When the supply was getting tight they could just pull the plug and all the hot water heaters would be turned off.

MR. D. JAMIESON: My wife does that to me every day by getting a bath first.

MR. L. BARRY: If consumers were prepared to go along with that, and if that resulted in a saving to them in dollar terms, maybe that would encourage them to go along with it. It is a little bit of an invasion of privacy, I think, in one sense; you know, there is a certain reluctance on people to have somebody tell you when you can have a bath or when you can wash the kids or the dog or the dishes or your car or whatever, but, when it comes right down to it, if that saves you money then the consumer may be prepared

MR. L. BARRY: to have that type of an arrangement entered into. Now, we are going to be experimenting with this sort of thing; we will be bringing in more details of this as time goes on. That is one example of where you could, then, encourage the use of hot water heaters in off-peak periods but have them shut off during the peak period and that would shave your peak, keep it lower than it otherwise would be and would mean that you would have to have less installed generating capacity.

I brought out this report. This was a seminar that was held in Montreal on marginal costing and the pricing of electrical energy back in May of 1978 at the Queen Elizabeth Hotel there, and there are 150 pages or so of discussion articles of the difficulties in bringing in these changes to the rate structure that I have spoken about. In fact, although this has been debated in North America since 1973, there has been very little that has been done in any jurisdiction because of the difficulty, the complexity, of actually bringing in a system that can recognize fully when a person is increasing the demand because of what he is doing, and therefore should be penalized in terms of price, and on the other hand recognizing when a person is taking steps to decrease ultimate demand and, therefore, he should be rewarded in terms of price. But we have active research underway into this area and we hope to have further information for the House before too long.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long I have gone on or how much time I have left.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two minutes left.

MR. L. BARRY: Two minutes left. This is only my first point of five points, so I guess I am going to miss a couple of points, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. JAMIESON: We are broken-hearted.

MR. L. BARRY: Just to mention some of the steps that have already been taken by this government, Mr. Speaker, in terms of energy conservation, and by previous PC administrations, the sales tax on home insulation materials and wood burning stoves was

December 5, 1979

Tape No. 1633

SD - 3

MR. L. BARRY: removed, as well as sales tax on  
electricity generally and fuel oil but that is not specifically a  
conservation measure, it is a step to decrease the cost to the

MR. D. BARRY:

consumer. New programmes have been entered into, federal/provincial programmes such as the CHIP programme, the Canadian Home Insulation Programme, Enersave, the residential energy service programme and so on. There has been a DREE agreement, and this Province is the first one to enter into this energy conservation, renewable energy DREE agreement with \$11.5 million available for expenditures on research into ways of bringing on renewable energy forms. And the Department of Mines and Energy is now entertaining proposals, and there will be more publicity on this matter over the next several months, but it already has a large number of unsolicited proposals but it will be actively soliciting proposals as well for projects that people would like to see carried out, either themselves or government, to conserve energy or to develop renewable energy resources. In terms of saving energy, some of the proposals have been bringing in a programme of thermographic surveying of neighbourhoods where you can fly over and take infrared photographs and you can actually see the leaks of heat coming out the sides of buildings, out of windows, out of doors, out of roofs and so on.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

It must be some picture when they go over here.

MR. D. BARRY:

It is one big red sky when they pass the Confederation Building if the windows are open. And they can point to your house and they can say, 'Look, you should have storm windows, you should have a storm door, you should have insulation in your roof,' and so on. 'Look, at all of the energy and the dollars that you are losing by not having this done.' The CHIP programme has not worked as well as it should; the money is there and going unspent, really. We have recommended that it be passed over to the provinces for administration and this seems to be the approach the Federal Government will take and we anticipate that there will be improvements in this programme as time goes on. There is still a lot to be done. We recommended that storm doors and windows and so on be brought into the programme so that people can obtain grants for this sort of thing as well.

MR. SPEAKER: (SUTT)

Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has run out

unless he is given leave.

MR. L. BARRY: By leave? Two minutes, by leave, just to conclude?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. S. NEARY: You still have not taken that swipe yet.

MR. L. BARRY:

No, I will forego the swipe at

the hon. member for LaPoile this time.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have had to develop other hydro sites on the Island, Einds Lake and the Upper Salmon right now being underway. The bottom line, however, Mr. Speaker, is that conservation, while it will help us put off the inevitable day when we have to install our next generating capacity, conservation in itself is not enough, unfortunately. It can help, it can be a big help and we urge the citizens of this Province to conserve, but ultimately the salvation of this Province, as far as energy is concerned, will be to see a transmission line between Labrador and the Island part of this Province, so that we can have our electricity coming from hydro rather than from petroleum and so that we can then have some control over pricing. Right now hon. members can say we should keep the cost of electricity down. If we do that, we are taking money out of one pocket, out of general revenue to put into another. The bottom line is that as long as we are dependent upon OPEC oil they will force our electricity prices up. The way that we can get stable cost power and energy for this Province is to have that based upon a resource within our Province that is under our control, that is not subject to cost escalation and that, Mr. Speaker, is to have our electricity coming from water. And that is our objective, to have the water, the hydro capacity of Labrador developed to serve the people of this Province. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

December 5, 1979

Tape No. 1634

DW - 3

MR. T. LUSK:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words to this resolution. I think the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in speaking earlier indicated that certainly we would be supporting this



MR. LUSH: resolution. But, Mr. Speaker, it is rather strange the kinds of resolutions that are sort of drafted and presented before this House by hon. members from the other side. They seem to be weak resolutions and mealy-mouthed resolutions. The intent of the resolution is certainly good and we go along with the spirit of the resolution because it gives us the chance to talk about the most important item that is facing Newfoundlanders and Canadians today, that of energy. The two main parts to the resolution, of course, have to do with conservation and with stable and low-cost sources of energy, but there is nothing in this resolution that is going to achieve either. I expect maybe that the hon. member probably when he was drafting the resolution tried to get ideas from members of the House as to what ideas we could come up with that would certainly bring around conservation that would result in stable and low-cost sources of energy to the people of this Province. But there is nothing at all within the resolution to suggest that this is going to be done. What we have is two parts to the resolution, one, 'Be it resolved that the Government of Canada and of the Province be commended for their efforts taken in the area of energy conservation, particularly in the recent signing of the DREE subsidiary agreement on renewable energy sources.' And I think that is what the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was getting at, that part of the resolution, when time ran out. Certainly, we agree with that part of the resolution, because if this agreement was not signed by the previous federal Liberal Government, I am sure that all of the plans were drawn up in consultation with the provincial government - all that was needed was a signature. So this, certainly we would find no effort in supporting. But again, to point out the ridiculousness of the resolution, now how do you go about commending? What are we looking for, to have back slaps and people to be congratulated? How do you commend both levels of government? What are we going to do - wire them a telegram? What are we going to do - write them a letter? Are we going to send somebody up there? Are we going to drink a toast? What are we going to do to commend both levels of government? Again, it points out the nonsense of the kinds

MR. LUSH:

of resolutions that we have.

And the second part talks about,

'Be it resolved that both governments be encouraged'. Now, Mr. Speaker, how are we going to encourage? Again, a resolution should state a specific action. We should state the 'What' and the 'How' of the resolution, what we want done and how it is going to be done. But again, maybe the hon. member was looking for suggestions from the House, looking for suggestions from hon. members as to how we should encourage both levels of government. If that is so, it is fine. But a resolution should state in positive terms, in precise terms, in specific terms, what line of action we expect. And words like 'commend' and words like 'encourage' and words like 'suggest' do not do that sort of thing. If we were to look at some resolutions here, we could see some good resolutions that indicate positive, precise and specific action.

Mr. Speaker, enough said about the wording of the resolution and the semantics of the resolution. There is no question that the hon. member certainly had the concern of Newfoundlanders in mind when he drafted the resolution, in terms of talking about conserving energy and with the hope that we can keep the cost to consumers down. That is what is important.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, how can we do that? How can we achieve that? Because, as I said before, this is the single largest problem facing people in this Province today, and people right throughout Canada, the cost of energy. There are people in this Province who do not know which way to turn, Mr. Speaker. They do not know how they are going to be able to cope with the high cost of energy, with the continual escalation in the cost of energy. There are cases where the cost of energy is almost costing people as much as their groceries, particularly those people who have electric heat. These people are facing a tremendous problem. If there is something we can do in this hon. house, certainly, to minimize

MR. LUSH: that expense, to help bring down that expense somewhat, then certainly we would have achieved something great for the people who sent us here, for the people who elected us to work on their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, there is nothing in the motion and the resolution to indicate any action at all, and the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) when he spoke certainly got on to two large items and one had to do with the first part of the resolution, namely the development of the hydro potential that we have in this Province, and certainly this is a must. We must do this, because as long as we have got to rely on oil as a source of fuel or heating homes or whatever, then we can only expect the cost of energy to escalate; and as long as we have to do that, then certainly we have got to somehow encourage our people, somehow bring out some kind of educational programme that will certainly instill in the minds of our people the extreme necessity for conservation. And this part of the resolution is the most commendable part of the resolution, namely the DREE agreement to develop what hydro potential we have, because this must be done. We must develop every last resource of hydro potential in this Province if we are going to do anything at all with minimizing the cost to our people. This must be done. And I would like for somebody on the government side, when they are speaking, to indicate the resources that we have and the priority - which rivers are going to be developed over the next ten years? What are the sources of hydro power that we are going to see in this Province that are going to be developed in the next few years, along with ongoing developments now? Because that is the only hope, that is our only salvation, if indeed there is any salvation at all, if indeed there is any escape from the tremendous high cost of energy to our people. So that certainly is the only solution, and the quicker we can eliminate the need for oil as a source of

MR. LUSH: electricity in this Province, as a source of fuel and heat, the quicker we can do that then the better for the people of this Province. And this must be a priority, and, as I have said before, I would certainly hope that the government will let us know in the near future what just precisely, what their plans are along these lines over the next few years.

The second part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the part having to do precisely with the conservation that the government be encouraged, and certainly I would like to encourage them in every way possible, but what are the ideas? What can we do? What is this resolution suggesting? Is it suggesting an educational programme be brought into our schools, maybe, where we can certainly instill into the minds of our young people the tremendous crisis in this Province and in Canada, and teach them some of the conservation concepts, some of the conservation techniques, because I believe this is where it has got to start. And I just wonder today, for example, how much of this sort of thing is being done in our schools, in our high schools, for the people who in a few short years will be married and building homes, this sort of thing. Are they being educated to the kinds of homes they should be building? Are they being educated to the kinds of conservation techniques that are needed today to cut down on the cost of electricity, to cut down on the cost of energy? And I certainly would recommend this as a step, that we bring in some sort of a programme in our schools to educate our young people and, of course, to supplement that we must certainly do something so that we can inform the consumers now, the people who are now consuming electricity - and again the Minister of Mines and Energy got on to a few of the things that can be done. But this must be done on a larger and a broader scale. It must be a deliberate attempt. I hope that this is what the hon. member was getting at, some sort of educational programme for the public so that they know, so that they are aware of, one,

December 5, 1979

Tape No. 1636

NM - 3

MR. LUSH:                                    the need for conservation, and two,  
of course, the way in which they can conserve energy, the way in  
which they can cut down ~~on the cost of electricity~~ <sup>↑</sup>

Mr. Lush: the ways in which they can cut down on the cost of electricity in their homes. And I would hope that we do not come up with any ideas like the hon. member did for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) , I believe, when some weeks ago he was talking about conserving energy and talking about various methods with respect to electrical utilities or equipment in the homes and said that one of the cheap users of electricity or one of the pieces of equipment that we could buy which uses very little electricity or kilowatt hours, whatever the terminology is, and he recommended microwave ovens.

Now I would not want to go down in my district recommending that people buy microwave ovens to cut down on the cost of electricity, I can assure you. But I hope that we can come up with some very positive steps. And I am sure that microwave ovens cut down on the cost of electricity, but look at the initial outlay for many of the consumers in this Province. It is probably fine for wealthy people, rich people to buy microwave ovens, but it is not the thing to be recommending to the consumers of the Terra Nova district, I can assure you.

But there are several things I am sure that the government can do, several things along with this educational programme, this massive educational programme that we can instruct our people about that we can make them aware of, so that they can do the things required, as I have said before, to cut down on the cost of energy.

Now I would just like to make a comment again on a matter raised by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and that was to do with the CHIP Programme, or I think probably more commonly referred to by the residents of this Province as the Home Insulation Programme. And again this is a good programme, encouraging people to insulate their homes , homes that were built at a certain time. But I would hope that the members on the opposite side would certainly see that this programme was improved, because as nearly as I can recall the home had to be built somewhere since, I believe,

Mr. Lush: or prior to 1940 or since 1940, whatever it is, that is eliminating, it is sort of restricting a lot of our people from applying. It is keeping it within a very, very small group, and suggesting, of course, that maybe homes built in the 1950s or in the 1960s were well insulated. As hon. members know, that is not so. I would like to see the time period broadened on that particular programme. But, again, I am not quite sure of the dates but I believe it is homes built prior to 1940 which, of course, makes the house about forty years old before you qualify.

Now I understand that there were some moves to advance that date, to bring it up to 1950 or 1960. So I would hope that hon. members - this is a step that we would take to encourage the government to up that date, to advance the date to bring it to the 1950s or to the 1960s. Because I can assure hon. members that there are a lot of poorly insulated houses built after the 1940s and after the 1950s and after the 1960s and after the 1970s. So there are a lot of people that cannot benefit from this particular programme the way it is presently structured.

Now maybe that is what the Premier had in mind when some weeks ago, he indicated via the news media that, I believe that he said, that he would like for this government to have control of that particular programme. And maybe he should. Maybe that is the best people to administer this programme. And I would hope, as I have said, if they do that, if they administer the programme that they would certainly, look at advancing the date by which may qualify because there is certainly a vast need for people to insulate their homes, homes that were built in the 1950s, homes that were built in the 1960s and homes that were built in the 1970s. And that again could be a measure, that could be a step the government could take to ensure that the cost of electricity is substantially reduced, is substantially minimized to the people of this Province. Because again, let me reiterate that the cost of energy is getting beyond the reach, is getting beyond the capability of many, many people in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador,

MR. LUSH: and anything we can do in terms of developing our full hydro potential and in terms of taking measures and steps that will certainly encourage people and that will certainly entice people to conserve energy are commendable steps. I would hope that all members of the House will give their serious attention to this particular resolution and come up with ideas and suggestions on which this government can act. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Next to fishing on the coast of Labrador, I think I would go on record to say there is no other issue so important to the people of Labrador as housing. I would also go as far as to say that we talk of the underprivileged world, of Pakistan, of India and other ones about housing - again, I would classify coastal Labrador in this condition and I would be able to substantiate this with the facts.

Most of the forms of energy on the coast of Labrador generators, not from hydro power - even though we have Churchill Falls in Labrador. There are two communities up there, Norman Bay and Pinsent Arm, which do not even have a diesel generator, but have private generators. It has also been proven down there - so much so that the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook) is having a public inquiry into the high cost of gas and oil in the community of Black Tickle, and I would even go as far as to say that should be extended along the coast.

There are places along the coast of Labrador where wood is not available as an alternate form of energy. In Black Tickle there is not one tree. The people of Fox Harbour have to go in six or seven miles. Residents of all the communities along the Straits of Labrador from L'Anse-au-Clair to Pinware have to go in seven or eight miles by skidoo. Port Hope Simpson is not so bad, but basically they have to go in about eight miles. And I can go on down the coast and point out the fact that if they want wood as an alternate form of energy, they have to make quite an investment in money in order to get it.



MR. HISCOCK: I also want to point out that in most of these communities, which are Summer stations, residents have two houses and, therefore, have great difficulty with the upkeep of these two houses. Most of the houses are of wooden structure, most do not have basements and most are not insulated. Again, as I can prove by these reports, they do not have a system on the coast of Labrador to carry these programmes to the people.

I was amazed, in actual fact, at the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) getting into very high theories, and one of the things I learned from his speech was that it was all academic. I am amazed that he can get up and actually talk in such academic terms instead of getting to realities. The reason why I wanted to speak on this was to point out the realities and offer concrete terms on how the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador actually can save money and improve living conditions for the people of this Province on the coast of Labrador.

The Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation has an officer at L'Anse-au-Loup, but he was responsible only for that part of the coast. There was nobody responsible from Mary's Harbour up to Cartwright. Now he has been given jurisdiction over that area.

When the officer goes in to inspect the houses - in most cases the houses take two or three years to be built. The people cut the logs, leave them to dry and go on fishing. Then they come back and partly build the houses that Fall and Winter. The next year they go fishing again and, later, finish them. So, for houses that are privately owned, it takes, at least in most cases, three years to build them.

The cost of oil and gas on that coast is, as I said, the highest in Newfoundland, and I would go as far as to say the highest in North America. Also, there is a monopoly on that oil and the people have no other choice but to buy it from one person.

There is a RRAP programme going - a rural remote housing programme - from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay, and I must say, I commend them on the job that they are doing. It is also

MR. HISCOCK: in Goose Bay, but I ask the question, Why is it not on the oldest part of Labrador, from Mary's Harbour to Cartwright? Why are these people being excluded, especially when they have to maintain two houses? They maintain a house in the Summer station - fine, they do not particularly need it, but coming back in the Winter on the Labrador Coast where the Winter sets in earlier, they have to consume more forms of gas and electricity. Why is it that the standard of housing has been improved in one instance and not in the other?

The Minister of Mines and Energy

(Mr. Barry) also said something, and I (inaudible) briefs as being presented in Goose Bay and on the Straits that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro are going to be bringing the power to the Island part of this

MR. E. HISCOCK: Province, and they are going to be bringing it through the Straits, but according to Hydro, according to the government, they are not going to put one ounce of electricity, if I am correct, on the Straits itself.

MR. BARRY: There will be other ways though.

MR. HISCOCK: As long as there are going to be other ways, and I want to go on record, I want to make sure that we will get rid of these diesel generators once and for all on the coast and be connected up by electrical grid. If that is so, fine.

The other thing I want to point out to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), and I hope he will pass it on to Mr. Crosbie and to Mr. Clark in Ottawa, that with regard to the North, Mr. Crosbie is saying that the older people are going to be cushioned against the high cost of gas and oil and also people on fixed incomes, I would even go as far as to say that the people in the North should also be taken into consideration and be cushioned, because they have to consume more gas and oil than any other part of Canada because of the climatic conditions and it is over a longer period of time. I hope to see this government, and maybe this House, make this recommendation to the Government of Canada, that the North itself be included in a special programme for cushioning. Maybe we could get the taxation of this government, which is almost twenty-eight cents on the gallons, done away with, and also the federal tax done away with, because as it is now it is up to something like \$1.40, \$1.50 a gallon on the Coast.

Newfoundland Light and Power, I am going to say something now and probably I should consult - but one of the things, as far as I am concerned personally, and this is only my own personal opinion, I feel that company should be nationalized, and I hope that in time that basically this party, on this side of the House, will see fit to back that position, that we nationalize Newfoundland Light

MR. HISCOCK: and Power from the point of view that we do not need a go-between, that Newfoundland Hydro take over the Newfoundland Light and Power thereby getting rid of the middle-man and giving a saving to our people of this Province. I see no reason why a company has to make \$1 million profit each year and turn around and say to the people of this Province that, basically, if you consume wood and you cut back then we will have to bring in another taxation saving device that will make sure that you pay the regular rate. So as far as I am concerned, personally, I think that should be nationalized.

With regard to housing, I want to take these reports that are being done for the provincial government, basically I think for DREE on the effects on the Coast. These reports on each community of the coast are prepared by AMCO Limited, in association with Terpstra Engineering Limited, for the provincial government.

Forteau, Labrador - over 145 houses in this community. 95 in very good condition, 32 in good condition, 21 are in fair condition and 3 are in poor condition. Half of them have wooden basements - 22 of them have wooden basements - and 5 of them have concrete basements.

The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) said that you have a type of technology now where you can take pictures to find out how much energy is being lost from cracks and windows and doors. I suggest that he go down on the Coast of Labrador and he would not see cracks or anything, he would just see nothing, just one big blob and it would not be hot air from this building either.

L'Anse-au-Loup itself, L'Anse-au-Loup has 142 houses, 81 are in very good condition - and by the way I may point out this is the result of the RRAP programme. This is the result of the RRAP programme, this is the result of the RRAP programme that has been on the go for the past four or five years in this

MR. HISCOCK: area. So if I were to have taken these reports four or five years ago this would have been worse again. And while I am reading these reports, I hopefully will make the recommendation that this government will see fit to make recommendations to the federal government that Mary's Harbour to Cartwright be brought in under the RRAP programme so that we can get these other houses that are in fair condition, and in ~~poor~~ condition, brought up to a standard so that we can save energy in this Province and improve living conditions for the people.

In L'Anse-au-Loup, as I said, 142 houses, 81 are in very good condition; good condition - 45; fair condition - 25; poor condition - 12.

Pinware, 40 houses; 13 very good condition; good - 16; fair condition - 13;

MR. E. HISCOCK: poor condition, five, most of these again are on wooden pillars and, again, like the North in that way. Bad Bay thirty-three in very good condition; in good condition, twenty-eight; fair, thirty-one; and poor, eleven.

MR. HOUSE: Who determined that evaluation?

MR. E. HISCOCK: This was the company, AMCO Limited in association with Terpstra Engineering that was commissioned by the government to do studies all along the Labrador coast from Nain to Cartwright. These are only preliminary reports that are going to be brought to the government by the end of December.

Charlottetown residents - and this is true all along the coast but it is written here by them: "Residents express the views that the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing requirements for surveying lots and land grants and that CMHC requirement of guaranteed income were too stringent for the residents of the coast. Surveys are difficult to arrange and costly, especially on an individual basis. So basically what I am pointing out there is that if they want to build a new house on the coast, from the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation, most likely they will give up on it because of the difficulty of getting an inspector to come down and inspect the lot, to get an inspector to come down and give the recommendation as to the size of the land. And as a result most people have forgotten about it and will not bother with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation and as a result, as I have said, it takes them sometimes three to four years to try to get a house on they go. And because of that, of not getting any help, they are building the houses without any kind of insulation and the problem still continues.

Fox Harbour, Labrador: Twenty-two in very good condition; good condition, thirty-five; fair condition, twenty-one; poor condition, seven. Again, as I have said, I will point out that none of these have basements and all of these are wooden houses.

In Cartwright, Labrador, Cartwright has 164 houses, just listen to this, very good houses, twenty-one; good houses, seventy-one; fair - would you say a fair house loses a lot of energy, consumes a lot of energy, causes undue hardship to the people

MR. E. HISCOCK: especially when the cost of oil is so expensive? - fair, eighty-two; poor, fifty-one. Fifty-one of the houses down there are in poor condition and as a result how can they turn around, with the cost of living going up all the time and build a new house that will save energy particularly when they do not have the programmes down there to help them?

Black Tickle is designated as the native community so therefore it qualifies for grants from the Federal Government to build houses which they continue to do. In Black Tickle, forty-one dwellings - there are more than forty-one. Of these eighteen are in very good condition; good condition, eight; fair condition, eighteen; and poor condition, sixteen. When I was down in Black Tickle this time - I was there five years ago - and while I was there Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation built two houses. While they built those two houses for the people there two others were condemned and instead of having the two houses that supposed to be condemned, torn down, what happened? - two other families moved into them. Two young married families who had children moved into these houses. Then when I was campaigning there, or the nurse comes there or the community worker comes there or the teacher comes in the first thing that happens, these people come up and grab you by the arm and bring you down to the community and say, 'Look, at the conditions that we are living in', but they did not tell you that a house was built and that a house was supposed to be torn down. So anyway, while I was there this time we ended up having another two houses built and I had to call a meeting of the council and get another two houses torn down so that problem would not continue to fester and other people move into sub-standard houses. So I would like to also go on record as saying that if the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation is going to be building houses for the people who need them, people on social assistance or in native communities, that they also be responsible for tearing down condemned houses so that other people do not move into them, and that we put more pressure on

December 5, 1979

Tape No. 1640

DW - 3

MR. E. HISCOCK:

these people.

the government to build houses for

Paradise River, Paradise River itself,  
again there are no basements, 60 per cent of the buildings are on wooden  
pillars and in excess of 30 per cent have wooden foundations.



MR. HISCOCK: Very good condition, seven; good condition, eight; fair condition, fifteen; poor condition twenty-three. L'Anse-au-Clair; again I can go on. I will not bother to go on with this but basically what I am trying to point out is that in the energy programme, the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) was extremely academic in his approach. I do not want to be academic, I have real problems here. I want answers to these and I want the answer that we get a RRAP programme on the coast of Labrador, extended so that we can turn around and save the energy and basically end up improving the standard of living. I have letters after letters after letters, more so than on Fisheries, we cannot have people stay in these houses during the Winter. Six houses were supposed to be built this year but due to a delay in inspection, due to a delay in approval and the bureaucracy it has to go through, these six families now have to wait until next year until these houses are built and as a result, the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation has to pay rent for them now. That should be speeded up. So I recommend that basically this government should go on record as recommending to Mr. Clark and Mr. Crosbie that there should be some special programme with the cost of oil and gas being subsidized or taxation being done away with with regard to the North.

Number two, that a RRAP programme be extended from L'Anse-au-Clair all the way up to Paradise River, all the coast of Labrador that is not included in the native communities.

So these are some of the things that hopefully the government - I have no hesitation in supporting this motion, in actual fact, I was quite pleased when I saw I was able to get up and give this evidence. So I thank the House for bringing this motion in. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take a great deal of time this afternoon and I believe there has been some agreement that unless other members wish to speak the

MR. D. JAMESON:

Hon. Member for Bay of Islands (Mr.

L. Woodrow) may wish to close up this. I think, very interesting and very important debate. It is a matter of some regret to all of us, I am sure, that in fact an issue of such importance has not generated more by way of public interest in the past or, indeed, perhaps one might say, enough interest among people in public life and so I think the member is to be commended for having brought it in because any of us who have had any experience at all will realize that conservation is an important part of the whole energy problem as we face it today. I think that it is perhaps impossible, given the lifestyles to which we have become accustomed, to do a great deal about many of the wastes, almost scandalous wastes, that are going on these days. It may be just academic and probably is more an entertaining revelation than anything about which we can do anything but I was recalling, during this debate, information which came to my attention while I was the Minister of Transport and I am not sure that any of us have really thought about this, but the fact of the matter is that the automobile, the individual owned and operated automobile is without a doubt the most wasteful form of transportation ever created and the thing that drives that home most dramatically is the fact that for all of its life, from the instant it is bought to the instant that it goes on the dump and is finished with, it is actually mobile something like 3 to 4 per cent of that whole period. In other words, 97 per cent of its time is actually occupied with simply sitting either in front of the door while people sleep, in front of an office while they work or something of that nature, and that I use as an illustration of just how almost scandalous, I repeat, has become our wasteful habit with regard to energy. And I am just speaking here, of course, of energy as it affects gasoline and the like.

In Newfoundland terms, of course, this has some modifications, if you wish, in the sense that one of the worries that I have about the growing energy crisis and the inevitability, it seems, of increasing costs, is the very large number and the increasing number of Newfoundlanders who are travelling and

December 5, 1979

Tape No. 1641

SD - 3

MR. J. JAMIESON: must travel long distances every day simply to go to work and to return home. When people are discussing ways and means whereby we can (a) conserve and help people with the

MR. JAMIESON:

cost of energy as it relates to transport. I certainly hope that (a) the federal government and, secondly, the Government of Newfoundland will consider some technique whereby people may be encouraged, for example, in the use of pool arrangements- some of it is happening already as a result of higher prices, but perhaps a very useful method might be of giving people some form of concession, that is, a group of workers heading in the same general direction so that you do not have the spectacle, which I am sure all members have observed at crossroads and various other intersections, say, along the Trans-Canada Highway or elsewhere, of three or four thousand pounds of automobile, multiplied one hundred times carrying a single individual to the same destination for precisely the same purpose. And something along that line - I confess not to have a formula directly on the top of my head - would be extremely useful in terms of the objectives which the hon. member has talked about.

There is another point I want to make and it really relates to the quite excellent intervention, I thought, by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), who highlighted something for which I do not believe politicians are really as much to blame as bureaucrats are, and that is that in terms of improved housing conditions for people, whether they be in Labrador or in many rural parts of Newfoundland, and indeed in my own constituency, the problem is really trying to get through the red tape to try to get the situation resolved. I had an instance just a few days ago, and I cite it as an example of what I am talking about, of a very industrious lady who was anxious to get some assistance to build a comparatively small, compact, and I have no doubt, energy saving dwelling. But there is no programme, apparently, which would permit this lady, who is a welfare recipient and getting on in years, no programme in which she could get the kind of small, compact sort of place that is ideal for her and which, I repeat, would undoubtedly save a great deal. On the other hand, there are programmes where she can

MR. JAMIESON: get considerable help to try to renovate a dilapidated, run-down, two storey, in her case, useless kind of dwelling. Now I emphasize that that has got nothing to do with the ability of members in this House or whatever the case might be; it is simply a question of a set of rules or regulations where the man looks them down and says, "I am sorry, ma'am. That is only going to cost \$4,500 but I have not got that kind of money under that kind of a heading. But if you want \$6,500 to do an inadequate job over here on this one, I will put new sills under the house for you, I will put a new roof on it, I will do anything but I cannot do the sensible thing." Now my theme in making this comment is that in some way or other we must find a means of cutting through the red tape. I am not altogether certain that public servants are to blame. I understand that they always-and it is wise and sensible on their part - have the rule book to fall back on, but there should be some technique or some method whereby logic, when it is so unmistakably there, is able to apply. I re-emphasize this one in particular because it is so dramatic. I think the hon. minister wants to ask me a question.

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) does the lady live outside the city of St. John's?

MR. JAMIESON: Oh, yes.

MR. DINN: And does not the rural and native housing programme cover that situation? I am aware of an upper limit, that the house has to be not bigger than, I think it is, 1,154 square feet or something but I was not aware of a lower limit.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I must confess that I cannot answer the hon. minister in specific detail except that this happens to be a case in which both my hon. friend, the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Hollett), and I are both familiar. I can assure him, and I would be glad to get him the details, that in fact we actually visited with the lady and it is a fact. It may not even be provincial, incidentally. I doubt very much if there is very much provincial involvement in it. I am not sure. But in any event I use it simply as an example, and I have no doubt, no doubt

December 6, 1979

Tape No. 1642

AH-3

MR. JAMIESON:

at all that there are hundreds of cases similar in one way or another to this throughout the Province. What I am really

Mr. Jamieson:

getting at is essentially, I guess, what I might describe as an old bogie that I have had for many, many years with regard to this precise interpretation of rules which can sometimes get us into so much ridiculous red tape and slowness with regard to these kinds of matters.

Now I will not, as I said at the outset, take a lot of time this afternoon. I have no choice but to agree with the resolution even if I did not wish to, because I am pleased to say that I had a fairly large part to play in negotiating the particular agreement to which the hon. member referred. And, I think, by the way, that this is only really in a sense scratching the surface of what may be done in the future. I have had the opportunity, as the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) also obviously has had, of learning of some of the new techniques, the new methods and the like which are suddenly and almost overnight, because of the oil crisis and the energy crisis, coming in again to prominence, and I have not understood, by the way, why we have not in this Province, where, if we have anything with regard to climatic conditions, we have a substantial number of windy days - I dare say if we had a windcharger on top of this particular building, by the way, we would be able to cut ourselves off from the Newfoundland Light and Power, because I have never come in here yet that I have not half been blown off the steps - but I suspect also that those of us who can

remember the days when windchargers were dotting the landscape of this Province would wonder why we have not started some kind of modern experiment with that particular natural and clearly renewable, and, I suspect, fortunate continuing result.

IN HON. MEMBER:

There is one being built.

MR. JAMIESON:

There is one being built? Good! Well, I am glad to hear it. But also, of course, in terms of small industrial projects and, indeed, small communities in some instances, it may be very well be possible that this kind of thing could be employed to a

Mr. Jamieson: far greater extent than it is.

But in the last analysis, I think, the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Barry) was probably right when he said that what is at the root of our real difficulty in the Western World in this regard is the attitudes of people, that we have come to be a very profligate, I guess is the appropriate word, in terms of our use of energy. And it is really quite amazing, by the way, to see the comparisons, and perhaps some hon. members have done so, between the per capita or per household or per unit, whichever measurement one wishes to employ, utilization of electricity in North America and Canada as opposed to even some of the most highly industrialized countries in Europe, for example, where our usages are well and beyond four, five, six, seven times beyond that of these other countries. And yet they do not seem to be that much less advanced; if you go to London you do not seem to get an impression that they are employing anything much less by way of power and so on.

So it is an attitudinal thing, and I suppose in the last analysis it is going to take perhaps a generation in order to get us, if we do it in the right way, within, perhaps, the school system even, or in places like that, to get younger people more conscious of the need to conserve.

The last point that I want to make is this that the Minister of Energy and Mines really posed what is, in the phraseology of the day, a Catch 22 situation for us, I suspect, down the road in Newfoundland. And I do not envy any of those who have to come to grips with the particular problem, and I am talking in a totally, in a sense, non-political way, and that is, of course, that I can foresee a time in the not too distant future when we will have, because of the costs involved in getting something in the Lower Churchill underway, I can see us saying that we need a higher utilization of electricity in order to get it on stream. I think the Minister of Energy and Mines alluded to it this afternoon, and it is an intensely



December 5, 1979

Tape 1643

PK - 3

Mr. Jamieson: complex situation. I do not know what we do if we suddenly find when the bottom line is reached, and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and others have to examine costs, I do not know what we do if we say we can bring that power in, but there is a

MR. JAMIESON: surplus of x, and the only way we can get it going is to make use of the surplus of x amount. Now where do we go from there? Do we then turn around and say to people, in fact, "You should utilize more," and do what Ontario Hydro is now in effect having to do, that is, say "Live better electrically," because you have this surplus on your hands? I do not, I repeat, have any short answers to that one but it is obviously going to be one of the real problems that is going to confront the government and the people of Newfoundland I suspect within a comparatively short time. But as for the usefulness of this debate, I think if it gets even a modicum of public attention, then the hon. member will have done a real service. And I think also that the fact that the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and members on the other side have pointed out some very specific and important ways in which conservation can go ahead, is really something that makes this debate very much worthwhile.

I should not end without commending the hon. member either for the most generous and happy way in which he received the friendly heckling with which we welcomed his introduction of this motion a week ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! If the hon. member for the Bay of Islands speaks now he closes the debate on this motion.

The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all hon. members for speaking in the debate; especially would I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson). I referred to him before as the 'golden tongued orator', as the St. John Chrysostom, and the Sir Wilfred Laurier and the late Bishop Fallon of London. I am sure you heard of all these hon. gentlemen. I could listen to him all night and I say 'God Bless him' and long may he live to help this great Province of Newfoundland. That is from the bottom of my heart.

MR. WOODROW: I also want to refer to the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). He is always so sincere in his remarks, and the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) certainly has a special case that he made for his district and I certainly commend him also.

Now after consulting with the hon. Premier I was very glad and delighted to have the opportunity to bring in this motion, which of course is now coming to an end.

I would like to say, first of all, to the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) that I understand the Premier is getting a mid-size car and the Lincoln Continental will be used on special occasions. I have heard this from the Minister of -

AN HON. MEMBER: The member for Humber West (Mr. Baird).

MR. BAIRD: Leave the member for Humber West out of it, that is what you can do.

MR. WOODROW: - the Minister of Public Service, is he?

AN HON. MEMBER: Public Works.

MR. WOODROW: Public Works and Services.

MR. WOO Now, in the meantime I would hasten to say, and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I was one who presented a number of petitions in the House last year, and I presented them on behalf, of course, of the members of the Bay of Islands district. And I would do the same thing over and over. because it is because of them that I am here speaking in this hon. House today. But I realize now that there is not too much we can do to stop the prices of oil from which, of course, our electricity is generated. And I would just like to quote from Time Magazine, November 27th., where the present Iran troubles is going to cause the oil to be even higher.

"With spot prices now hovering to \$40 or more per barrel, nearly twice the maximum official OPEC price of \$23.50 for oil sold under contracts of three months or more, OPEC members are clamouring for a hefty new increase

Mr. Woodrow: when the Cartel meets in Caracas on December 17, notes a top Carter Administration official, 'Spot prices are the locomotives now dragging OPEC prices along,' adds data resources Ekstein, 'Our present forecast has OPEC prices going to \$26.00 per barrel during 1980 as a result of the current situation in Iran, and perhaps \$29.00 in 1981. But if Iran's production shuts down completely, the resulting in shortfall would mean that we could well be paying between \$35.00 and \$40.00 long before then.'

So, Mr. Speaker, you can see that there is not much that we can do about the prices. It was, of course, and I perhaps suggested myself, perhaps we could subsidize it. But if we subsidize it, what MUST we do? We will probably have to put another 1 per cent or 2 per cent on sales tax. So I think that we have to try to suffer it out and conserve as much as we can.

Now conservation, Mr. Speaker, has become almost a daily word our in our language of the day. But we must recognize that conservation alone is not enough. Now, whilst the Province has done much to instill the conservation ethic in the minds of consumers, new initiatives must be developed to ensure low cost, stable energy supplies for future generation. and I will just mention a couple of them, the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Barry) already mentioned them, we must seek to develop our hydro-electric resources which are renewable and in abundance in our Province. This would decrease our ever increasing reliance on imported petroleum products and provide a badly needed break for consumers of electricity who are finding it increasingly difficult to keep pace with our hydro rates. We must continue to support the revitalization of our railway, this is an important thing, and increase our encouragement for an important and an enlarged water transportation network. These modes of transportation are generally regarded to be the most energy efficient means to move goods. We have a tremendous opportunity to effect some meaningful changes in this area when my colleague for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) presents his Private Member's bill for

MR. WOODROW: consideration.

It may be worthwhile to look at ways of providing stimulants for consumers to purchase small compact cars. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will notice that over the past five years especially a lot of small cars have been bought. And I am glad to know the Premier now is going to lead the way in getting a mid-size car. I think, really, it is only right and fair that this should happen and I am delighted to know that it will happen hopefully soon. Perhaps a lot of the members in the hon. House of Assembly will do the same thing. I refer to my good friend for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett), He has already purchased a diesel car, and it costs to go to Corner Brook from here about \$10.00 in a diesel car whereas in , say, an eight cylinder, gas would cost about, roughly speaking, \$30.00.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: Pardon?

MR. RIDEOUT: You had a small one before the Premier?

MR. WOODROW: I did yes. Well, maybe I am leading the way and I am glad to hear that from the hon. member.

MR. RIDEOUT: That was the point I was referring to.

MR. WOODROW: Very good.

These are already signs that buying habits are changing in the direction and with future incentives in the form of tax breaks, our consumer trends would gradually be transformed.

But, I believe I said, Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this motion that it takes about six to seven years to change buying habits. You know, we still perhaps just

MR. L. WOODROW:

like to be seen driving in a big car, it calls for a little bit of prestige and the like, but I think we will have to bury that and get down to using our small cars.

Mr. Speaker, while much has been done to date by government to provide incentives for an atmosphere of energy conservation throughout our Province, we must ensure that our energy conscious ethic is a continuing process in the future. Our country is based on the economic supply of energy because of our size and cold climate. I am going to say a word on this before I finish also. We are the largest per capita users of energy in the world. The fundamental preservation of our Province and our country as a whole depends on our continued commitment to energy conservation and the future development of new and conventional energy supplies. We must and will meet this challenge in the years ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few more notes here, some little notes that I have made. I am especially concerned, Mr. Speaker, about people who have built homes heated by electricity, they built them in good faith and in fact most of the people at the present time ~~they~~ heat their homes with oil. Now, it is amazing today even in the smaller places of this Province how many people have gotten away from wood. But I would rather see, Mr. Speaker, I would rather see car gas go to \$5.00 a gallon and see the fuel that we use in our furnaces go down to fifty cents, because a lot of our people this winter and a lot of our people in every district in this Province, I am sure, are going to find it hard, we are going to find it hard ourselves. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) noted, we can have car pools for getting back and forth to work, we can go, in fact, even now in the city of Corner Brook, and also in all the various communities in my district, we can go, in fact, there is a bus transportation. So, I do not know if any thought has been given to that or not, but I can tell you that it is going to be a big strain on many people.

MR. L. WOODROW:

like to be seen driving in a big car, it calls for a little bit of prestige and the like, but I think we will have to bury that and get down to using our small cars.

Mr. Speaker, while much has been done to date by government to provide incentives for an atmosphere of energy conservation throughout our Province, we must ensure that our energy conscious ethic is a continuing process in the future. Our country is based on the economic supply of energy because of our size and cold climate. I am going to say a word on this before I finish also. We are the largest per capita users of energy in the world. The fundamental preservation of our Province and our country as a whole depends on our continued commitment to energy conservation and the future development of new and conventional energy supplies. We must and will meet this challenge in the years ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a few more notes here, some little notes that I have made. I am especially concerned, Mr. Speaker, about people who have built homes heated by electricity, they built them in good faith and in fact most of the people at the present time ~~they~~ heat their homes with oil. Now, it is amazing today even in the smaller places of this Province how many people have gotten away from wood. But I would rather see, Mr. Speaker, I would rather see car gas go to \$5.00 a gallon and see the fuel that we use in our furnaces go down to fifty cents, because a lot of our people this winter and a lot of our people in every district in this Province, I am sure, are going to find it hard, we are going to find it hard ourselves. As the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. Jamieson) noted, we can have car pools for getting back and forth to work, we can go, in fact, even now in the city of Corner Brook, and also in all the various communities in my district, we can go, in fact, there is a bus transportation. So, I do not know if any thought has been given to that or not, but I can tell you that it is going to be a big strain on many people

MR. L. WOODROW:                    this year to keep their homes heated and I hope some consideration will be given to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, also speaking of the CHIP programme, it certainly has done a lot of good but it is a rather strange thing and I have, I do not know if any other hon. members have any calls like this one or not, but I have had calls from people in my district who have not got a credit rating because they pay by cash and they can not get the insulation. The merchant who sells somebody the insulation, he has to wait maybe six weeks or two months before he receives his cheque from the federal government and naturally he can not carry people over thirty days. So, a lot of people have been turned down because of this reason and they said to me that insulation is only for the rich and not for the poor, which I think naturally is false. And then again, Mr. Speaker, I have also heard of people, they have had the insulation installed, say, by their neighbor or some ordinary worker in the community and they cannot receive the money for labour unless it is installed by a company. So to have it installed, say, by some company over there,



MR. L. WOODROW:

construction firm or company it would cost them \$1,200. In fact, this is something, I think, also that we should give some attention to.

A few more points, Mr. Speaker, before we close off. I also, Mr. Speaker, would like to say that I am concerned about the high cost, naturally, of electricity and the like and the hydro and I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that these costs are sometimes due to the greedy shareholders in those companies. They are not satisfied with 15 per cent but, in some cases I understand, that they are receiving as much as 40 per cent and over. I suppose there is not too much we can do about it living under a democratic society but it is too bad that these people would not have a bit of compassion on those who have far less than they have.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that - Oh, yes, I would like to say, too, that believe it or not there is an energy saving house, the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to it, there is one being built over in the community of York Harbour. So you can see people are really trying every way they can to keep down the cost of electricity. And also I understand that Arctic Power can be used to wash clothes, in fact, you then do not have to use hot water. In fact, this is another matter that people certainly could bear in mind.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible)

MS. VERGE:

Zero, too.

MR. L. WOODROW:

Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker, no.

Also, there certainly have been a lot of wood stoves sold throughout the Province and this also is helping people to keep down their electricity rates. People are really, in fact, becoming conscious of it. In fact, what I would like to see the hon. Minister of Lands and Forest (Mr. Morgan) to see him give permission for people to cut the dead timber along the highways. We have to go, in fact, in I think it is thirty-three feet or something -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Three hundred and three feet.

MR. L. WOODROW: 303 feet and so a lot of that could be used as well. I believe I alluded before when I spoke last week to the hon. Prime Minister - I do not know if it is all right to mention his name in the House now or not; this happened yesterday - but when we see a picture taken of him we see him with a sweater on in the living room and I would like to say that I have taken at least one leaf out his book and I tried to follow that; in fact, in the living room I always wear a sweater.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. WOODROW: And last but not least, I suppose we may go back to the old days. There was a Leader of the Opposition in Canada known as Robert Stanfield and we have had to go back to the Stanfield days.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. WOODROW: It is probably used now, I do not know. But in any case I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to face it, we have to set the pace ourselves

MR. WOODROW: within the boundaries of reason, and I feel sure that all hon. members really realize what it is all about, and maybe there is not too much we can do by way of keeping down prices but at least we can set the example.

And once again, I thank all hon. members and I hope that this resolution at least will result in doing a little bit of good for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): It is moved and seconded that the motion carry. All those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", motion carried.

It is also agreed that the clock be advanced to six by both parties.

MR. MARSHALL: It was agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

This House stands adjourned until 3:00 P.M. on Thursday.